

STATE LIBRARY
* 2-JUL 1964 *
OF VICTORIA

The Australian Communist

•
No 3

FOR THE APPLICATION OF MARXIST-LENINIST
THEORY TO THE CONDITIONS OF AUSTRALIA

PRICE: 1/6

THE FEDERAL ELECTION IN THE LIGHT OF MARXISM-LENINISM	Page 1
LENIN ANNIVERSARY ARTICLE REVIEWS THE TASKS AHEAD	16
THE RIGHT OPPORTUNISM OF THE "THEORETICIAN" E. AARONS	23
REVISIONIST C.P.A. LEADERS DEPART FURTHER FROM MARXISM-LENINISM	31
TROTSKY'S GHOST REALLY WALKS AGAIN	41
REVISIONIST GYMNASTICS OF C.P.A. LEADERS UNDER "THE BATON"	45
A COMMENT ON L. L. SHARKEY'S CENTRAL COMMITTEE REPORT	54
MIGRANTS AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE AUSTRALIAN WORKING CLASS	60
ABUNDANCE ALONE DOES NOT MEAN COMMUNISM	65
EXCERPTS FROM N.Z. PARTY STATEMENT TO C.P.S.U.	68
IN MEMORIAM	72

STATE LIBRARY
*
2 - JUL 1964
OF VICTORIA

The Federal Elections in the Light of Marxism-Leninism

MARX, Engels, Lenin and Stalin drew profound conclusions about the nature of the State, of Parliaments, of bourgeois democracy, of reformism, of revisionism. These conclusions have guided the workingclass in its revolutionary struggle for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. These great leaders formulated principles of universal application. Those principles demand integration with the concrete practice and reality of Australia. The success of a revolutionary party depends on its capacity to integrate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with Australian reality. Therefore the Australian Federal elections of November 30, 1963, must be looked at in that light.

Lenin said, "To decide once every few years which member of the ruling class is to misrepresent the people in Parliament is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in parliamentary constitutional monarchies but also in the most democratic republics." (State and Revolution Selected Works, 12 Vol. Edition Vol. 7, p. 44). Is this proposition of Lenin out of date? Is it dogmatic to quote it? Is it borne out by an examination of the concrete reality of Australia? Did the Federal Election of November 30, 1963, illustrate its validity or disprove its validity?

In the Australian reality to answer these questions requires a careful analysis of the nature of the Australian Parliament, of the nature of the contending Parliamentary parties, of the policies of the contending parties, of the situation in the Australian and world economy. Such an analysis proves beyond any question the validity of Lenin's statement.

Parliament is a specific form of capitalist class rule. Its activity, and bourgeois social theory about it, (including reformist theory), have been designed to create the illusion that the common people have some real say in their own affairs. Why, it is said by a governing party, if you don't like our policy you can throw us out; you have a vote; there are political parties to watch your interests; moreover the various parties have constituted the government from time to time; the government is responsible to Parliament and Parliament is elected by the people; in any event there is a Parliamentary opposition which prevents governmental excesses.

The critical question, however, is that despite all this, Australian capitalism has grown: gone through many phases of development; is today Australian imperialism. Australia has developed into an imperialist country as a constitutional parliamentary monarchy (within the so-called British Commonwealth). Many Parliaments have existed in Australian Parliamentary history and there have been governments of all the Parliamentary Parties. Capitalism has grown and become imperialism; the Australian workingclass and working people (small farmers and business men, middle classes) have been exploited at an ever increasing tempo: monopoly grip has tightened. The State apparatus has been strengthened with an increased standing army, more repressive legislation, more gaols, more courts.

Parliament Serves Monopoly Capitalism

No single election and no change of government has in any way whatever interfered with the operation of the social laws governing the development of Australian capitalism and more latterly, of course, Australian imperialism. But everyone has exercised his vote: many people are opposed to capitalism and imperialism: many more are opposed to one or another aspect of it: they have exercised their vote but the aspect of their opposition remains unsatisfied. And why?

Because Parliament is merely a part of the superstructure which serves the social system of monopoly capitalism.

It was never intended to interfere with it in any way: its whole purpose is to oil the working of the social system of monopoly capitalism. The whole of the Australian economy is effectively in the hands of the great monopolies and if by some mischance Parliament got out of hand, ceased to be their instrument, they would simply close down the economy. How would Australia fare without oil, steel, motor vehicles, sugar, bread, leather and many other such products all of which are effectively in the hands of the monopolies. Moreover, you may examine the reports of parliamentary proceedings and debates and see that Parliament is a talking shop in which the motions are gone through of passing legislation. All the legislation has a class content — a capitalist class content.

Hence the question of Parliament must be approached by the workingclass in a way entirely different from a mere electoral campaign, from a mere reliance upon Parliament to bring about fundamental change. In its present form, it cannot and will not — to conceive of such a thing is a contradiction in terms because Parliament is a specific institution to serve the ruling monopoly class.

It is true that Parliament has a positive importance and use for the workingclass. The very struggle to extend the franchise, to abolish restrictions on Parliamentary candidates, etc., has

given the workingclass valuable experience. It has politically driven back the ruling class which, in its turn, has skilfully adapted itself to each new victory won by the workers historically in extending the franchise and has used that also to its own advantage.

But the very extension of the franchise was won in struggle outside Parliament and Parliament's legislation only recorded that victory.

Similarly, for example, limited working hours have been won outside Parliament and the courts, and the Parliament and courts by their legislation and decisions have simply recorded the victories already won outside Parliament. By passing the legislation, the illusion is created that it is Parliament that has done the job. So it is a process which needs careful analysis and explanation all the time.

Again in times of election, political interest is heightened and the workers and working people are more receptive to explanation about the real nature of society (including Parliament) and the real need for struggle to end the social system and with it the system of Parliamentarism as we know it.

Still further, Communists (Marxists-Leninists) in Parliament can use it as a powerful forum to assist and merge with the movement outside Parliament to gain this or that reform as part of the struggle to end the system and with it Parliament as we know it. All Australian Marxist-Leninists and class conscious workers must re-study very carefully the essential character of Parliament and at the same time the need to participate in elections and to be elected to Parliament.

They could do no better than to read Lenin's "State and Revolution" and his "Left Wing Communism." These are books readily available and readily understood. The A.L.P. leaders, of course, fundamentally disagree with Lenin's teachings as their very existence depends upon Parliament. The revisionist leaders of the Communist Party give lip service to Lenin, but in reality they subordinate everything to Parliamentarism and elections.

If you examine their Tribune and Guardian and the written material they issued in the election (and you should examine it) you will find that it is kept absolutely within the confines of Parliamentarism. Never once is the character of Parliament explained, and everywhere throughout it the illusion is created and fed that the return of a Labour Government within the Parliament will solve the main social problems.

Hardly a revolutionary approach!

Scarcely in accord with the teachings of Marx and Lenin! These gentlemen regard the workers and working people as too dull, too backward, to understand such matters. They are sectarians in the true sense of the word, far removed from the people, contemptuous of the workers and without faith in the people.

And they are betraying the working people because they are helping to deceive them when the task of all Communists is to tear the mask from the deceptions and tricks of the ruling class.

The Present "Alternative" To Menzies

But, these gentlemen say, the reality is that the only alternative to the Menzies Government is a Labor Government and they parrot this abroad day after day in their narrow doctrinaire way as though it is the final wisdom. "Return a Labor Government" is their leading slogan. In passing, one wonders why they bother to have a party and one wonders what has happened to their well known criticism of the Communist Party of Great Britain for using just this slogan, and their rejection of the same slogan as late as 1959 and 1960.

All that can be left aside, just as these people have left aside honesty. Let us examine it as it stands.

It is quite true that the only alternative in the Parliamentary field to the Menzies Government is a Labor Government. That was quite clear. Just because the Labor Party operates within the confines of Parliamentarism, assisted by the revisionist Communist Party leaders, there could no alternative.

The only alternative is the struggle of the people aimed at ending capitalist society and creating workingclass rule. That demands ruthless exposure of Parliamentarism as it now is. In that, neither the A.L.P. nor Communist Party leaders are in the slightest interested. Then they say, but that's not reality; that's skipping over stages; that's sectarian; that's pseudo-revolutionary. However, we say, no it is not the immediate reality, but since when have Marxist-Leninists failed to look at reality as a whole and on the contrary made their estimates on transient, passing, fleeting phenomena.

Marxist Leninists leave that sort of thing to the Philistines and humbugs whom Lenin so vigorously castigated. These gentlemen should ask themselves this: if it was good enough for Lenin forty-eight years ago with not a single socialist country and with a workingclass less experienced than today to speak out trenchantly and work hard in exposure of Parliamentarism, the fraud of parliamentary elections, the treachery of reformism why is it not good enough for you forty-eight years later with a third of the world socialist, a raging national liberation movement and a far more experienced workingclass to speak out even more trenchantly and work more vigorously in exposure of these things?

Why not, gentlemen, why not?

And does not your own theory of the force of example of socialist ideas itself impel you to such a conclusion? If you are

Marxist-Leninists of course it would be one of the factors but you want to drop the struggle altogether and be liberated by mere force of example when "the sensible capitalists" (who in your opinion have today got more sense) will see the futility of capitalism and then embrace socialism. Such is revisionism!

Cause of Communist Vote Decline

The A.L.P. and Communist Party leaders both considered that the A.L.P. would win the elections. There is no question of that and it was a bitter blow to them when it did not happen. In passing it is a commentary on their divorce from Marxism-Leninism and their inability to make a concrete analysis that could get them into such a stupid position. It was pure subjectivism — philosophical idealism.

The Communist Party leaders were so carried away with their desire and wish that the Labor Party would solve everything for them that the wish was seen as the fact — a lesson itself in dialectics, in the thought processes of revisionists. Again in key industrial electorates Communist votes in Victoria declined (e.g., Wilson in Melbourne Ports). The revisionist gentlemen previously blamed low votes on the sectarianism of the so-called dogmatists. Now they have got rid of the so-called dogmatists, how will they explain honestly the Communist vote decline? It lies in the decline of reformism and revisionism.

Their very nature is designed to prevent any radical change. The very system of parliamentarism means that the ruling class can bring about a change of Government with a change in a mere handful of votes, part again of the deception.

How did the defeat of the Labor Party occur? Its defeat is rooted in the general crisis of capitalism, the general crisis of the Labor Party itself, in the very system of Parliamentarism and the betrayal by the Communist Party leaders of Marxism-Leninism.

We recognise that the majority of the workingclass in an election favour the return of the Labor Party. That is reality. But the workingclass instinctively knows that the Labor Party leaders will not solve their problems. Lenin long ago dealt with this very problem and he pointed out that Communists recognise this desire of the workers and take it into full account.

"If I as a Communist come out and call upon the workers to vote for Henderson against Lloyd George, they will certainly listen to me. And I will be able to explain in a popular manner not only why Soviets are better than Parliament and why the dictatorship of the proletariat is better than the dictatorship of Churchill (which is concealed behind the signboard of bourgeois democracy) but also that I wanted to support Henderson with my vote in the same way as a rope supports the hanged — that the establishment of a Henderson government will prove that I

am right, will bring the masses over to my side, and will accelerate the political death of the Hendersons and the Snowdens as was the case with their friends in Russia and Germany" (Left Wing Communism. 12 Vol. Edition Selected Works, Vol. 10, pp. 130-131: all emphasis ours).

If you used Calwell for Henderson you could transmit this to the Australian scene. But does this mean that we endorse the A.L.P. leaders? Does it mean return a Labor Government because a Labor Government is good?

Of course it doesn't.

It means just the reverse (a classical exposition of dialectics) to expose and destroy the Labor leaders.

Over 40 years have gone since Lenin wrote this. And is the situation more favourable for the exposure of the A.L.P. 40 years later? Of course it is.

And above all, because the workingclass has experienced several Labor governments with all their anti-workingclass actions and their defence and development of the capitalist system. " . . . Propaganda and agitation alone" (for socialism) "are not sufficient. For this the masses must have their own political experience" (Ibid.).

And the Australian masses have had a very rich experience indeed of the bankruptcy of reformism. Hence the soil for direct Communist work, candidature and independence is far more fertile than 40 years ago.

Let us remember that in discussing this question, Lenin never ceased or evaded the exposure, nay, ruthless exposure, of reformism.

Imagine Lenin advocating the return of a Labor Government as our Australian "Communists" Sharkey, Dixon, Aarons do!

And after the abject defeat of the A.L.P. leaders defending them and their policy!

It is literally fantastic. You may search the pages of Lenin and never find a single word to support such a stand.

Weakness In Revolutionary Work

The fact of the strength of faith in the Labor Party in countries like England and Australia points out the weakness of revolutionary work over the whole period of the existence of the Communist Parties. Today there are specific features — logical outcome of trends long present — which show that the Communist Party leaders actually strengthen the illusions of the workers in the A.L.P.

Let us examine some of this. It is necessary to start by asserting once again (no matter how the revisionists howl about

it) that there was and is no essential difference between the policy advanced by the A.L.P. leaders and that of the Menzies Party. In essence their policy was the same.

On the critical questions of foreign policy the merest shades of difference appeared. It is better to let Mr. Calwell speak and we will make some passing comments.

What does Mr. Calwell say about the U.S. base at Exmouth Gulf in Western Australia? — **"Labor's attitude on the North West Cape has been made so clear that I need not repeat it at length.**

"WE SUPPORT THE BASE and we have stated our attitude to certain features of the treaty covering it.

"We want joint control, not military control, at Government levels."

What is that but imperialism?

Joint control amounts simply to sharing imperialist interests even if the U.S. imperialists are kind enough to listen to Mr. Calwell which is highly unlikely.

Again Mr. Calwell: **"We will raise the strength of the Pacific Island Regiment in Papua-New Guinea from 700 to an ultimate 6,000 and re-establish the Torres Strait Regiment as part of the Papuan battle group."**

What is in New Guinea to warrant this? The answer is Australian imperialist exploitation of the New Guinea people whose immediate and unconditional independence every decent Australian demands.

Let us continue with Mr. Calwell's imperialist policy. Everyone knows that Menzies is an open and unashamed imperialist but what is Mr. Calwell's criticism of Menzies?

"In 1952-53," said Mr. Calwell in his policy speech, **"Menzies spent 4.8% of the gross national product on defence. In 1962-63 he spent 2.7% on defence.**

"Were we to restore the defence spending to the scale of 10 years ago, we would now be spending about £350 million a year or £100 million more than we are doing."

And what is this spending for? It is for "our foreign policy" which, said Mr. Calwell, is based firmly on four pillars: **Membership of the Commonwealth of Nations; firm adherence to the Australian-American alliance established by the Curtin Labor Government; unswerving loyalty to the United Nations.**

"If war ever comes, we will honour our treaty obligations. We make it clear that we shall always be found on the side of liberty and democracy."

Yes, Mr. Calwell, "liberty and democracy" U.S. imperialist style, conditioned by Exmouth Gulf and the Australian-American alliance and the Commonwealth of Nations with its troops in Malaysia, and the consequent threat to Indonesia. It is a policy in the interests of Australian monopoly capitalism at the head of which stands B.H.P., C.S.R., G.M.H., A.C.I., Burns Philp (with their record profits) to name but a few.

(In passing, it must be pointed out that the first task of every standing army in capitalist society is directed at the internal repression of the workers).

But lest you think we exaggerate, let Mr. Calwell speak again:

"The Prime Minister has stated he wants the election to be fought on the question of Malaysia.

"In other words, he wants the Nation to divide on a question on which it is not fundamentally divided."

On the domestic front did the proposed social service increases in any way challenge monopoly capitalism? Have they anything in common with socialism? Clearly enough they have not

In fact, increases in these things serve the capitalist class. Child endowment paid from Government funds (derived as they are from loans on which interest is paid to the capitalist, from direct and indirect taxation, the main burden of which falls on the working people, from inflation of the currency which hits the working people and middle class hardest) protects the capitalists from having to pay higher wages.

Were it not for such things the private capitalists would be compelled to pay higher wages because wages are fundamentally determined by what it costs to maintain a man and his wife and children. If part of the burden is carried by the State then to that extent the capitalist, and in particular the big monopoly capitalist, is relieved.

Likewise Australian capitalist development demands a larger number than hitherto of technically well qualified workers. It is a commentary on the anarchy of capitalism that it has fallen so far behind in providing such people. So Mr. Calwell stepped up the education program of the A.L.P. fundamentally for this reason.

Of course those things met and meet with our approval for quite different reasons — they can be used to the advantage of the working people.

Now let us turn to another side of the policy speech — that dealing with the wages and conditions of the working class.

Australian trade unionists demand the unconditional repeal of the penal provisions of the Arbitration Act.

Mr. Calwell promised nothing like this. He said: "Labor is opposed to the policy of penal provisions for contempt in industrial legislation. Early action will be taken to AMEND the pertinent penal provisions of Section 109 and 111 of the Arbitration Act" (note "amend," not repeal).

Then there are those (including the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party) who said that the Labor Party would implement the A.C.T.U.'s economic programme with its demand for increased basic wage, increased margins, restoration of quarterly adjustments to the basic wage and so on.

But Mr. Calwell said in his policy speech:

"Labor will establish a productivity index and will also establish a representative committee of review to prepare recommendations in an advisory capacity to the Commonwealth Statistician. We shall intervene before the Arbitration Commission to support the A.C.T.U. and A.W.U. for an immediate restoration of automatic quarterly adjustments of the cost of living."

A long way short of the A.C.T.U.'s programme!

But the most significant feature of it was its complete acceptance of the system of arbitration — "go to arbitration" — the time-honored cry of Labor Party leaders.

No matter what the workers demand, no matter what support in words the A.L.P. leaders give them (and Mr. Calwell does not even do that) the Arbitration machinery is there to deny them and Mr. Calwell did and does nothing about it.

And you may add many more examples. One more will suffice. The political sections of the Crimes Act have long been the subject of workingclass opposition. Until August, 1963, the A.L.P. stood for their repeal in toto but the A.L.P. Federal Conference (1963) modified that and instead of unconditional repeal there appeared at the Federal election in the A.L.P. official policy statement entitled "Build a strong Australia with Labor," under the heading, "Civil Rights" this statement:

"Labor will amend the Crimes Act to:

"Repeal the sections which permit a person to be convicted on evidence of reputation rather than proven facts.

"Abolish the death penalty."

A very different picture from repeal of the Crimes Act.

Naturally we support even these limited demands but we direct attention to the systematic retreat of the A.L.P. leaders.

So that today it is true to say that the nominal, declared policy of the A.L.P. is more than ever to the right. There has always been a great difference in the actual A.L.P. policy from its nominal, declared policy, for example, nominally it has stood for socialism but in reality for capitalism, nominally it has stood for the repeal of the Crimes Act, really for perpetuation of the

Crimes Act. Today, however, its nominal policy is being brought much more into line with its actual policy. Thus it is expressly recognising its own existence as a capitalist party and making it all the easier to deal with.

Clear Disavowal of Socialism

This calls for more exposure: it provides more experience for the workers: and provides more examples of conformity with capitalism: it shows express disavowal of socialism and even of capitalist nationalisation (Calwell's policy speech). Such a development could not be otherwise because capitalism is more and more on trial and it is more and more dangerous to the capitalists for radical ideas to get about. Hence the A.L.P. must cease to generate even mildly radical ideas: it may not be able to control the radical ideas.

So reason the capitalists.

And who is it above all who obscures the real character of the A.L.P. It is the modern revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of Australia. Without any question whatever, they underwrote and supported the A.L.P. policy and though they wrote a laborious article "proving" there were differences between them and the A.L.P., such was their disappointment and chagrin when the A.L.P. was defeated, that they forgot all about the differences and defended the A.L.P. to the end.

But it is primarily in their "theory" of the A.L.P. that they have confused the issue and allowed reformist illusions and faith in the A.L.P. to develop. We must take some examples of this.

Sharkey has asserted that the A.L.P. is a two class party, that is, presumably a party of the capitalist class and of the workingclass. This is an absurdity and contrary to all Marxist-Leninist theory on the question. When tackled about this Sharkey who had claimed the "credit" for this original "theory" sought refuge in his own statement that it had emanated from the Communist International.

But it is a proposition absolutely wrong and very dangerous except for the A.L.P. and the modern Australian revisionists. If the A.L.P. is a two class party then sooner or later the workingclass can be victorious within the A.L.P. and on certain issues it can assert a workingclass policy.

If that is so then of course the A.L.P. can change its nature and according to these theoreticians it is changing its nature. This is entirely and utterly false and has no correspondence whatever with reality.

Historically it is quite untrue, for in every set of circumstances in all Australia's history from the foundation of the A.L.P., that party has served the capitalist class, is now serving imperialism, is a Parliamentary Party committed never to change the

social system. At the present time it is just as untrue as it has always been. We pointed out above that the avowed (nominal) A.L.P. policy is more to the right now than it has ever been. And no amount of effort on the part of our revisionists (and they spare no mean effort) can change that for it is reality, practice and fact, and fact cannot be changed by wishes.

Our revisionists fervently wish the A.L.P. a little more radical and then they substitute the wish for the fact.

The A.L.P. is not a two class party at all. It is a capitalist class party as was vividly demonstrated once again in this Federal election. It is a capitalist party which commands electoral support in the workingclass. It commands that support by deception, by tradition and by reason of the ineffectiveness of Communist policy, and now the outright betrayal of Marxist-Leninism by the Communist Party leaders.

Lenin examined the character of such parties as the A.L.P. and demonstrated they were parties of capitalism. In line with that he said of the A.L.P. "... it is a liberal-bourgeois party and the so-called Liberals in Australia are really Conservatives" (Lenin on the A.L.P., 1913). But our revisionists never tell the workers about that.

The A.L.P. pretends to be a workingclass party. It is based on the trade unions. It speaks, particularly when in Parliamentary opposition, in defence of the workingclass. Historically it has had the socialist objective for more than 40 years. It has in words attacked capitalism (conspicuously in this election it did not even do that). But under its rule capitalism has prospered and it has in no way impeded the advance of Australian imperialism and today it defends Australian imperialism and Australian imperialist policies just as vigorously as Menzies. (Labor will do its utmost to make Australia self reliant in defence so that the nation can play a full role in its obligations to its allies under A.N.Z.U.S., S.E.A.T.O., and U.N. From the pamphlet "Build a Strong Australia with Labor").

Workers More Critical of A.L.P.

Hence the A.L.P. position rests upon deception and the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party do nothing about that deception except to facilitate it. The simple fact is, as anyone who moves in the workingclass knows, that the workers are more and more critical of the A.L.P., more and more looking for an alternative but that is not forthcoming from the revisionist Communist Party. It is now coming from the Australian Marxist-Leninists.

For a very long time, R. Dixon, President of the Communist Party of Australia, has laid great emphasis on the struggle against "sectarianism" as he calls it. Do not criticise the A.L.P. for that is sectarian! He has used all his influence to foster

this campaign. Sectarianism is, of course, very bad but it does not mean what Dixon says. It means isolating yourself from the revolutionary movement and that is just what Dixon has done. Correspondingly with it, he has misused the term "right wing of the A.L.P. or right wing of the labor movement."

The Communist Party has developed a great campaign against the D.L.P. and National Civic Council. The D.L.P. and N.C.C. leaders are people who are fascists masquerading in the name of Labor.

But the Communist Party has developed the campaign in such a way that these people (or their associates) are seen as the right wing in the labor movement and have conducted the campaign as though this was the be all and end all of the campaign against the right wing.

Of course it is correct to denounce these people: it must be done, but it is entirely wrong to develop it to the exclusion of the proper criticism of orthodox reformism and even left reformism.

Under cover of the vigorous attack on the D.L.P. and N.C.C., the Communist Party has supported reformist ideology. It has sacrificed everything in principle in the struggle against these people and it is the A.L.P. and its ideology that has emerged strengthened and not Marxism-Leninism.

Its entirely one-sided treatment of this question has led to further deception of the workers. Dixon, in line with this policy has even characterised Calwell as not belonging to the A.L.P. right wing but to the A.L.P. centre — a laughable proposition. How much further to the right could Mr. Calwell go? Perhaps Mr. Dixon will enlighten us.

The right wing of the A.L.P. is its top leaders. Only those can be classed on the left who are moving towards Marxism-Leninism. The A.L.P. Parliamentary leaders, the A.L.P. Federal and State Executives, are the orthodox leaders of a capitalist Party and they stand for the maintenance of capitalism. Of course there are differences amongst them and it is very important to recognise those differences and to use them in the struggle to defeat reformism in the working class movement altogether.

But to see these differences as major differences of principle and to put that forward as offering emancipation to the working class is arrant nonsense.

On the contrary, it requires a long and protracted struggle to defeat reformism taking advantage of all differences. The commencing point is the proper appreciation, estimation of reformism as the adaptation of the working class to capitalism. The competition in working class politics is between that ideology, on the one hand, and Marxism-Leninism on the other. That must be squarely stated and squarely faced. Our revisionist leaders

systematically obscure it. Marxist-Leninists have the job of winning the workers to adherence to Marxism-Leninism and to defeating reformism.

What are the prospects of this? The prospects are very good. The strength of reformism lies in the top section of the workers — to higher paid workers whose lot under capitalism is comparatively better than the general run of workers. Hence they are less prone to call in question the whole capitalist system. Nonetheless the situation of this section of workers is very precarious now. Marginal rates have never gone back to the previous proportion they bore to the basic wage. Mass production, mechanisation and automation continually erode their position and they are eternally threatened by replacement by a small number of highly qualified technicians and are threatened with being thrown into the ranks of the unskilled workers.

The brittle nature of capitalism threatens all workers with unemployment, impoverishment in all sorts of ways, inadequate travel facilities, speed up, inflation, bad educational and medical conditions, attacks on wages, shortage of homes. Reformism offers no way out and continually seeks to contain the workers within capitalism.

Lesson of N.S.W. Election Results

The most dramatic lessons on all these matters are to be learned by studying the election results in New South Wales. There the A.L.P. suffered its most serious reverses. And it was precisely in that State that there has been a Labor government for more than 20 years and the D.L.P. is weaker than anywhere else in Australia. It is not possible therefore to blame the situation on to the D.L.P. (more plausibly but just as inaccurately this can be done, for example, in Victoria). If the revisionist slogan of "Return a Labor Government" is correct, the very fact that the A.L.P. has been in office for so many years in New South Wales should have been the best reason to have had a resounding Labor win.

Exactly the reverse happened.

And with their doubleheaded penny our revisionists then say oh it was a right wing Labor government. On this reasoning they must win every time — they can never lose but reformism goes on unchallenged in its fundamentals with no competition. And what an answer! for its clear implication is clean up the A.L.P., get a left wing leadership and this disaster won't happen. In other words develop some more illusions in the A.L.P. for after all it is, according to Sharkey, a two class party and all that is wrong is that the wrong class is temporarily on top. Or in still other words, the Communist leaders see no alternative, do not see themselves or anyone else as the alternative. They are hemmed in by parliamentarism and parliamentary parties.

The results in New South Wales show a disillusionment with the A.L.P. but with no other alternative open to the workers for the hard reality is that the Communist Party offered no alternative and it shared in the A.L.P. decline precisely because it put itself forward only as a parliamentary party and at that as a parliamentary party which supported the A.L.P.

The starting point of a revolutionary party must be to see, expose in active struggle before, during and after elections, the fraud of Parliamentary elections, the fraud of reformism.

Active struggle for peace (but say our revisionists peace is not in danger: "there has been a significant easing of international tension" the Victorian Guardian said in commenting on Menzies' war talk): active struggle for economic demands (but say our revisionists the A.L.P. electoral policy looked after that): active struggle for education (but the A.L.P. again looked after that): active struggle for democratic rights (but the A.L.P. promised "amendment" of the penal powers): active struggle on all issues and use of Parliament to further the struggle, that is the only approach.

The pathetic crawling, unrequited lover-like hanging on to the A.L.P. leaders by the Communist Party leaders is a revelation indeed of the bankruptcy of revisionism as is the present whining, snivelling, despair at the result.

Active struggle — gathering the revolutionary instinct, strivings and strength of the working class is the task. But our revisionists are mortally afraid of revolution (it is "sectarian," "pseudo revolutionary," "dogmatic," "jumping over stages," "the masses won't understand it" to talk about it). For heaven's sake don't do that: it might land us in gaol (to which no one wants to go but it is an unfortunate hazard of revolutionary activity and one very much eschewed, with, no secret about it, by our "revolutionary" leader Sharkey who has never ceased to whine and snivel about his unfortunate experience) — a hazard because the ruling class is riddled with fear and hypocrisy. It sees only one side of communism and it does not really believe or practice what it says about democracy.

Moreover we would be the last to ask you to learn all about reformism or revisionism merely by studying the federal elections. Our very starting point was that in themselves Parliament and parliamentary elections decide little. Parliament and elections come and go. Their very nature is designed to prevent any radical change. Parties' fortunes change with a mere handful of votes yet such is Parliamentary deception that it is made to appear something fundamental.

They have their importance and they must not be treated with contempt but they must be seen as part and parcel of the struggle against capitalism and in the present situation as part

and parcel of the struggle for peace against the Australian imperialist war plans against the peoples in the so-called Malaysia, against Indonesia, against New Guinea and as part of the alliance with the imperialist U.S. butchers. They must be seen as part and parcel of the struggle for democratic rights against Menzies' telephone tapping, his penal powers, for improved living standards against arbitration and for gathering the forces carefully for eventual ending of capitalism.

At the same time the elections do highlight aspects of the limits of Parliamentarism, of reformism, of the nature of the A.L.P., of the nature of revisionism.

Again we would be the last to deny that there is a profound process of disintegration going on within the A.L.P. which makes revisionist treachery and deception all the more damnable and despicable.

Many members of the A.L.P. are genuinely turning to the left and the trade union and A.L.P. functionaries closest to the workers are quite conscious of this process. Some of them too turn away from reformism. Marxism-Leninism must give them the answer they seek. It is possible to be sectarian about all this, to see things abstractly, to substitute our wish for the fact. That must be guarded against. The newspaper Vanguard correctly said:

"We ourselves have very good relations with many Labor Party leaders and many, many workers who support the Labor Party. We believe in fostering the best possible such relations. But that cannot possibly blind us to what is the nature of the A.L.P. nor can it possibly excuse us from explaining frankly and honestly to those very Labor leaders and Labor Party supporters that the Labor Party is a Party of capitalism and the role of the A.L.P. leaders."

"Any other course is rank deception."

"Hence we firmly believe in the process of unity with and struggle against the A.L.P."

"While uniting with the A.L.P. influenced workers in all struggles we believe in keeping clearly before the workers the clearest possible line of demarcation between Marxism-Leninism with its irreconcilable struggle against capitalism on the one hand and reformism (A.L.P.) and revisionism (C.P.A.) with their reconciliation with capitalism on the other."

Lenin Anniversary Article Reviews The Tasks Ahead

JANUARY marks the 40th anniversary of the death of Lenin. In those years the Communist movement has progressed tremendously on the firm foundations built by Lenin. Stalin consolidated Lenin's work in the Soviet Union.

Under Stalin's leadership the imperialist attempt to destroy in World War II Lenin's work ended in the ignominious defeat of the then contenders for world domination. There came into being the socialist states of Eastern Europe. And in Asia the great victory of the Chinese revolution gave a tremendous impetus to the national revolutionary and liberation movement. Less than twelve months before his death, Lenin in speaking of the struggle to consolidate the victory of socialism said:

"In the last analysis, the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority, that during the past few years, has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of Socialism is fully and absolutely assured." (Lenin, "Better Fewer But Better." Selected Works, 2 Vol. Edition F.L.P.H. Moscow 1947, Vol. 11, P. 854).

What prophetic insight Lenin possessed!

Lenin's Work Under Attack

Today the great work of Lenin is under serious attack — an attack headed by the leadership of the very party he founded — the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Speaking of the treatment accorded great revolutionaries, Lenin said:

"After their death, attempts are made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonise them, so to say, and to surround their names with a certain halo for the 'consolation' of the oppressed classes and with the object of deifying them, while at the same time emasculating the revolutionary doctrine of

its content, vulgarising it and blunting its revolutionary edge. At the present time, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists in the labour movement concur in this 'revisionism' of Marxism. They omit, obliterate and distort the revolutionary side of its doctrine, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, 'State and Revolution' Selected Works 12 Vol. Edn. Vol. 7, p. 7).

How apt a description of what Khrushchov and his followers are doing today! With their entirely one-sided and distorted presentation of peaceful transition, peaceful co-existence, peaceful competition are they not omitting, obliterating, distorting the revolutionary soul of Marxism-Leninism.

Are they not pushing to the foreground and extolling what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie?

Of course they are and every revolutionary, every class conscious worker needs to ponder over every word that Lenin wrote. Today's revisionists, and we include Australian revisionists, pour ridicule on those who quote and cite Lenin. It is dogmatic, doctrinaire, they say, but Lenin himself faced just such a situation when dealing with the then revisionist distortions of Marx and Engels. He said:

"It will be necessary to quote at length from the works of Marx and Engels. Of course, long quotations will make the text cumbersome and will not help to make the most popular reading, but we cannot possibly avoid them." (ibid. p. 8).

Just such a task faces today's revolutionaries throughout the world and here in Australia. The Communist Party of China, tested and proven in the longest and most arduous revolutionary struggle, has done noble work in defending and developing the revolutionary essence, the revolutionary soul of Marxism-Leninism.

The Albanian Party of Labor has suffered the most fierce and prolonged attack from the revisionists precisely because it refused to be party to the distortion and emasculation of Marxism-Leninism and, on the contrary, spoke up boldly and courageously in its defence.

The banner upheld with such integrity by these two parties and others, has evoked a ready response throughout the world. Marx and Engels were two men whose work seemed but a drop in the ocean, nonetheless the great truth of their message gave birth to a movement of gigantic proportions. It survived all attempts to kill it. Lenin seemed virtually alone in his defence of it, but his defence and development of it resulted in the great October revolution. The Chinese and Albanian comrades in their defence of it were and are said to be isolated, but the two men who founded the revolutionary doctrine now known as Marxism-Leninism today have legion defenders and upholders throughout the world. The fate of modern revisionism has

indeed already been determined. But it cannot be defeated and destroyed just by stating that.

The modern revisionists do not announce, proclaim to the world, or erect a signboard that they are revisionists. They masquerade in the name of Lenin, in the name of following the Party of Lenin and a thousand and one other subterfuges. Accordingly we must study their words and actions closely.

In Australia they have compromised every single question of the revolutionary movement — be it on the nature of the State, the transition to socialism, peace and war, political economy, dialectical materialism or any other question you like to take.

In the years since 1956 (the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.) the movement of the leaders of the Communist Party of Australia to an unequivocal revisionist position has been accelerated and particularly, of course, since the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. (1961).

But it is necessary to understand that the germs and conditions of this have been present virtually since the inception of the Communist Party of Australia and we who aspire to be real Marxist-Leninists share a responsibility in this — a responsibility that must discipline us never to let it happen again, never to fail to speak out, never waver in our independent study and integration of Marxism-Leninism with our concrete reality.

Examples Of Errors Of The Past

Let us give some examples of the errors of the past. The Communist Party of Australia made a serious error in estimating the character of the war in 1939. The roots of this error were never frankly analysed and admitted.

Again there is no question whatever that the Communist Party of Australia was heavily influenced by Browderism (despite the statement in the famous article by Duclos to the contrary). Browderism was an attempted crude adaptation of the working class and its Communist Parties to imperialism — it was liquidationism. But the leaders of the Communist Party of Australia never frankly analysed their position but hushed the situation up and traded on Duclos' erroneous praise of the Communist Party of Australia's "rejection" of Browderism.

If, however, you examine the resolutions of the Australian Communist Party Congress at the end of the World War II you will see just how deep this influence was. Sharkey (and it was not his position alone but that of the whole leadership) is on record in the Communist Review as supporting Browder. These are but two examples, but a complete examination of the history of the Communist Party will show strong tendencies throughout to adapt the working class to capitalism — to become an accepted part of capitalist society rather than as the leadership

of the movement against capitalist society and to be bounded, restricted by Parliamentaryism, arbitration and so on.

The very election of Communists to leading trade union positions, hailed so much as a victory, has another side that requires careful examination and thought. Such elections would indeed be very important if the holders of these offices were, as Lenin demanded, Communists first and trade union officials second. With a few notable exceptions, it is safe to say that Communist trade union officials complacently accept the status quo and like reformist trade union officials do not want in any circumstances the status quo disturbed. How could one distinguish for example, the leading Communist trade unionist, Tom Wright, from a host of frankly reformist trade union officials in his policies, his conduct, or in any other way. (By and large one can say that the personal integrity of most Communist trade union officials is above that of the reformists. There are some notorious exceptions even to that and there are also reformist trade union officials whose personal integrity is beyond question).

Herein lies an evasion of struggle, a conformity with capitalism. And in this respect, as in all others, the Communist Party of Australia has moved close to the A.L.P. Hence Sharkey's booklet on the history of the Communist Party of Australia and his article on the Struggle for Marxism-Leninism in the Communist Party of Australia need to be looked at very critically.

We, too, have accepted far too uncritically much of what has gone on and been party to it. It is necessary for us frankly to face this to examine our own errors and to remould ourselves, to throw off all that was bad and to embrace all that was good. For once again the Communist Party of Australia, historically, has attracted all that was good and honest in the working class. It has led notable campaigns; it has introduced Marxism-Leninism to the Australian working class; it has been faced with a continuous internal struggle between the supremacy of Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. Its leadership has become revisionist but Marxism-Leninism is strong in the Australian Labor movement.

Lenin, in the passage quoted from State and Revolution, spoke of the vulgarisation of Marx. Vulgarisation is indeed an apt and accurate word to describe the conduct of Sharkey, Dixon, Aarons, Gibson and Hughes. The Communist Review of December, 1963, contains their somewhat hysterical speeches made to a Central Committee meeting. They should all be widely read. Some of them are specifically dealt with in separate articles in this publication. For crude vulgarisation it would be difficult to find their equal. Apart from characterising us as revisionists (Hughes), Trotskyist (Gibson), dogmatists, sectarian Melbourne group (Sharkey), Hill group (all of them) their speeches contain the most vulgar and crude assertions without any attempt at documentation or verification.

Sharkey pathetically makes a series of bald assertions — he has made exactly the same assertions without even bothering to vary the words since the end of 1961 when in return for the "kindness" of the Soviet Party leaders he completed his betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

Bald and crude assertions without any reasoning (because no reasoning is open to him) will get nowhere. Nor will assertions that his discussion with Mao Tse Tung is a pack of lies alter the truth. The world knows that Mao Tse Tung is not a liar. The world revolutionary movement knows that Sharkey and the Australian Party's Political Committee were at one with the Chinese Communist Party on the main questions of the revolutionary movement and Sharkey himself knows it. Liars are despised by all.

The crude assertion by Dixon that the policy of the Chinese Communists contains strong "overtones of racial and colour influences" is so despicable that it is nauseating even to deal with it. It comes direct from the imperialist lie factories, the customers of which are Khrushchov and Tito.

It is a simple fact that the Communist Parties in the Western countries have fallen under revisionist leadership. That is not a question of racialism or colour: it is a simple fact. People who make assertions such as that of Dixon reveal their own racialist and colour prejudices. Enough of such sickening rubbish!

Confidence In Soviet People

We are reproached for changing our political position. Yes, that is quite true. In his speech to the February, 1962, plenum of the Central Committee Hill said frankly that he had suffered from illusions following the 20th Congress C.P.S.U. and had helped to spread them. And there are many other such errors, and no doubt there will be many more.

It requires a process of study and experience to reveal those errors. These revisionist gentlemen reproach us for altering our attitude to the Soviet Union. But no that is not true. We have full confidence in the great Soviet people and their splendid achievements. We have no faith and confidence in Khrushchov whom we have come to despise. There is a vital difference and we have no shame in asserting it.

In contrast, the revisionist Gibson defended and extolled the Chinese people and Chinese Party including, above all, its leaders, particularly in the face of attacks by the Soviet Party leaders and then, overnight, he switched completely, along with Sharkey and Dixon. That is just plain humbug.

The position of these people is impossible. It cannot be sustained because it rests on lying about their previous position and it rests on deception.

They could have made something of a case if they had said (as Sharkey lamely and, partially at that, attempts to do) "yes, we did occupy a similar position to the Chinese Party but now we have further information that has altered our position."

D. N. Aidit, leader of the great Communist Party of Indonesia, not so long ago said that there was no market for revisionism in South East Asia. And that is perfectly true except that the leaders of the Communist Party of Australia (Sharkey, Dixon, Aarons) snapped up the offer of the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Party and themselves embraced revisionism. Thereby they isolated themselves not only from the Australian masses but from the South East Asian masses notably from the Marxist-Leninist position of the Communist Parties of Indonesia and New Zealand. The isolation of the Australian "leader" is indeed complete.

The leaders of the Communist Party of Australia are deserting the great cause of Lenin. We commemorate his life by renewing our determination to carry forward and develop the Communist movement in Australia. Already we have said the revisionists have complicated every aspect of revolutionary theory. It is not enough to record it. It is our job to reassert revolutionary theory and integrate it with concrete reality.

"Vanguard," "The Australian Communist" and "Declaration of Australian Marxist-Leninists" have made a start. There has been an outstanding response to them. But there is an immense amount of hard work yet to be done — an immense amount.

The study of Marxist political economy has been steadily thrust into the background by the revisionists. Some Communists do not understand the very elements of Marxist political economy. Without it the mechanism of capitalist exploitation remains a mystery — reaction to it emotional. Emotions of revolt are not enough: they must be backed by science. Hence we need study of Marx's Capital and of his pamphlets on economics.

In the Australian labor movement there is no more neglected question (evidence again of social democratic influences) than the agrarian question. Yet it cannot be understood without the assistance of Marx's theory of ground rent nor of Lenin's Agrarian Thesis (to be found in Vol. 10 of the 12 Volume Edition of the Selected Works, p. 218 and Vol. 2 of the 2 Volume Edition, p. 645). Or to take the question most confused by the revisionists — the nature of the A.L.P. Lenin's works "State and Revolution," "Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," "Left Wing Communism," "On the A.L.P." (to be found in the collection of Lenin on Britain) are the foundations for understanding this.

The Australian revisionist E. Aarons poses as a great expert on Marxist philosophy. His article "Philosophical Errors of the Left" is dealt with in a separate article. It is an example of supreme crudeness and condescension. Lenin dealt with just such people with withering scorn and the elucidation of

dialectical materialism in his "Materialism and Empiro Criticism" (Vol. 11 of the 12 Volume Edition).

Or on the principles of the Party, Lenin enunciated their very foundation in "What Is To Be Done," "Two Tactics," "One Step Forward." There is a wealth of material to be mastered and, side by side, integrated into our own concrete reality. We cannot talk seriously about integrating it into our own concrete reality until we have mastered it and studied our own concrete reality. And can it be done? Yes, of course, it can. Lenin in his lecture on the State urged students not to be put off by what they might think were difficulties in reading Marx and Engels. When you do not master it at one reading do not worry, return to it again and still return to it. Even after many readings and even mastery, it still contains lessons.

The international documents of 1957 and 1960 further summarised experience in the revolutionary movement. They are a further contribution to the storehouse of Marxism-Leninism.

Just as Lenin spoke of the destruction of the revolutionary soul, vulgarisation and blunting the revolutionary edge of Marx and Engels so an attempt is being made to destroy the revolutionary soul, vulgarise and blunt the revolutionary edge of these documents.

Within twenty-four hours of the signature of the 1960 Statement Khrushchov, despite the strong words to the contrary in the Statement spoke of Yugoslav as a socialist state. Sharkey in the speech already referred to purports to show that the Chinese comrades and other "dogmatists" have departed from it. His crude, unsubstantiated, arbitrary statements are elsewhere commented upon. No the critical content of these documents is their revolutionary essence, their revolutionary soul. And that too demands integration with our concrete reality.

Moreover, the works of the outstanding Marxist-Leninist Stalin further elucidated the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Mao Tse Tung has provided the most inspiring and profound integration of the general principles of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete reality of China. His works are classics in their own time. They too are available in English.

So we have before us a treasure house of generalised experience. It remains for us to develop and integrate Marxism-Leninism with Australian reality. We can commemorate the life of Lenin no better than concretely building up a Communist Party upon the granite foundations he himself laid down. That Communist Party is taking shape. It will assuredly achieve victory. It will clarify all the questions so shamefully confused by the revisionists. It will study, and lead the Australian workers in studying the Marxist-Leninist principles of revolution; it will study and generalise the concrete reality of Australia and its integration with those Marxist-Leninist principles of revolution.

The Right Opportunism Of The "Theoretician" Eric Aarons

ON Page 314 of the *Communist Review*, October, 1963, an article appears entitled "Philosophical Errors of The Left," by Eric Aarons, who peddles right opportunism under the high sounding verbage of philosophy.

Eric Aarons came up through the university and naturally has had to wage battles against bourgeois ideas.

His article makes it crystal clear that his efforts to absorb Marxism have met with dismal failure. Eric is capable of spinning words, and being one of the Aarons family, has found the path of promotion in the Party relatively easy.

He is now at the top, a member of the central committee secretariat, and is considered an up and coming theoretician. Who is better equipped to propound the theory and practice of revisionism? In the above mentioned article, he sets out to expose the theoretical basis of the left errors, but after reading it, one finds that what has been served up is a vulgarisation of Marxism.

The main content of the article is to launch an attack, from a philosophical opportunist point of view, on the Communist Party of China.

One conclusion drawn in the above article is that things must be seen in relation to a given frame of reference or a given scale. For example, it is a true proposition that "it is going to stop raining sometime. But imagine offering this truth to a farmer who is anxiously looking to see if it will stop raining today, knowing that if it does not, he will be flooded out."

The farmer is looking at things on a scale appropriate to his practical situation and would look most unkindly on the dogmatist who, in that situation, offers the "consolation" that it can't rain for ever.

According to Aarons many of the propositions of the "Lefts" are of this character, namely, the proposition that "imperialists and reactionaries are paper tigers."

Let us examine the ideological roots of E. Aarons' thinking on these two propositions. Take the conclusion about the farmer and rain and apply it to the wages struggle. The workers who find it hard to live on their incomes are demanding increases in wages. According to the reasoning of E. Aarons it is dogmatic whilst assisting to win a wage demand, and would be of no "comfort," to explain to the workers that the end solution to their exploration lies in the ending of capitalism and its wages system and the establishment of socialism where the power of the capitalist class to use the State apparatus against the people is ended for all time. With political power in their hands the capitalist class gives with one hand and takes away with the other. Experience, or to use Aarons' favorite term "practice" has demonstrated this with great force in recent history of the Australian Labor Movement.

We must also conclude from E. Aarons and his philosophical meanderings, that Marx was a dogmatist when he urged the workers of the world to unite, as "you have nothing to lose but your chains and a whole world to gain."

The essence of the philosophy of E. Aarons has nothing in common with Marxism, but has its roots in reformism and modern revisionism and leads to negation of revolutionary spirit and tailism, and fails to advance the political consciousness of the workers.

Contradictions Are Intensifying

Australia, along with all other capitalist countries is affected by the general crisis of capitalism. Superficially, economic conditions may appear reasonable, but we know that the economy is brittle and could crack at any time.

The contradiction between the working class and monopoly capitalism is sharp and intensifying. Democratic liberties have been curtailed and the right to strike has been virtually taken away. The Australian monopoly capitalists and their State apparatus are geared to increase their attacks on all fronts under the dictates of U.S.A. imperialism.

Australia has become a military base for the imperialist war plans. Australian forces are becoming more directly engaged in the anti-liberation wars against the colonial peoples.

This is a reality.

Reformist policy is at one with the Menzies government on these principal questions.

E. Aarons and the revisionist "Communist" Party leaders are lauding the advantages of a labor government, and under the

slogan of "Elect a Labor Government," are creating the very illusions in reformism among the working class which has been so disastrous to the revolutionary struggle in this country.

E. Aarons says that the "Lefts" urge more and more intense criticism against reformism. "Criticism of reformism and the errors of reformism and individual reformists must constantly be made."

The reality is that of recent times, criticism of reformism and its policy has been almost non-existent in the publications of the Communist Party, and where it has been offered, it was mild, as though the party was in fear of offending the reformists.

Take the criticism of the N.S.W. Labor Government. Criticism offered in the "Tribune" over the past years could almost be written on the back of a postage stamp, although the State Labor Government has administered the State apparatus as efficiently as any Tory government.

The leadership of the Communist Party in N.S.W., over a period of years has left the workers almost leaderless in the struggle against the ideology of reformism, both in theory and practice. But then they are building unity. What kind of unity? Unity not based on revolutionary ideas, but unity based on tailing reformism.

Imperialists Are Paper Tigers

Now let us turn to another proposition of the "Lefts." "Imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers." In Aarons' article, this philosophical genius deals with this proposition and says "dispersing the enemy strategically," is used to urge the adoption of the incorrect and adventurist policy of the Communist Party of China by the world movement and to slander those who do not agree with this policy as being timid as mice, with no confidence in victory.

As with the imperialists this thesis seems to have hit Aarons on a tender spot of his revisionist philosophy.

E. Aarons was in China some years ago and it is now 16 years since Mao Tse Tung presented this thesis of the "paper tigers." So E. Aarons, after all these years has discovered that this thesis is all wrong, adventurous and what have you. Maybe, as a theoretician, Aarons has taken a dialectical leap, but gauging by his article in the Communist Review, one can only conclude that he is drowning and has come under "the baton," so ably wielded by Messrs. Khrushchov, Sharkey and Co.

Marxism-Leninism makes a scientific analysis of the development of the struggles of the working class and on the basis of this analysis guides the revolutionary struggles of the working class and all people struggling for freedom.

History reveals that although the people are in an oppressed position, and the oppressors are always in a position of strength, provided the oppressed persist in struggle under correct leadership, their strength will grow and they will finally defeat the reactionary and decadent rulers, because they represent the new and rising forces.

This is a truly scientific answer, full of revolutionary importance, Lenin pointed out:

"All classes and all countries are not regarded statically, but dynamically, i.e., not in a state of immobility, but in motion (the laws of which are determined by the economic conditions of existence of each class).

"Motion in return is regarded not from the standpoint of the past, but also from the standpoint of the future, and, at the same time, not in accordance with the vulgar conception of the evolutionists who see only slow changes, but dialectically."

As described by Lenin, when the relationship of class forces is examined from a revolutionary, dialectical point of view, the revolutionary forces can correctly determine their strategic plans and step by step advance boldly in the struggle against the temporary powerful enemy. History provides numerous examples of the correctness of revolutionary leadership. Lenin stated on many occasions, in writing on the struggle of the Russian people to establish and consolidate Soviet Power in the face of intervention:

"All these seemingly huge and invincible forces of international imperialism are unreliable and hold no terrors for us. At the core they are rotten. They are making us stronger and stronger, and this added strength will enable us to win victory on the outer front, and to make it a thoroughgoing one."

History has confirmed the fate of all reactionaries, that their might is not reliable, and in the end they must meet their doom. Hitler, Mussolini, Japanese fascism, all appeared strong, but were defeated by the courage and determination of the Soviet Union and other countries.

Basing himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory of the class struggle and Leninist theory of imperialism, Mao Tse Tung has summed up a wealth of historical experience, stating that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers, that they are powerful only in appearance, that in reality they are inwardly weak, though outwardly strong, weak inside though fierce in countenance, and that therefore they are not terrifying. This is completely in accord with the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin in their estimate of the class struggle.

Cde. Mao Tse Tung profoundly analysed the international and national situation following the Second World War, showing

the contradictions between the working class and the capitalist class, the contradictions between the imperialists and the people of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, making clear that the outcome of the second World War had greatly intensified these contradictions, and that this would inevitably lead to new economic crises and wars.

U.S. imperialism emerging as the most powerful imperialist force, would be foremost in displaying these contradictions and would become more reactionary and rotten politically. History has shown how correct was this analysis. Cde. Mao Tse Tung said that the imperialist enemy "has a weak and fragile foundation, he is disintegrating internally, he is alienated from the people, he is confronted with inextricable economic crises, therefore he can be defeated."

In the light of this, he pointed out, "all reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful. From a long term point of view, it is not the reactionaries, but the people who are really powerful."

In the past years, this thesis has stood the test as these events show.

- The victory of the Chinese people over the powerful forces of Chiang Kai Shek, backed by the U.S. imperialists.
- The Vietnamese people's protracted eight-years war against the U.S. backed French colonialists, ending 80 years of French colonial rule in the northern part of their country.
- The Korean people's victory over the forces of combined imperialism.
- The Algerian people's victory over the French colonialists, ending 120 years of colonial rule.
- The victory of Cuba, situated on the doorstep of the U.S. With a population of only seven million, and in the face of all the provocations of U.S. imperialism, the Cuban people, with the support of the world's people, have waged a resolute struggle, have hit back against these provocations, and have successfully defended their sovereignty and their revolution.

These facts give ample proof that imperialism and reaction are weak and that the revolutionary forces of the people are strong enough to defeat them, and this is accepted by the revolutionary masses, because it corresponds to objective reality.

The imperialists fear this thesis, as they wish to appear powerful and strong. They wish to intimidate the people and impose their rule. They fear the people will recognise them as paper tigers and thus hold them in contempt.

To continue to oppress the people, they must declare themselves to be powerful, real tigers, and not paper ones.

Lenin has said: "Dialectics in the proper sense is the study of contradictions in the very essence of objects."

E. Aarons' metaphysical interpretation of this thesis of the paper tiger, has nothing in common with Marxist dialectics.

Marxism teaches us, time and time again, not to be misled by superficial phenomena, but to look at things in their essence and find the essential relationship among a host of phenomena.

Cde. Mao Tse Tung, has done just this. He has analysed the dual character of imperialism. On the one hand, real tigers, on the other hand paper tigers. The law of the unity of opposites is present in every single phenomena in the world, and so it applies to imperialism and all reactionaries. They are real tigers and paper tigers at the same time.

There are those like E. Aarons and others who do not acknowledge that imperialism is a paper tiger. They are frightened and scared by its appearance of strength. They reason that to hold imperialism with its power, in contempt, is not to see reality. But in fact it is they who do not see reality as reality. Lenin said of such people, that they know only pedestrian realism; the revolutionary dialectics of Marxism-Leninism, which emphasises the urgent tasks of the advanced class and discovers in the existing state of things those elements that will lead to its overthrow, are absolutely alien to them.

E. Aarons, no doubt, will protest against the charge that he and others have little faith in the strength of the people, but his propositions on the "philosophy of the Lefts," are riddled throughout with opposition to the lessons of history which show that the forces of the people, although at first in an inferior position, will grow strong and will be able to defeat imperialism and all reactionaries.

Therefore it is not accidental that these people cannot accept the thesis that imperialism is a paper tiger. This lack of confidence in the strength of the people is a fundamental characteristic of the opportunists. Contrary to this viewpoint, Marxism-Leninism holds that the strength of the people is the most powerful force of all, and the decisive force pushing forward social development.

Every revolutionary struggle generates strength, provided it has its roots in the people. This strength has no parallel.

"Men not weapons are decisive," is rejected by E. Aarons. He says this "only applies within very restricted limits."

"The lefts have an abstract, dogmatic approach which fails in the essential demands of Marxist philosophy, for a concrete study of concrete conditions." What rubbish! Is not a study of written history, or the era of imperialism a concrete study of concrete conditions.

As a Marxist is it possible to make a concrete study of concrete conditions in relation to Cuba in isolation from the epoch in which we live? Imperialism has always tried to intimidate the people with weapons at their disposal. But whatever superiority they may possess at a given time, this does not alter their fundamental weakness of being divorced from the people. The cold hard facts of world history show that the destiny of humanity has never been decided by weapons but always by the masses of the people. Not nuclear weapons, but the strength of the people.

The nuclear weapons which imperialism is using to intimidate the people and nuclear blackmail, is supported by E. Aarons, but irrespective of the opportunist philosophy of Aarons and his clique, nuclear blackmail cannot intimidate the revolutionary people, nor the masses.

Aarons gives as an example for his "theories" the case of Cuba, but the Cuban revolution was achieved in spite of the tailing behind and incorrect policies of the then Communist Party of Cuba. In essence this incorrect leadership of the Cuban Communist Party is supported in theory and practice by E. Aarons.

Cuba, situated close to the U.S., beginning their struggle, overthrew the Batista, U.S. dictatorship, with only 12 men and seven rifles. After two years, they smashed the hold of U.S. imperialism and gave a brilliant example to the whole of Latin America.

Day in and day out, since this heroic revolutionary victory, U.S. imperialism has tried to subvert the Cuban revolutionary regime. U.S. imperialism creates tension in an attempt to strangle the Cuban revolution, but with the support of the people all over the world, the heroic Cuban people waged a struggle which defeated this war provocation of U.S. imperialism.

Facts are stubborn things, or should we say, a study of concrete things in concrete conditions, Mr. Aarons, and no matter how you peddle your opportunist philosophy, your rejection of the thesis of the paper tiger is akin to all opportunists who in the past have travelled under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

In your philosophical wanderings you reject indirectly the pronouncement of Lenin on the second anniversary of the October Revolution:

"It seemed at the time that world imperialism was such a tremendous and invincible force, that it was stupid of the workers of a backward country to attempt an uprising against it."

"Now however, as we glance back over the past two years, we see that even our opponents are increasingly admitting that we were right. We see that imperialism which seemed such an insuperable colossus, has proved before the world to be a colossus with feet of clay."

In essence there is little difference between the pronouncement of Lenin following October and the thesis of Mao Tse Tung made in the historical conditions following World War II.

In the opening paragraphs of his article Aarons says the incorrectness of some of the propositions of the "Lefts" is readily seen from the statements that 90 per cent of the world population are for revolution and that the struggle of the Australian working class will soon be crowned by the all-embracing, liberating success of socialism.

It is logical that Aarons should scoff at these propositions for he cannot see their revolutionary essence.

People in the socialist world, which is stronger than the capitalist world, support the struggles of all oppressed people for socialism. Millions in the colonial world are in revolutionary upsurge and the struggles of the workers in the capitalist countries against monopoly capital is developing and cannot be seen in isolation from the revolutionary movements in the rest of the world.

For instance in Australia a new quality has emerged in the Aborigines' struggles and this, without doubt, is not unconnected with national liberation movements now raging in S.E. Asia, Africa and Latin America. Similarly, new levels of struggle are emerging in New Guinea.

Aarons cannot see the revolutionary strength of the peoples now unfolding and it is this lack of faith in people that leads him to his right opportunist thinking.

Without a grasp of the truth that the masses make history then recognition of new qualities in struggle is impossible.

If one sees the weakness of Australian capitalism in the context of the general crises of world capitalism and has confidence in the people and the revolutionary spirit of the advanced sections of the Australian working class, then the proposition of E. F. Hill that the Australian workers' struggles "will soon be crowned by the all-embracing liberating success of socialism" is quite correct.

Revisionist C.P.A. Leaders Depart Further from Marxism-Leninism

THE speeches of the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of Australia to its central committee, as reported in the December issue of the Communist Review, reveal that they have reached new low levels of political degeneracy and have continued to depart from the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

We invite readers to study these speeches alongside what is written here in criticism of them.

Dixon, the president of the C.P.A., continues with his unprincipled and lying attacks on the Communist Party of China. We deal here with his speech in some detail because his attacks on the Chinese Party are attacks on Marxism-Leninism and they are designed to divert the Australian working class from a revolutionary course.

First Dixon blandly claims that the "nuclear test ban treaty has eased world tension and improves the possibility of maintaining peace. It was a great victory for the forces of peace over the imperialist warmongers, and is a harbinger of further successes."

This wild assertion (now very typical of the revisionists) is not in line with the facts. The terms of the Tri-Partite Pact signed in Moscow were advanced long ago by the imperialists and were rejected on more than one occasion, in the strongest of language, by the Soviet Party leadership. The imperialists have not changed one word of their original proposals and the Pact, therefore, is still consistent with their aggressive aims. Those who changed their tune are the revisionists, headed by Khrushchev.

So how can a retreat to accommodate the demands of the imperialists be described as a victory for the forces of peace? The Pact was a deal. Not one single concession was won from the imperialists. Some revisionists try and explain the change of Khrushchev (they have to admit he has changed) by claiming, without producing facts of course, that the Soviet Union "must" have developed some new weapon which now puts her in such a strong position that she can give ground. But why "give

ground" at all on such a question — particularly if you have become stronger? No, the simple fact is that the Pact is a further act of capitulation to imperialism and flows from the general political line of class collaboration followed by the Khrushchev leadership.

New Aggressive U.S. Moves

And as for world tensions — where have they eased? Imperialist war policy continues as expressed by the numerous underground hydrogen bomb tests conducted by the Americans since the signing of the Pact. And then the U.S. 7th Fleet has extended its operations into the Indian Ocean which decision followed the Malaysian provocations against Indonesia. Akahata, organ of the Japanese Communist Party, in an editorial commenting on the 7th Fleet's extended sphere of operations, says that "this U.S. imperialist intrigue is for the strengthening of its policies of aggression and war which have suffered seriously from successive blows in South-East Asia. This event proves that no matter whether the U.S. president is Kennedy or Johnson, U.S. imperialism after all is U.S. imperialism; Johnson is actively carrying out Kennedy's 'dual tactics'."

Tensions, in fact are rising, not easing, in the regions close to Australia and this calls for the sharpest vigilance on behalf of the working class.

A further wild assertion uttered by Dixon reads: "Complicating this favorable situation is the division in the international communist movement BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA." (Our emphasis).

Well, let us examine the facts. And no doubt we will examine them again and again for these slanders and malicious falsehoods cannot be left unchallenged. And they won't be.

The revisionist policies of the Khrushchev leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were unleashed in an all-embracing and systematic form at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. held in 1956. Combined with the attacks on Stalin and the negation of all his work, handled personally by Khrushchev, the revisionist onslaught threw the international communist movement into confusion. The Communist Party of China did not stand idly by while this onslaught against the world revolutionary movement was made. Its leaders, including Mao Tse Tung, consulted with leading Soviet comrades, and made their views known to them in a comradely but firm way.

For instance, in April, 1956, less than two months after the 20th Congress, in conversations both with Mikoyan, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., and with the Soviet Ambassador to China, Mao Tse Tung put the views of the C.P.C. on the question of Stalin. He emphasised

that Stalin's "merits outweigh his faults" and that it was necessary to "make a concrete analysis and an all-round evaluation of Stalin."

In later discussions between the leaders of the C.P.C. and the C.P.S.U. it was pointed out that on the question of Stalin there had been a "total lack of an overall analysis of Stalin," a "lack of self criticism" and a "failure to consult with the fraternal parties in advance."

In their many internal discussions with comrades of the C.P.S.U., leading comrades of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. also systematically set forth the Chinese views on the question of peaceful transition, on the international situation and the strategy of the international communist movement with direct reference to the revisionist errors in the policies laid down at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

C.P.S.U. Leaders' Mistakes Debated

In 1957 the Moscow meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties took place and at this meeting the revisionist mistakes of the 20th Congress were openly debated and certain differences were eliminated. The Chinese delegation to this meeting was headed by Mao Tse Tung and it made a considerable number of major changes to the two successive drafts of the Declaration put forward by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. The Moscow Declaration held imperialism to be the source of wars and concluded that "so long as imperialism exists, there will always be soil for aggressive wars." The Declaration also held that such aggression could be prevented by the combined struggles of the socialist countries, the national liberation movement, the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries and the mass movement of the peoples working for peace.

In the article "The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the C.P.S.U. and Ourselves," published as a comment on the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., the Chinese state: "Despite these changes, the formulation in the Declaration on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism was still unsatisfactory. We finally conceded the point only out of consideration for the repeatedly expressed wish of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. that the formulation should show some connection with that of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U."

It is important to recall that Tito's Yugoslavia refused to sign the 1957 Declaration and openly attacked it.

The thesis of the 1957 Moscow Declaration was quickly disregarded by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. Instead of the struggle against U.S. imperialism being stepped up, as called

for by the Declaration. Khrushchev came out with paeons of praise for Eisenhower and substituted "top" negotiations for the international class struggle. His connivance with Tito continued.

Then, in 1958, less than one year after the Moscow Meeting, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. put forward demands on China which would have brought her under Soviet military control. When these demands were correctly rejected, the Soviet Government unilaterally tore up the agreement on new technology for national defence concluded between China and the Soviet Union in October, 1957, and refused to provide China with a sample of an atomic bomb and technical data concerning its manufacture.

On the eve of Khrushchev's visit to the United States, despite the objections of China, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. rushed out an official statement through the news agency Tass on September 9th concerning an incident on the Indian border. The statement sided with the Indian reactionary rulers and brought the differences between the Soviet Union and China right out into the open.

THIS WAS THE FIRST TIME AN EXPRESSION OF DIFFERENCE WAS MADE PUBLICLY AND IT WAS MADE ON THE SOVIET SIDE.

One would be very naive indeed, if these extraordinary events were not seen in connection with the Camp David talks with Eisenhower.

Both Sharkey and Dixon know all about these events. They condemned them privately at the time. They expressed deep reservations about the line of the 20th Congress and supported the Chinese stand at the Moscow meeting.

All the foregoing is historical fact. Nothing can alter it. After 1959 came the Rumanian Congress at Bucharest where violent attacks were made on the Chinese Party and anti-Chinese documents circulated to fraternal delegates by the C.P.S.U. Then the technicians were withdrawn from China and further attacks made on her at the 81 Parties' Meeting in Moscow in 1960.

And yet Dixon, baldly and without any substantiation whatever, says China started it all! No Communist worthy of the name should tolerate such obvious lying for a moment.

The Communist Party of China was forced to defend itself against the Khrushchev slanders and in doing so it is also defending the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the interests of all the oppressed peoples of the world.

Stood Firm Against Lies

In the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Australia were men who would not tolerate the distortion of the truth and

the attacks on Marxism-Leninism. It is to their eternal credit that they did so. What were they to do? Watch a betrayal unfold before their eyes without saying anything? No, they did the correct thing: they raised their voices and stood firm. Was this an anti-Party attitude? Again no! Dixon pathetically tries to label this genuine and sincere working class stand as "anti-Party" in the hope that the genuine and sincere people in the C.P.A. will not be influenced. A vain hope, Mr. Dixon! Your lies and deceit are being exposed daily; you sense the speed with which your deceit is being uncovered for that is why your anti-China slanders and anti-Marxist-Leninist ravings are becoming wilder and wilder and less and less convincing.

You say, Mr. Dixon, that the Communist Party of China seeks to impose its so-called "general line" on the world Communist movement. What is the general line of the Communist movement? Fundamentally it is proletarian internationalism and this means workers of all countries, unite; workers of the world, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace; national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without exploitation of man by man.

That is what the Chinese say the general line of the international communist movement is at the present stage.

Does this line "stand in opposition" to the world communist movement? Does it run counter to the decisions of the two Moscow meetings? No, it conforms with them.

It is the line of forming a broad united front, with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as its nucleus, to oppose the imperialists headed by the United States; it is a line of boldly arousing the masses, expanding the revolutionary forces, carrying the proletarian world revolution forward to the end and of effectively defending world peace.

Dixon says that "peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, and economic competition between them, is the basis of the foreign policy of the socialist countries." This is not in accord with Marxism-Leninism. The basis of foreign policy of genuine socialist states is proletarian internationalism. The principle of proletarian internationalism is revolutionary so to raise peaceful co-existence and economic competition above proletarian internationalism is to negate revolutionary principle.

The peaceful co-existence of Khrushchev is not "creative Leninism" it is the negation of Leninism; it is a policy of class collaboration.

At Lenin's funeral Stalin said: "Lenin never regarded the Republic of Soviets as an end in itself. He always regarded it as a necessary link for strengthening the revolutionary movements in the lands of the West and East, as a necessary link for facilitating the victory of the toilers of the whole world over capital. Lenin knew that only such an interpretation is the correct one, not only from the international point of view, but also from the point of view of preserving the Republic of Soviets itself. Lenin knew that only in this way is it possible to inflame the hearts of toilers of all countries for the decisive battles for emancipation. That is why this genius among the great leaders of the proletariat, on the very morrow of the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, laid the foundation of the Workers' International. That is why he never tired of expanding and consolidating the union of the toilers of the whole world, the Communist International."

In the name of the Soviet people Stalin pledged to hold firm to the principles of the Communist International and he never betrayed that pledge.

The content of peaceful co-existence is clearly cited in both the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 81 Parties' Statement and to repeat it is the joint struggle of the socialist countries, the national liberation movement, the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries and the mass movement of the peoples for peace. Peaceful co-existence is the result of these combined struggles — it is not the result of the armed might of the Soviet Union or of any other socialist country.

Dixon elevates economic competition above these fundamental struggles. It is elementary to Marxists that trade is used by the imperialists for political aims. The blockade of China and Cuba is sufficient evidence of that today. Economic co-operation is not the basis for peaceful co-existence. The mistakes of this proposition are:

- (1) They do not distinguish between the two systems. If peaceful co-existence is the final aim, co-operation serves this aim and then the basic differences are covered up.
- (2) They see economic contacts as a kind of division of labor. This would mean the two systems will go on relying on one another, therefore they would exist forever.
- (3) They entertain unrealist illusions that imperialist countries are sincere.

There can be no waiting for the collapse of imperialism in the course of peaceful competition. The business of a genuine revolutionary is to advance the revolutionary struggle. Only struggle is absolute.

Dixon repeats the distortions of the Chinese views concerning the national liberation struggle found in the Open Letter of the C.P.S.U. of July 14th last. He says that the Chinese are incorrect when they point out that Asia, Africa and Latin America are the "focal point of all the contradictions existing in the world."

"If this is so," he parrots, "then the main leadership of the world movement against imperialism is the national bourgeoisie, including, as the Chinese say, 'patriotic kings, princes and aristocrats'. The working class are relegated to the background."

Dixon goes on: "In the modern world it is the working class movement and the countries of socialism where the working class rules which constitute the leadership of the struggle against imperialism. The Chinese view on the role of the national liberation movement negates Marxism-Leninism."

Dixon and the Soviet leadership put forward these distortions in order to try and justify the policy of "freezing revolutions" and of playing down the role of the national liberation struggles. In doing so they objectively assist imperialism.

Let us examine the question of contradictions.

The international proletarian struggle today is very complex, and in its process there are a number of contradictions namely, the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialists; the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries; the contradiction between the oppressed countries and imperialism; and the contradictions among the imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

The Fundamental Contradictions

As the Chinese say, all these fundamental contradictions are interrelated, that is, each particular contradiction is a part of the general. Nowhere can it be shown that the Chinese have raised one of these particular contradictions above the general. The most intense contradiction in the general struggle against imperialism at the present stage is without doubt the one which is giving rise to the anti-imperialist, revolutionary struggles in Asia, Latin America and Africa. The Chinese correctly point out that these revolutionary struggles are pounding and undermining the foundations of the rule of imperialism and colonialism, old and new, and now are a mighty force in defence of world peace, and that "in a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population."

In examining contradictions it is necessary to distinguish between the general and the particular and to see the connection between the two. It is also necessary to examine both aspects of each particular contradiction otherwise we become subjective

and one-side. The strategical aim of imperialism, headed by the United States, is to destroy the socialist world and restore capitalism there, and in this process the U.S. rulers hope to get rid of their rivals. Since World War II U.S. imperialism has attempted to subjugate all the countries lying between it and the socialist world. Both in Europe and Asia opposition to their plans is growing and this opposition is the most intense in the colonial countries. Thus the struggles of the oppressed peoples in these regions are a vital part of the whole struggle for world peace and socialism.

If U.S. imperialism were successful in grabbing and subjugating the countries lying between it and the socialist world would it pull up? No, it would proceed with its aim to destroy the socialist countries and thus the whole world would be plunged into a devastating war.

Hence it follows that the national liberation struggles are extremely vital to the preservation of peace. Every victory of imperialism in the form of re-establishing colonialism, is a step nearer World War III.

Surely all this is common sense.

But what do the Soviet leaders advise? It is they who raise the particular above the general and they do more than that. They try and divorce the particular from contradiction itself. This is complete abandonment of dialectics. How do they do this? With their theory of peaceful co-existence and the emphasis on negotiation on top. In the magazine *Soviet Weekly* on November 9, 1963, this is clearly done. The magazine says: "Good Soviet-American relations mean much more than merely relations between our countries. Upon the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union the whole world situation largely depends. ON THESE RELATIONS DEPENDS PEACE.

"If the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. united their effort to safeguard peace, who would dare, or who would be able to disturb it? As Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko remarked at the 22nd Party Congress — NO ONE! (Emphasis ours.)

It is this ridiculous gimmick of "Soviet — U.S. United for Peace" that the modern revisionists are trying to impose on the revolutionary movement and the imposition of this policy has as its main target, the struggle for national liberation.

Contradiction Cannot Be Blotted Out

The imperialists are well aware where the most intense contradiction lies and they are aware of the need to solve it on their terms. The revisionists call on those who are locked in armed struggle with the imperialists "to wait — we will win everything for you by the force of our example. Give us time to get stronger."

Let Fidel Castro answer this gimmick: "The duty of the revolutionaries, above all at this moment, is to know how to perceive and catch the changes in the correlation of forces which have taken place in the world, and to understand that this change facilitates the struggle of the peoples. The duty of revolutionaries, of the Latin American revolutionaries, is not to wait for a change in the correlation of forces to produce a miracle of social revolutions in Latin America, but to make full use of everything that favors the revolutionary movement in this changed correlation of forces and to make revolutions!" (*The Road to Revolution in Latin America*, pp. 7-9).

The Communist Party of China has always insisted that the national liberation movement should be led by the proletariat and that a broad, united front be established under working class leadership. The letter of the C.P.C. to which Dixon sneeringly refers says: "The oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are faced with the urgent task of fighting imperialism and its lackeys. In these areas extremely broad sections of the population refuse to be slaves of imperialism. They include not only the workers, peasants and intellectuals and petty bourgeoisie, but also the patriotic bourgeoisie and even certain kings, princes and aristocrats, who are patriotic."

Where do the Chinese say that the leadership of this struggle has passed into the hands of the national bourgeoisie? Where do they even hint of such a thing? The distortion is in Dixon's perverted mind.

And is it not a characteristic of today's favorable situation that the national democratic revolutions of the oppressed countries can proceed to socialist revolution? Surely Cuba is the best example of this in recent times. In Castro's *Road to Revolution in Latin America*, already quoted, the Cuban leader says: "In many Latin-American countries the pre-revolutionary conditions are incomparably better than those which existed in our country."

It is true that some of the national liberation struggles have been led, predominantly, by bourgeois elements, but this is mainly in Africa where the proletariat is at yet somewhat immature. But does this mean that the whole ferment of national liberation movements should be seen in the light of African events?

No, the facts are that the main stream of national liberation struggle is coming under the leadership of the proletariat and its genuine Communist Parties and so, therefore, as in Cuba and in China itself, after liberation there will be no pulling up but an immediate passing over into the socialist revolution.

These are the perspectives that should be continually put before the Australian working class so that the maximum enthusiasm and revolutionary assistance to the national liberation struggles can be generated.

But what is the effect of the rubbish that Dixon talks? It is to spread confusions, to play down revolution and condition the Australian working class for an acceptance of the policies of Australian imperialism which jogs along like a running dog, hopeful of a bone or two, behind U.S. imperialism.

It is sheer betrayal and all genuine Communists must see it that way.

Praise From Class Enemy

Both Sharkey and Dixon, in days gone by, always stressed the fact that if one pursued policies which were praised by the ruling class, then some serious re-appraisal of those policies had to be made.

On December 17, the American Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, told the Ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in Paris, that it was of the utmost importance that the N.A.T.O. nations agree in their assessment of what is going on inside the Communist world. With the Soviet Union and China quarrelling over the issues of militancy as against peaceful co-existence, it was obviously in the West's interests that the Russians win the argument. He said that "peaceful co-existence professed by Russia, seems preferable to the militancy of Communist China."

If it were true, as Dixon alleges, that China is disrupting the international communist movement, that she is trying to impose policies alien to Marxism-Leninism on the world's working people — then surely she would be supported to the hilt by imperialism.

But exactly the opposite is the case. It is the Khrushchevs, Togliattis, Sharkeys and Dixons who are receiving the support of the imperialists. This becomes more manifest as every day passes.

It is making all honest people do some hard thinking — and reappraisal.

Now that the issues are clear in the world communist movement and the struggle has been joined against revisionism there can only be one result — the strengthening of the people's struggle for socialism on the basis of a deepened understanding of Marxism-Leninism and in this sense, the world revolution will be speeded up. Despite the temporary divisions, the prospects are bright. The people are becoming stronger every day while imperialism becomes weaker every day.

Trotsky's Ghost Really Walks Again

By G. P. O'DAY

THE revisionists have been compelled by the widening support for the Marxist-Leninists, to devote almost the whole of the December issue of their so-called "Communist" Review to attacks upon us.

The longest of these attacks is by Ralph Gibson. It is entitled "Trotsky's Ghost Walks Again" and its main assertion is that we are neo-Trotskyists.

The natural question that will be asked is "What is a Trotskyist?" We must preface our answer to this by remarking that error is multiple and truth single. Naturally the errors in Gibson's article are too numerous for each of them to be dealt with.

Marxism-Leninism is a scientific analysis of politics and economics based on dialectical materialism. Its truth is guaranteed by the analysis of facts and verification in practice. Trotskyism is not a definite scientific doctrine nor is it verified by practice. Before 1917 Trotsky was one of the Mensheviks, i.e., revisionists in the Russian Social Democratic Party. He did not have many followers: like the rest of the Mensheviks he opposed Lenin and the Bolsheviks. His opposition did not greatly worry Lenin who called Trotsky a windbag and said that Trotsky lost his way among the trees.

What was his Menshevik doctrine? Briefly that the bourgeoisie aided by the proletariat would carry out a bourgeois democratic revolution against the Czar and establish a bourgeois republic and, after a great many years, go on to Socialism.

The peasantry would be purely passive. The Bolsheviks said that the proletariat aided by all the peasantry would overthrow the Czar and then almost immediately the proletariat, aided by the poor and a great section of the middle peasantry would overthrow the bourgeoisie, instal a proletarian dictatorship and proceed to build socialism. It is hardly necessary to say who was correct!

Finding himself isolated in 1917 Trotsky joined the Bolsheviks and played a considerable part in the revolution and the civil war — a part that was not free from various errors. For example, he opposed the Brest Litovsk peace, saying in effect that if the Soviet Union continued the war with the Germans all Europe would rise and the revolution become universal.

It is necessary to say here that there are two ways of undermining a revolution. One is passivity, the other adventurism. There is no doubt that if Trotsky's adventurist advice had been followed the Russian revolution would have been destroyed.

Then in 1920, the question of policy towards the trade unions came up. Trotsky was largely responsible for a great waste of time on this question. Lenin said of him "politically the whole approach to the subject is pure tactlessness. Comrade Trotsky's 'theses' are politically harmful. Taken as a whole, his policy is one of bureaucratically nagging the trade unions. And I am sure our Party Congress will condemn and repeal this policy." And so it did.

In the twenties, Trotsky continued to say that socialism could not be built in one country and that the peasantry could not be enlisted in the building, thus continuing the above-mentioned doctrine. Facts of course **confounded** Trotsky, and Trotsky left the Soviet Union.

It is clear that Trotsky was not a Marxist-Leninist, but a revisionist and the term Trotskyist really means, in essence, revisionist for Trotsky was not consistent even in his revisionism; he veered from left to right and at times even disowned statements he had made for years. In the last struggles he had in the Soviet Union he joined with all the other revisionists.

So that if you are a Trotskyist it means that you are following a policy which will end in the victory of the imperialists and the defeat of the working class.

It must be noted here that Stalin was the man who finally defeated and exiled Trotsky. Khrushchov, whom Gibson and company support, is the man who reviles Stalin and reverses his policies.

Khrushchov and Gibson & Co. support Tito, that renegade and agent of American imperialism, thereby rejecting the judgement of Stalin. We and the Chinese emphatically endorse Stalin's judgement. Despite Gibson the Chinese do not condemn everything connected with Yugoslavia; they have faith in the Yugoslav people and the sincere Marxist-Leninists still to be found there — and believe what a Yugoslav working woman told me, viz., that in the end the Yugoslav people will do to Tito what the Italian people did to Mussolini.

Gibson apparently cannot distinguish between bourgeois pacifism and the revolutionary struggle for peace. Again he had better study Stalin.

He accuses the Chinese Party and us of a denial of the aim of peaceful co-existence in practice. He has apparently not noticed the Bandung agreement nor the successful way in which the Chinese have kept the peace with their neighbours and the United States — and of course he doesn't mention India. Why, my dear Gibson, did Nehru attack China? Why does Khrushchov join with U.S.A. and Britain in supplying money, arms and aeroplanes to the Indian government which continues to loudly announce its intention to attack China?

Why do Gibson and Co. support Khrushchov and Nehru by their silence?

About the liberation movements — the colonies — Gibson must admit that Khrushchov and the Australian revisionists draw very nice pictures of money being saved by disarmament and devoted to building up the undeveloped countries. This despite the fact that India, Southern Korea, South Viet Nam, Thailand, Turkey, Yugoslavia, etc., etc., have had billions of dollars in aid and every one of them is in an economic slump; despite the fact that the only undeveloped countries which have developed are those that won their freedom by fighting and are building socialism, e.g., China, North Viet Nam, North Korea, Cuba. It is perfectly certain that undeveloped countries must eject the imperialist exploiters, overthrow their feudal landlords, carry out an agrarian revolution, build a socialist industry. That is as Lenin said the only way for them. The Utopian solution put forward by Khrushchov and the Australian revisionists can only delude the people for a time and play into the hands of the imperialists.

Gibson is in fact a loving friend of Casey and the fraudulent Colombo Plan.

Surely it is clear that Gibson & Co. are revisionist, anti-Leninists and are Trotskyists, not neo Trotskyists, just the plain old brand.

Gibson refers to the expulsion of most of the Victorian State Committee in 1933 as the expulsion of Trotskyists. What was that State Committee: I knew it well, it was a company of saboteurs and police pimps. When not long before their expulsion I stood for Carlton, I made it a condition that one of that State Executive should not speak on my platform. My reason? — that he was foul mouthed. Really, they were lower than the usual Trotskyists and Gibson is unjust to the Trotskyists.

Finally, we must admit that we did not recognise Khrushchov's renegacy, incidentally for that we have no apology. We waited

till we were certain. But we did recognise the **renegacy** of Sharkey, Dixon, Aarons, Gibson immediately. It was so blatant and so sudden.

We ask all working people to study the question carefully. The Chinese Party has printed the Soviet Statements and pamphlets and their own.

What could be better? The C.P.S.U. on the contrary has done its best to prevent the Soviet people reading the Chinese statements. Do not neglect reading our statements and those of Sharkey & Co.

If you do that you will quickly perceive the shallowness of Gibson's arguments which are mainly based on analogy. If we argued the same way we could say that a certain leader of the revisionists was obviously a disreputable member of the lumpen proletariat. Like them he always looks dirty, unwashed and bedraggled; the fallacy is obvious.

For example, the Bolsheviks and the British millionaires both desired the fall of the Czar. The radical Australian workers and Dr. Mannix both opposed conscription in the 1914-1918 war. Is it true therefrom that the Bolsheviks were really bourgeois and Dr. Mannix a democrat? Or must one look further and consider the class interests in the first case and the ambitions of the Vatican for a Holy Roman Empire in the second.

May our enemies go on attacking us. They will inevitably reveal what they really are — enemies of peace and of the proletarian revolution.

Revisionist Gymnastics of C.P.A Leaders Under "The Baton"

THE three leading members of the Communist Party of Australia, Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons writing in the December Communist Review, intensify their attacks on Socialist China and like all leading revisionists — Bernstein, Kautsky, Tito and Khrushchov — they justify their attacks in the name of Marxism-Leninism.

Sharkey now presents himself as an outstanding upholder of the 81 Party decisions. In this article we aim to show that these three modern revisionists did not **accept completely** the modern revisionist line until after the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U.

Let us begin with the long-standing revisionist, L. Aarons. Readers of Tribune and Communist Review are well aware that Aarons has consistently attacked Socialist China over the past couple of years. Let us quote some of Aarons's statements:

"We **Australian** Communists (and most people all over the world) prefer to base ourselves on **facts** and **reality**, etc." (December Review, 1963).

Keep **facts** and **reality** in mind. We continue:

"In their attacks on peaceful co-existence the Chinese leaders seem to be especially infuriated by any reference to '**Sober elements**' among the imperialists. In this they take up the classical **doctrinaire** position so effectively demolished by Lenin, etc." (December Review, 1963).

Permit us to continue quoting Aarons:

"So long as monopoly capitalism remains dominant in the U.S.A. and in the so-called Western World, just so long will the world live under the clouds of threatened war. If Kennedy and Nixon can be said to represent different sections of U.S. monopoly, it must be clear that there are no '**peaceful**' or '**reasonable**' monopoly groups in the U.S.A., etc." (Communist Review, December, 1960).

So today Mr. Aarons sees things much differently. He finds "**sober**" elements among the U.S. imperialists. However, we

must admit that Khrushchov discovered the "sober" elements before Aarons. Let Aarons continue:

"The putting down of the Eisenhower mask, cracked and threadbare, for the new smooth Kennedy mask, will not change the nature of the imperialists."

"Both Nixon and Kennedy stand for modern-day slavery — the rule of monopoly at home and abroad: wage slavery for the American people and colonial slavery for the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America." (December Review, 1960).

Now let Mr. Aarons say something about China; referring to the imperialists he says:

"They fear and hate China, not only because of its advance but because it is a shining socialist example, particularly to the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This is the cause for the bitter campaign against China, for the flood of lies and slanders poured out by imperialist spokesmen like Eisenhower and Menzies, dinned out daily by press, radio and television."

He could add to this in 1963, "And by Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons." But don't let us interrupt Mr. Aarons, who says:

"The foulest slander against China is that it is opposed to peaceful co-existence, that it wants war and threatens peace. It is China which first worked out, with India, the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. China's whole foreign policy is one of active struggle for peaceful co-existence. Only a few weeks ago Chou En-Lai proposed again a Pacific Peace Pact offered to all countries around the Pacific, including U.S.A. The U.S. imperialists, who have never ceased to smart under the loss of China as a semi-colony for imperialist exploitation, pursue a policy of inveterate hostility to China. They occupy Taiwan, deny China its rightful place in the United Nations, encircle China with a ring of bases for aggression, and stir up provocations against China. The People's Republic stands firmly for peace, goes calmly ahead in building socialism, and exposes the U.S. policy towards China as a threat to world peace. But the day of imperialism is ending and no matter what the U.S. rulers do, they cannot impose their will on China." (Communist Review, October, 1960).

Remember what Mr. Aarons said today ("We Australian Communists prefer to base ourselves on **facts and reality.**") Today he says:

"In their attacks on peaceful co-existence, the Chinese Leaders, etc."

So which set of "**facts**" does he base himself on? It is quite obvious that he bases himself on Titoism, modern revisionism; because people who today make similar statements to those that

Aarons made in 1960 are classified by Aarons, Sharkey, Dixon, Tito and Khrushchov as "left-adventurists, dogmatists, doctrinaires and Trotskyites." These are the names that the modern revisionists call all genuine Marxist-Leninists. No doubt Aarons, Sharkey and Dixon will intensify their attacks on Peoples' China and all Marxist-Leninists at their coming National Congress.

On The History Of Mr. Sharkey

Now let us review Sharkey's position prior to the 22nd Congress and after:

"The Chinese leaders, because we do not see eye to eye with them on a number of questions, have seen fit to support the small group of splitters, leftists and dogmatists who flouted democratic centralism, carried on factional and disruptive work in defiance of all the accepted norms of party organisation, etc." (December Review, 1963).

What the Chinese party leadership is extremely concerned with, is a struggle to maintain and strengthen the purity of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and this "small group" that Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons keep referring to, comprises millions (the majority of Communists) throughout the world who are also fighting for a real Marxist-Leninist proletarian internationalist line.

And to achieve this, which we surely will, it is absolutely necessary to wage a most determined struggle and exposure of right-opportunism in the form of modern revisionism.

Many years ago, Sharkey, when he considered himself to be a Marxist-Leninist, had to put up a struggle against the then right-wing leadership in the Party, and he did this with only one supporter at the beginning. Let us quote what he says of those days:

"The leaders of the then Central Committee were not particular as to the methods of maintaining their control. For the Christmas 1927 Party conference they prepared by organising new branches in the far north of Queensland, each of which gave a proxy vote to members of the Kavanagh faction (Kavanagh was secretary of the party) who arrived at the conference with from three to five votes apiece. Norman Jeffrey J. Ryan and myself were removed from the Central Committee by this means in order to preserve the majority of the ruling faction."

To continue:

"The former secretariat leaders became part and parcel of the international right-wing which had appeared in the Communist parties at that time."

Now listen to what Sharkey says:

"The Central Committee with the exception of **Moxon** and myself **refused** to implement the decisions of the Sixth Congress and the Tenth Plenum."

Further:

"Moxon and myself published one of these documents on our own responsibility in order to acquaint the members with the viewpoint of our brother parties. We were censured for this by the Central Committee **majority** and threatened with expulsion if the offences were repeated."

According to himself, however, this did not stop Sharkey. He wasn't going to be stopped by the use of democratic centralism, and majority decisions. He went flat out winning people to support his "line" inside the party. As he says:

"Moxon and myself decided to appeal to the E.C.C.I. against this decision and cabled Moscow receiving a reply endorsing our view." (Sharkey's History of the Communist Party of Australia).

Nevertheless, Sharkey and these few who supported him were quite justified in doing what they did, in the best interest of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and his struggle to expose and defeat right-opportunism — revisionism during that period.

But today, modern revisionism is a greater danger than it was when the 81 parties met in 1960, and today Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons are in the same camp as Tito and Khrushchov, the outstanding revisionist of all times. Sharkey's statement in the December Review is a most disgraceful attack on Socialist China.

Sharkey in December Review (1963) says:

"The Chinese supported a split in our party and a number of other Communist parties, in total disregard of the 81 Parties' Statement which declared that 'all parties are equal and independent. The struggle with the leftists in our party was an internal affair of the Communist Party of Australia'."

To repeat again — the Communist Party of China stands for international unity. On the basis of **Marxism-Leninism** and **proletarian internationalism** they realise the need to struggle against and to **expose and defeat modern revisionism** and therefore act in the best interest of Marxism-Leninism and proletariat internationalism. There is a community of interest with genuine Marxist-Leninists in all countries who are struggling against modern revisionism and for the purity of international proletarianism.

Mr. Sharkey admitted that as far back as 1926 it was necessary for him and Moxon to send a cable to Moscow in his struggle

then against the right-wing leadership and the Communist international endorsed his action.

Mr. Sharkey tried to apply the 81 party statement to fit his method of thinking; true, the 81 parties say that all parties are "equal and independent" but who was it that really disregarded this decision? Was it not Khrushchov and the C.P.S.U. leadership who made the public attack on the Albanian Party and called for the overthrow of its leadership, and was it not Khrushchov and company who attacked the Chinese party?

And while these were intensifying their attacks they were boosting up Tito and capitulating to Kennedy and the U.S. imperialists — making concessions to them and all this is done in the name of "peaceful co-existence." Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons dogmatically repeat with slight changes, every word said by Khrushchov. They say:

"Unity was our aim, just as it is today. We did have views on a few problems similar to the Chinese which were resolved by the 81 parties' statement. After hearing the attacks by the Chinese and Albanians on the C.P.S.U., etc."

According to the March Review (1962) political committee of party stated then:

"We consider incorrect and harmful to the unity of the world movement such statements of Enver Hoxha as 'the question of the fight against Stalin's cult has been used by N. Khrushchov to uncrown Leninism, to prepare the ground to revise Marxism-Leninism, and spread his opportunist view on the most important questions of the present day world development and the international Communist movement.'"

Well now, Mr. Sharkey; this is no attack, this statement is a correct Marxist-Leninist criticism, and history will prove the correctness of this criticism.

Messrs. Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons must feel very uncomfortable after their attacks on the Chinese Party leadership and other Marxist-Leninists, when they try to justify the recent Moscow test ban treaty, signed by the U.S., Britain and the U.S.S.R. Sharkey and Co. seem to take delight in being lined up with the Menzies government and other imperialists.

"The Minister for External Affairs, Sir Garfield Barwick said today he deplored Communist China's rejection of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty." He said he "also deplored China's open aggression against India and its continued affirmation of the inevitability of war." (Sun, 24/10/63).

One would think Barwick was taking his line from Khrushchov or Sharkey.

It is Menzies, Barwick and all imperialists who believe in the inevitability of war. They back to the hilt the U.S. imperialists who have continued to prepare for war. Menzies increased the war budget by £30,300,000 to £251,671,000 for 1963-64 and Treasurer Holt said: "The scale of defence expenditure will be progressively increased during the next few years, etc." (Age, 14/8/63). On top of this they have increased the amount paid to the secret police (security) by £153,000 to £858,000 per year (Age, 14/8/63).

This expenditure, in the main, is paid to agents to spy on the workers and quite a bit of this expenditure is paid to agents inside Mr. Sharkey's party.

Then, of course, there was Sir Garfield Barwick's amendment to the Crimes Act. So Mr. Sharkey is lined up with some nice company indeed.

Now Mr. Sharkey, let us deal with another question. Surely you don't believe that it is **impossible** for a socialist country, if the leadership were revisionist, for such a leadership to lead it back to capitalism? Hungary was one example if the revisionist counter-revolutionaries had not been defeated it would now be in the hands of the capitalists and land owners backed by the U.S. What sort of "Marxist-Leninist" would one call Khrushchov, when he withdrew blue prints, technicians, material, spare parts, etc., from Socialist China and later agreed to have Soviet planes, helicopters, etc., used against China by Nehru of India? So Hoxha's assessment of Khrushchov was quite correct in the light of events. **For his action in this direction and further concessions to the imperialists, Khrushchov receives great praise and is backed up by Barwick, Rusk, Harriman, and, of course Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons.**

Khrushchov, addressing the Bulgarian Party Congress in June, 1958, in his condemnation of Tito's revisionists said:

"It is appropriate to recall Bebel's apt words: 'If the enemy praises you, think what stupid things you have done'."

The Somersaults On Yugoslavia

Once Mr. Sharkey had an anti-imperialist line concerning Yugoslavia. In his Basic Questions on Communist Theory he says:

"At the same time they **PRAISE** the Yugoslav line and have given them aid to the extent of 670,000,000 dollars since 1950. Can we believe that the U.S. imperialists, who are openly planning a nuclear war for the destruction of world socialism, want to build socialism in Yugoslavia?" (Basic questions of Communist theory).

Well, Mr. Sharkey, a good question. And at that time you were convinced that U.S. imperialism would not pump capital

into a country to build socialism. Nor would any Marxist-Leninist. But today Khrushchov, Sharkey and other revisionists tell us that Yugoslavia is a **SOCIALIST** country — despite the decisions of the 1957 Declaration and the 81 party statement of which you say in the December Review (1963).

"We firmly uphold, together with the overwhelming majority of Communist parties, the Declaration of the 64 parties in 1957 and the Statement of the 81 parties in 1960."

Let us remind you, Mr. Sharkey, what is said in the statement about Yugoslavia.

"The Communist parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist 'theories' in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they term obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Declaration of 1957.

Exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the Communist movement and the working class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists **REMAINS AN ESSENTIAL TASK OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTIES.**"

Well, Mr. Sharkey — since Khrushchov and you and your leadership have accepted the Yugoslav revisionists as SOCIALISTS — then the above portion of the 81 party decision does not apply to Khrushchov and yourself.

So this is where the Chinese party, and all Marxist-Leninists take up the struggle against the Titoists, Khrushchov, you, Dixon and Aarons.

We take up the struggle in defence of the 1957 and 81 Party Statements and this is why it is so necessary to expose and to continue exposing, modern revisionism. It is quite clear that Sharkey during the past few years did not know where he stood. So this is why he made so many fundamental mistakes. Way back in 1958 he wrote:

"It is to China that we look to for an example of the Leninist teaching of the application of basic principles to varying national conditions."

Further:

"China stands out in striking contrast to the muddled position of the Yugoslavian revisionists, their opportunism and bourgeois nationalism which they attempt to palm off as National Communism rejecting proletarian internationalism." (Review November, 1958, page 465).

Let Aarons say something of modern revisionism, because he has completely forgotten to mention the word revisionism over the past couple of years:

"In our Party's history, right opportunism has always tried to reduce the party to an appendage of the Labor Party, either advocating liquidation of the party or the 'ginger group' theory."

This thoroughgoing right opportunism is the **MAIN DANGER**, in the form of modern revisionism. The modern revisionists want to reach an accommodation with capitalist ideology; to them unity means unity with the ideology of reformism." (Review, July, 1961, page 284).

Well, well, Mr. Aarons, you have sure learnt a lot from the modern revisionists this last couple of years, and it is quite obvious that now Sharkey, it seems, is unable to distinguish between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. He said in 1958:

"The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. also 'revised' Marxism-Leninism, notably in regards to war, pointing out that war was no longer inevitable in face of the powerful peace forces that confront the imperialists in the world today, as well as new proposals in regards to working class unity and the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism." (Review November, 1958, page 465).

The big mistake Sharkey made was quoting the word **revised** (Marxism-Leninism) because it was at this 20th Congress that Khrushchov did revise Marxism-Leninism on the basic question of war and peace. He did similarly in his revisionist proposition of **peaceful transition to socialism**.

And to deceive the majority of delegates at the 20th Congress, Khrushchov linked his revisionism with attacks on Stalin. So here we will repeat Hoxha's statement which Sharkey and the party leadership attacked:

"The question of the fight against Stalin's cult has been used by N. Khrushchov to uncrown Leninism, to prepare the ground to revise Marxism-Leninism, and spread his opportunist views on the most important questions of the present day world development and the international Communist movement."

So in defence of his revisionist line Khrushchov comes out at the 22nd Congress with a public attack on the Albanian Party leadership on Hoxha, followed by more drastic slanders against Stalin and the Chinese Party leadership and in this way he prepared the ground for further capitulations to the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists. He has reached "agreement" with the U.S. and Britain on their terms in a test ban treaty which is a complete capitulation to the imperialist warmongers.

This treaty, as the Chinese say, is a **fraud** not in the interests of peace, but one that that makes the danger of war more of a reality.

Khrushchov formely said of the partial test ban proposals of the imperialists:

"What use would there be in cessation of tests if the arms race continued and war industry went on working full blast creating nuclear weapons in ever growing numbers? I would say this would be in some way tantamount to lulling public opinion, lulling man's vigilance. People would think something had been done to prevent war while in effect nothing was being

done, on the contrary, the military machine would go on working full blast. Besides, the Kennedy-Macmillan proposals say nothing on cessation of underground test explosions and on so-called explosions for peaceful purposes, etc." (Tass, 1961).

Let us quote the 81 Party Statement on this:

"In the opinion of Communists the tasks which must be accomplished, **first** of all, if peace is to be safeguarded are to stop the arms race, ban nuclear weapons, their tests and production, dismantle foreign war bases and withdraw foreign troops from other countries; disband military blocs, etc."

On this Sharkey said in the Review of May, 1961:

"Such is the immediate program of the peace-loving forces of the world in face of the threat of a nuclear war."

Another quote from Sharkey's report to the Central Committee (Review, June, 1962) is enlightening:

"A second tricky proposal of the U.S. was that of banning the means of delivery of nuclear weapons. You will note — **not** the outlawing and destruction of nuclear weapons, but only the means of delivery. As the U.S. has ringed the socialist countries with an estimated 2000 military bases, this would mean the socialist countries would live under the guns of the Pentagon, while the U.S. far across the ocean would be immune from retaliation. No one in his senses would accept such a one-sided proposition."

Khrushchov, Sharkey, Dixon and Aarons have **NOW** accepted a similar proposition — and have the affrontry to call themselves Marxist-Leninists and allege they support completely the 81 Party Statement. Let us conclude by quoting Khrushchov on those who sail under false colors:

"Particularly dangerous to the revolutionary movement are those who call themselves Marxist-Leninists but who in practice, whether they want to or not, play the part of agents of the class enemy of the working class movement. The Communist and Workers' Parties are therefore very concerned over the question of theory and are irreconcilable with regard to any attempts to **REVISE** Marxism-Leninism." (Review, August, 1958, page 337).

So here we have a good statement from the world's outstanding revisionist. It is common knowledge that Kautsky also made good statements in his time; but this didn't stop him from developing into a leading revisionist. We saw the only positive way to defend world peace **IS TO DIRECT YOUR STRUGGLES AGAINST THE IMPERIALISTS' POLICY OF AGGRESSION AND WAR**, particularly of U.S. imperialism.

We demand the dismantling of U.S. bases on Australian soil. We demand the banning of all nuclear tests and the destruction of stockpiles of A and H bombs.

A Comment on L. L. Sharkey's Central Committee Report

THE Communist Review of December, 1963, contains a "report" by L. Sharkey, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Australia, entitled "We Stand by the 81 Parties' Statement."

Communists and other class-conscious Australian workers will read this report with interest.

The Statement of the 81 Parties agreed to and signed in November, 1960, was an important revolutionary document setting out the line of development for the entire world communist movement. Adherence to it in word, deed and spirit surely is a must for all who embrace the revolutionary goal of socialism.

How does Mr. Sharkey's report analyse the words, deeds and spirit of the C. P. of A. in the light of the decisions of the 81 Parties?

It must be said here and now that the report does nothing of the sort.

It occupies 70 inches of space in the pages of the Communist Review . . . Fifty-six of these inches are spent attacking a fraternal brother party, the Communist Party of China. The remaining 14 inches contain a hotch potch of a bit of a travelogue through some Soviet towns, a jaunt into Prague — a warning from Marx and Engels that "our theory is not a dogma" (one is tempted to ask of Mr. Sharkey "what theory?") finishing with a hollow, unsubstantiated claim that "we (i.e., the leadership of the Australian Communist Party) have not revised our Party Program nor the decisions of our Congresses."

In short, the only evidence of the connection between the Communist Party of Australia and the 81 Parties' statement appears to lie in the heading.

True, vague reference is made here and there in the report to the "basic propositions" of the 81 Parties — but not for the purpose of analysing the precise work of Australian Communists, but almost entirely for the purpose of falsifying the position of and slandering the Communist Party of China. In fact, it is not hard to get the impression that Mr. Sharkey is venting all his spleen and anger for the unhappy state in which he finds himself, upon the Chinese Communists.

As the decisions of the 81 Parties are frequently referred to these days, Mr. Sharkey might plead that everyone is completely familiar with them, so that there is no need to restate them.

Such a situation would be very encouraging and certainly there are many people who read and re-read these propositions. To all intents and purposes these do not include Mr. Sharkey in their number. It's as plain as the nose on your face that the afore-mentioned gentleman has abandoned the decisions as if they were youthful indiscretions.

But clearly, if one wishes to make a serious Marxist analysis of the work of a serious Communist Party, it is essential to summarise these main propositions again.

The 81 Parties' Statement makes an all-sided examination of the world in which we live. It analyses the socialist world, the capitalist world, pin-points the contradictions between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, sees the clash and struggle between the ruling class and the working class in the capitalist countries, sees the contradictions between the oppressed countries and imperialism, at the same time analysing the contradictions between the imperialist states and monopoly groupings.

The Statement takes an all-round view of the problems of war and peace, the concept of peaceful co-existence, deals with the breakdown of colonialism, the relations between working class parties and the problems affecting unity within the working class and finally deals with the role of the Communist Parties and the struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist ideas.

Basing itself upon the laws of social development, the Statement enunciates some revolutionary principles — every reader is advised to read the Statement again — but there can be no doubt that the summary made by the Chinese comrades of these revolutionary principles is correct, is fully in accord with Marxism-Leninism, viz. — "Workers of all countries unite; workers of the world unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, peoples' democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp, bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man."

What is Mr. Sharkey's view of the revolutionary principles and general line of the Communist movement? Well, that's rather a hard question to answer because he doesn't tell us precisely. But he does tell us that the Chinese "have repudiated it." He says "They say that peaceful co-existence is not the general line of the Communist movement" and to clinch the matter once and for all — to prove the whole perfidious character of the Chinese Communists — triumphantly quotes what the 81 Parties has to say "In a world divided into two systems, the only correct and reasonable principle of international relations is the principle of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, advanced by Lenin."

Well, so what? Only lunatics and rabid imperialists would deny that "the only correct and reasonable principle of inter-

national relations is the principle of peaceful co-existence," etc. The Chinese comrades have never rejected the proposition as outlined in the Statement. What they have objected to, is robbing the Statement of its revolutionary content, paring it down so that all that remains of the all-sided analysis of the problems of peace and war is this one-sided presentation of peaceful co-existence as being the sum total of the general line of the communist movement.

What The Chinese Really Said

To quote the Chinese Party's own words (and although Mr. Sharkey puts what purports to be their statement in quotation marks, he entirely neglects to give us the supposed source of the quotation) in the document entitled "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement dated June 14th, 1963": "This general line proceeds from the actual world situation taken as a whole and from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world and is directed against the counter-revolutionary global strategy of U.S. Imperialism . . . The general line is one of resolute, revolutionary struggle by the people of all countries and of carrying the proletarian world revolution forward to the end, it is the line that most effectively combats imperialism and defends world peace.

"If the general line of the international communist movement is one-sidedly reduced to 'peaceful co-existence', 'Peaceful competition' and 'peaceful transition', this is to violate the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, to discard the historical mission of proletarian world revolution, and to depart from the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism."

So reads the whole quotation of the Chinese on this matter. Does this reject the propositions on peaceful co-existence? Of course it does not — It certainly does reject the one-sidedness which presents it as the be-all and end-all of the entire revolutionary Declaration and Statement. It restores it to its proper position as one part of a thorough-going revolutionary Statement. It is a fitting commentary on Mr. Sharkey's position that he should so dishonestly misrepresent the Chinese position.

One's first reaction on reading Mr. Sharkey's diatribe, is to feel the need to deal with each of his accusations separately — there are 13 in all. However, on reflection, it would appear that by doing just this, we would probably all finish up just as addle-brained as Mr. Sharkey would appear to be becoming.

Talking generally and vaguely about the unity of the Communist movement (is this the man who violated the decision of the Parties and publicly attacked the Albanian Communist Party almost two years ago??), the Communist Party General Secretary says, "Our Party, on the other hand takes its stand on the platform

of the 81 Parties' Statement which we wholeheartedly accepted and have carried out to the best of our ability"!!!! And then, for good measure, he throws in the following gem, "The 81 Parties' Statement declares that while revisionism is the overall danger, dogmatism and leftism can become the main danger in individual parties — This was true of our struggle against the anti-Party group in Melbourne."

Well, the days of the old music hall illusionists are not yet over, it seems. "You might think I'm standing on my two feet, but I'm not, I'm standing on my head" — so, in essence, says Mr. Sharkey.

For what precisely did the 81 Parties statement say—without paraphrasing, "interpreting" or anything else you might care to call it? On Page 33 of the English Edition it says this—

"The Communist Parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist 'theories' in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the Declaration of 1957 . . . exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle. . . . Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the Communist movement and the working class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remain an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist Parties . . . The further development of the Communist and working class movement calls, as stated in the Moscow Declaration of 1957, for continuing a determined struggle on two fronts — against revisionism, which remains the main danger, and against dogmatism and sectarianism."

Now, by what stroke of "creative thought" did Mr. Sharkey devise that Australia could plead the path of exceptionalism to revisionism being the main danger?

Did he analyse the objective conditions of Australian economic and political life, above all of Australian economic life and the outcome of an unprecedented period of comparative prosperity contributing to reformist illusions among Australian workers? Did he self-critically examine how the policies of the leadership of the Communist Party of Australia had of recent date contributed to these reformist illusions?

No, he dogmatically asserts that dogmatism and leftism are the main dangers for the Australian Party. And why? Virtually, he says, "It is so, because I say it is so" — or should we say, "Because Mr. Aarons says it is so."

What did this "anti-party group" in Melbourne — the subject of much attack in this issue of the Communist Review — do? Did it formulate some outrageous, new theories demanding that

these be foisted upon the Communist Party of Australia? No, nothing of the sort. It would appear the real crime lay in "the group's" insistence that the decisions of the 81 Parties and the decisions of the 19th Congress — particularly propositions such as "The victory of Socialism all over the world will completely remove the social and national causes of all War" (81 Parties' Statement, page 18, Eng. Ed.) or "In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind" (ibid P. 31), be adhered to and popularised among the Australian people.

For the purpose of this article — one other proposition or accusation to put it more correctly needs to be dealt with — namely: "The Chinese now assert that, in fact, each socialist country should go it alone in building its economy, one of their latest discoveries."

"Go It Alone"

Dealing first with the cheap jibe about the "latest discoveries," it is suggested that the Chinese comrades discover things just like a conjuror producing a rabbit out of a hat, but of course, it is a fact that Chinese propositions for consolidating their socialist economy, or for that matter, any other propositions they make, are based on a concrete analysis of the general laws of socialist development, applied correctly to the objective conditions existing inside their own country.

Secondly, the term "go it alone," is not the term the Chinese use to describe an aspect of their socialist construction. It is the term used by those who sneer at the principle of "relying mainly on their own efforts in construction" and developing their own economies on the basis of independence.

Mr. Sharkey sees this as being in contradiction to the Statement which sees "the development of the national economy, culture and statehood goes hand in hand with the strengthening and development of the entire world socialist system . . ."

He doesn't develop the point. And, in truth, it would be a bit hard to do so.

Does it weaken the world socialist system for China to strengthen and improve her Socialist economy? Of course it does not. Has relying upon her strength and resources strengthened the Chinese economy? Of course it has as the following facts show.

During the first Five Year Plan, China could make about 55% of machinery and equipment she needed. During the second Five Year Plan the level was raised to about 85%. Self-sufficiency

in steel products climbed from about 75% in the first Five Year Plan to around 90% in the second Five Year Plan. Similar advances can be recorded in all fields of socialist construction.

Did Mr. Sharkey analyse the origin, review the objective conditions which demanded that the Chinese proceed in this way? It must be said he neglected to inform the C.C. meeting, to which this report was given, that the action of the leadership of the Soviet Union way back in 1960 of withdrawing all Soviet technicians and personnel from China in an effort to bring economic pressure to bear to make the Chinese toe the Soviet leadership's ideological line, forced the Chinese people to rely upon their own strength and resources.

In his travel talk, he did take some side-swipes at the Chinese about the blow they dealt the Czech industry because of their refusal to accept delivery of some "vast" amount of machinery and other manufactured goods (no details supplied). Adding insult to injury he complained "the Chinese brought the ideological differences into the sphere of state relations." Again, the phrase is not even original. It is lifted *holus bolus* from the Chinese who used it to describe the actions of Soviet authorities against themselves some three years previously.

And so, Mr. Sharkey, General Secretary of the C.P.A., wildly lashes and splashes about. He claims the Chinese recent 25 points as contained in the Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement are formulated in opposition to the proposition of the 81 Parties' Statement.

Well, we could at least be pleased that Mr. Sharkey has read the propositions although it must be recorded that they don't seem to have done much good.

Every reader is urged to read the "Proposal Concerning the General Line" for himself. Contrast the masterly presentation of material, the way in which every claim is substantiated by a Marxist analysis of both the world and national situation with the vague, diffuse wanderings — the idealist claims that "things are so because I say they are so" of Mr. L. Sharkey.

Small wonder that one of the revisionist "leaders" in the Victorian Party organisation recently deplored that never before had Party leaders been held in such contempt by the rank and file. Once one abandons the position of truth before the working class, soon little remains but a pitiful apology for a once-respected working class leader. He will finish upon the revisionist scrap heap, left behind by the Australian workers who will continue their battle to master truth, to equip themselves with the infallible guide of Marxist thought, to carry their struggle against the Australian ruling class to a successful conclusion, the victory of Socialism.

Migrants and the Struggle of the Australian Working Class

An important feature of Australia's post-war development has been the population change brought about by migration. Since 1945 the net gain from new settlers, after allowing for departures, totalled 1,460,000 or an increase of 39%. To this must be added the 720,000 children born to migrant parents. During the past six years 435,000 migrants were gained. Of these one-third were British, one-third Southern Europeans and one third of Northern European origin.

Ninety-five per cent of migrants are wage-earners. The majority of the Southern Europeans — Greeks, Italians, Spaniards, Maltese, Yugoslavs — are of peasant origin.

The motives of the ruling class of Australia in allowing such a large scale migration were other than humanitarian, despite the press propaganda aiming to create the impression that post-war Europe had to be assisted to rehabilitate the victims of Nazi concentration camps.

Amongst the main aims of mass migration were:

(1) to create internal markets for the products of and cheap labour power for, an Australian industry geared for mass production of consumer goods during World War II and

(2) to break down, if possible, the militancy of the Australian working class and in the event of an adventurist colonial intervention to the north to provide replacements for Australian workers conscripted in the army.

The first aim has been partly attained subject to the normal unemployment upheavals of capitalist economy. The laws of overproduction still operate despite the efforts of the disciples of Keynes to prove otherwise. During periods of unemployment, it is notable that one of the outcries of the Labor Party is the demand to stop or reduce migration. As a large percentage are unskilled, migrants are the first sufferers of a "recession." It is immaterial to the ruling class that in bringing out migrants an undertaking was given for their full employment. In a "recession" innumerable reasons are found why a migrant cannot be employed . . . difficulty of language, lack of skill, etc. . . . all except the main cause, i.e., overproduction of goods and breakdown of capitalist economy.

Strong Anti-Fascist Influences

The second aim was less successful. Although a majority of migrants are of peasant origin or coming from countries with a strong reformist trade union movement, the anti-fascist war of 1939-45 has influenced many of them. Coming from a Europe that suffered under fascism, the comparative bourgeois democracy in Australia had the effect of attracting migrants to unions. A factor for this attraction was the recognition of the necessity that unity among all workers in a certain industry was a necessity for wage gains.

The strong trade union tradition in Australia and the rising post-war militancy, the coal, metal and transport strikes of 1945-52 influenced the early post-war migrants, particularly those from Southern Europe many of whom participated in the armies of liberation of their respective countries.

Even the early pro-Nazi refugees from Northern Europe were forced to take a passive, even though hostile, stand towards the trade unions. So the second task of the ruling class and its henchmen in the labor movement was hard to be carried out. As for any adventures to the north of Australia, the lessons of Korea and Dien Bien Phu were well digested by the Australian ruling class.

What were the motives of the migrants in coming to Australia? In the main to escape the effects of a capitalist system that had plagued their countries.

This generality has to be specifically examined on three points—

1. **The attitude of migrants to war — which had broken out on their soil many times in the past 50 years.**
2. **To what extent the availability of work and better standards of living has strengthened or weakened their class consciousness.**
3. **To what extent the illusion of bourgeois democracy in Australia has revised their conception of the state machine of their mother countries.**

The war of 1939-45 affected migrants in two ways. Those fighting for the allies to defeat fascism were aware of the progressive character of the war. Workers from the semi-colonial and capitalist countries of Europe for the first time were fighting fascism on the same level. Even workers whose ruling classes dragged them behind the war chariot of Hitler, given the opportunity, expressed their opposition to the war by mass desertions and surrenders.

War to migrants is a real thing. Modern revisionism is appealing for the support of a peaceful world without arms, a nebulous peaceful co-existence far from the politics behind the war aims of the ruling class. Modern revisionism is using the anti-war sentiments of migrants to try to convince them

that wars just happen. According to the new Kautskys, migrants are not prepared to learn the real causes of war because they suffered so much and all they want is to work in peace.

But migrants who suffered from war are more receptive to ideas of the real causes which underlie imperialist wars. In his articles on "War and the Workers," Lenin deals with a problem that faced the Bolsheviks during the war of 1914-18 when the social-chauvinists of the Second International deserted the workers. To fight for the fatherland, was the easy way out. The then chauvinist slogans of the ruling class are replaced today by the blackmail of the atom bomb.

Lenin pointed out that it is necessary to explain the class basis of imperialist wars. He pointed out that despite chauvinist influences on the workers, in the final analysis, an understanding of this class basis of war will drive them to revolutionary action against the instigators of war.

The revolutions of 1917 in Russia and other European countries proved the correctness of Lenin's theory.

Lenin also pointed out the need for teaching the workers to differentiate between wars that must be supported by the working class and unjust wars that must be opposed by the working class. Many of the migrants have experienced periods in which both just and unjust wars were fought by their countries.

Consciously or not their support or opposition was clearly expressed. The Italian surrenders during World War II in Albania and Libya were an indication of this. The heroism of the Italian guerillas against the nazis was another. Mussolini met his fate at the hands of these same guerillas. The correct conditions under which the Fatherland should be defended were well understood by the Greek people.

The war experiences of migrants, however large or small, have convinced them that world peace is to their interest.

Link Experience With Theory

But that is not sufficient. It is necessary to link their experience with the theory of Marxism-Leninism on War and Peace. It is necessary to carry a step forward the proletarian theory of the causes of war. A contradiction exists between the experience of migrants of war and their understanding of the theory of peaceful co-existence. This contradiction can be eliminated by a principled attitude to war and peace.

The impoverishment of the peasantry in a number of European countries was their second motive for migration to Australia. It is a recognised fact that the young peasant and rural workers of Southern Europe migrate yearly as regularly as migratory birds. The difference between the birds and young migrants is that the former return to the land that gave them birth, the latter very seldom do.

Due to their relationship to the means of production, migrants of peasant origin tend to be less class conscious than the minority of industrial workers from large cities in Europe. Nevertheless many are more politically conscious than the average Australian. The unstable politics of Europe, the weak base for reformist ideology, the strong anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist movements have developed certain militant tendencies. This has created their contradictory attitude towards unions and other working class organisations.

The migrant expects a more militant attitude from the moderate unions to which most of them are eligible to belong. They suspect the class collaboration between some reformist union leaders and the management. Despite these trends and attitudes given proper leadership migrants are prepared to struggle alongside their fellow-Australians.

The recent strike struggles in the rubber, motor car and textile industries are a clear example.

The militancy of migrants particularly of Southern Europeans has not been dampened by the comparative full employment in Australia. The low wages of unskilled workers keep most of them on the border-line. The need for a consistent explanation of the Marxist theory of surplus value and its relationship to the enormous monopoly profits is of paramount importance.

The failure to develop the practical day to day tasks of the working class struggle in proper accordance with the development of correct proletarian principles is one of the many crimes of modern revisionism.

The time-worn slogan of the reformists that the worker is not educated enough to grasp the secrets of economics is replaced by the modern revisionist theory that the workers are too well off in Australia to fight for socialism.

In other words leave the workers under the influence of bourgeois economics because capitalism temporarily provides them with certain amenities.

Just as the illusion is strengthened that the migrant worker is well off compared to conditions in his country of origin, so is the illusion of bourgeois democracy in Australia.

Most migrants in one way or another have experienced the real use of the state machine by the ruling classes in Europe. Conscripted for predatory wars, brutal suppression of strikes, putting down of peasant revolts, concentration camps and gas furnaces . . . all weapons of oppression . . . aimed to bolster up a dying system. Again, consciously or not, the migrants' understanding of the state is real. In Australia, the state is also real. It exists for the same purpose as European class states . . . the machine is the same, the way that it is used is

different for the time being. Migrants who participate in the trade union movement face the reality of the State, but here the strike breaker is replaced by a law which forbids strikes . . . here the outlawing of a union is replaced by crippling fines against a union . . . here the arrest and imprisonment of trade union leaders is replaced by court-controlled ballots.

But the intimidation of migrants by the capitalist state is the same.

Intimidation takes many forms. Refusal of naturalisation, refusal of pensions, deportation and racial discrimination against Asiatics. To the migrants, these acts of the State are real. A contradiction exists between their experiences of the capitalist state and the illusion created that the State in Australia has a different role to play.

The recent elections and the results have created many misgivings in the minds of migrant workers. How is it possible for a Party that gained 46% of votes to have only 33% of seats in Parliament, migrants ask?

To the migrant the state machine is a mighty awe-inspiring weapon to be used against him. Consciously, or not, his attitude has altered little despite attempts to create the illusion that bourgeois democracy in Australia is much better than the open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in European countries.

The migration policy of the Australian ruling class and their motives — the hopes and attitudes of migrants to the vital questions affecting them and their class, the working class — can be summarised in the efforts of the ruling class to extract from them greater surplus value, and in the struggle of the exploited to improve their conditions.

Australian workers, of course, vary in their political consciousness. Some are class conscious (Marxist-Leninist); some are class conscious without being Marxist-Leninist; some are backward (even very backward) and between the extremes are many variations. So too are migrant workers.

The common struggle of migrant and Australian workers, a struggle that has yet to be developed, is the factor that unites them and influences their attitude to one another as workers. To the migrant, struggle with the Australian worker gives him confidence. To the Australian worker, the influx of migrants has broken down some of his traditional isolation and the chauvinist influences that operate. Internationalism, the corner stone of the working class movement, is cemented in the process of struggle. The common aim of all workers is the development of this struggle to its highest point, the establishment of working class power in Australia, to socialism.

Abundance Alone Does Not Mean Communism

THE revisionist Dixon, said at a meeting in Melbourne that "abundance means Communism" and went on to say "but some people do not agree with this conception and think that abundance is a departure from Communism." He was referring to the leaders of the Communist Party of China and indirectly to Marxist-Leninists everywhere.

Abundance conjures up a picture of granaries overflowing, shops stacked with goods, wall to wall carpets in every home, in fact "a land flowing with milk and honey." If abundance means communism then all we have to do is work hard and increase productivity, for an abundance of material things can be acquired in a modern capitalist state. In capitalist countries there IS an abundance — as long ago as 1844 Engels said there was no shortage of houses in Britain . . .

In the United States and in Australia granaries are full and shops are filled with food, clothing and electrical appliances.

But Dixon, we presume, was also implying that only under a planned economy can this abundance be fairly shared, although revisionists of today say less about this aspect, now that Yugoslavia is back in the fold.

Khrushchev in his report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. says "the bowl of communism is the bowl of abundance" and "if we were to proclaim that we introduce communism when the bowl is still far from full, we would be unable to take from it according to needs." He goes on to say that "we base ourselves on strictly scientific estimates, which indicate that we shall in the main, have built a communist society within 20 years."

It is true that the Khrushchevs and the Dixons pay much lip service to the ideological education of the people. Khrushchev, in fact, spent a lot of time in his report on social relations and the need to raise ideological work to a higher level for the creation of a new man.

But in practice the EMPHASIS is on the material and technical basis of building communism. This is plain to see in the Soviet Union as the Sharkeys and the Dixons well know.

The importance attached to material incentives comes as a shock after visiting China where politics not currency is in command. At the Stalingrad hydro-electric station the writer asked how they managed to attract so many workers to such a place and was told that they got high wages. A question about "other incentives" received the reply that "The young girls like to go out with men who had worked on these huge projects."

Khrushchev in his report pays a lot of attention to the raising of wages. Do high wages also mean communism? Since the 22nd Congress, the promise to abolish taxes on lower incomes has been shelved. And the prices of some essential foods have risen. Bread is scarce and wheat is being imported. Communism in the terms of abundance, seems a long way off.

Chinese Living Standards Soar

Do the Chinese leaders say that abundance is a departure from communism. Of course not, and they never will.

Even the revisionists have to admit to the improved living standards of the Chinese people as compared to their conditions before 1949. Even the most reactionary capitalist ideologists admit that, due to the policies of the Chinese government, no-one has starved or gone unclothed during the years of dreadful natural and Soviet government-assisted calamities in China. To suggest, as Khrushchev did recently, that the Chinese government is not concerned with the material needs of the people is criminal. To go further and suggest as Dixon did, that the Chinese government is not interested in creating conditions of abundance is even more criminal.

What the Chinese leaders say is that abundance **ALONE** does not mean Communism. Nor is it permissible for one socialist country to devote itself to providing its own people with an abundance of material things while other socialist countries are struggling to raise living standards. Nor is it permissible, while working people anywhere in the world are suffering oppression and exploitation.

The revisionists use Lenin's remarks on the force of example to justify their actions. But Lenin never said that a socialist country should withdraw fraternal aid from other socialist countries in order to show the workers in capitalist and colonial countries the material benefits of socialism.

The Chinese people, even during the lean years of 1960-61 gave fraternal aid to Albania which had supplies cut off by the Soviet government and other socialist countries. The tremendous aid given to Cuba after its devastation by hurricane and the

fraternal assistance given to other countries could well have been used by the Chinese people. And how can one count the cost of the 400,000 Chinese volunteers who gave their lives in Korea to push the United States invaders away from the Soviet and Chinese borders.

Whether a country can rapidly reach a position of abundance for all, depends not only on internal conditions, but also on the fraternal support it gives to other socialist countries and the international working class. And also on the support it receives from these sources. Internal conditions are primary but they are interwoven with the external. Stalin made this clear in his Foundations of Leninism — a work which even the revisionists have not yet decried.

Whether a country takes the road to socialism or to capitalism is a struggle which continues long after the overthrow of the exploiting classes. Emphasis on material benefits engenders capitalist ideas — greed, selfishness, personal gain and prestige.

Material benefits are essential, say the Chinese and all other Marxist-Leninists, but the success of all work rests on the level of consciousness. On a definite material basis, ideology controls and changes everything. People with different ideas have different results. Therefore in the task of building socialism the guiding theory is politics in command combined with material incentives; with politics in first place.

Lenin saw the first voluntary work in the new Soviet state as action of the greatest importance. In China piece work has disappeared, the workers voluntarily went over to the time work and socialist emulation some years ago. At a big factory in Harbin the workers told the writer that overtime was not allowed except where there was a weak link. In earlier years they used to bring their bedding to the factory in their determination to improve quality and increase production. Each factory group now has a volunteer to see if the workers arrive on time but his job is also to see that they leave on time. They had two slogans "High production in eight hours" and "three shifts in the time of three shifts."

A deep study and understanding of materialist dialectics (not at all a mystery as bourgeois philosophers make it out to be, but well within the reach of a literate worker), of political economy, of all Marxist-Leninist theory, applied internationally, nationally, locally, and in one's everyday life, will eventually bring abundance. But it will be abundance for all working people, and any sacrifices that people have to make in attaining it will not be seen as sacrifices (as many say in the Soviet Union), but as an internationalist duty and will be the willing actions of huge numbers of people throughout the world.

Excerpts From N.Z. Party Statement to the C.P.S.U.

ON the initiative of the Communist Party of New Zealand, bi-lateral talks on the ideological differences in the world communist movement were held in Moscow from August 30th to September 4th, 1963, between the C.P. of N.Z. and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Here is published excerpts from a statement submitted by the general secretary of the New Zealand Party, Comrade V. G. Wilcox to the C.P.S.U.

They begin: "First, may I on behalf of this delegation, from the C.P. of N.Z. express our thanks to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. for making our forthcoming discussions possible. We are confident that the meeting will prove of mutual benefit to our two parties."

"Right at the start we must say that our Party by conference decision is in disagreement with the actions and statements of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. on a number of very important questions, arising from the interpretation of both theory and practice in the application of those vitally important Marxist documents, the 1957 Declaration and the 81 Parties' Statement of 1960 . . ."

"We are not at all happy about the way in which certain ideological differences in our world movement have been advanced by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. since the Bucharest Congress of the Rumanian Party . . ."

"We do not consider that at the time of the Bucharest Congress it was correct for the C.P.S.U., after that congress ended, to call a meeting of fraternal delegates present in Bucharest, and there open up an ideological attack on the Albanian and Chinese Parties, asking those fraternal delegates to agree with the C.P.S.U. viewpoint. No fraternal delegates at that time had any mandate to act on behalf of their Party leadership, and they did not know of the issues to be raised. It was a serious breach of the collective approach and an ignoring of the principle of collective leadership."

"When the 81 Parties met in Moscow in 1960, all delegates were supplied not only with the draft of the statement to be discussed and eventually (when amended) issued, but also with a full account of the C.P.S.U. statements at the Bucharest meeting. This was obviously done as part of the official organisation of the meeting, but the Chinese documents were not

so available. In fact, many delegates to our knowledge never read them or saw them. Your reply to the Chinese statement was then issued but not the Chinese further reply. This was in our view incorrect. It was asking Comrades to form opinions without consideration of what another Marxist-Leninist Party, attacked in your document, had to say on the issues involved."

"Again, the holding of an open session at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U., in which a violent attack was launched publicly on the leadership of another fraternal party, the Albanian Party of Labor. This not only gave joy to the enemy in the capitalist world and spread confusion in our own ranks but in our opinion, was in direct opposition to the decisions of our world parties as to how differences in our movement should be handled. We say this irrespective of the rights or wrongs of the position of the Albanian Party. They can speak for themselves inside our world movement at the right time and place — they have that right as a Marxist-Leninist Party. It is no answer to say that the Albanian Party have again publicly attacked the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and then go on to quote speculative articles in Capitalist papers such as the 'Scotsman' and others."

"Frankly, Comrades, we are seriously worried at the number of assertions made by leaders of your Party and by some other leaders of other Parties that are not, as we see it, based on facts. We will give one example of what we consider this incorrect approach. We quote: 'Since the leaders of the Communist Parties of China had exacerbated in the extreme their differences with the C.P.S.U. and the entire Communist movement' (Khrushchev's speech at meeting of the C.C. C.P.S.U. June 29th, 1963). Well, Comrades, you are entitled to your opinion of the Chinese leadership and what they have, in your opinion, done but you see it is just not correct to say 'and the entire Communist movement.' It is not true. We start to tread a dangerous road when we depart in our statements from known facts, no matter how much we may dislike them."

One-Sided Approach To Transition

"On the question of leadership of the working masses to socialism, we are seriously worried that the general world approach in our Marxist-Leninist movement, under your influence as the leading world Party, today lays too much stress on peaceful possibilities in areas where no such possibilities exist, and not enough on other methods. If our view is correct, is it not a fact that in countries where possibilities exist today of advancing from national liberation struggle to socialist revolution there is a definite braking effect? Everywhere in the capitalist world this strikes at the revolutionary core of our parties and opens the way for social democratic ideology. As we see it, the base for advance remains the class struggle, the class battles in the non-socialist worlds. We agree that socialist victories, the successful accomplishment of the C.P.S.U. program, etc., are important, and

will have a further favorable effect, but should not be treated as a secondary matter. We do not deny the possibility of peaceful transition under certain conditions, but excluding the over-riding influence of the heroic, victorious Red Army in World War II, the first historical example of peaceful transition has yet to occur. Yet we understand that some Marxist-Leninist Parties have actually reached, or are reaching the conclusion, that the only way to socialism in their country is by the peaceful road.

"For this serious revisionist development, we consider that your influence has been a contributing cause. Concepts arising from your 20th Congress have grown and expanded until the above situation has been reached. As far as we know, no serious criticism of this development has come from your Party while recently a frontal attack has been persistently made against any ideas that in most parts of the non-socialist world, peaceful transition is but a pipe dream."

"Again comrades we are worried at what we consider is a failure to see that with changing conditions the storm centres of the developing world socialist revolution have inevitably shifted. In 1917 it was Russia and Europe. Today are not Asia, S.E. Asia and South America to a degree, a storm centre? Here, we will make a quote from a report of Lenin's which has some aptness although not directly applicable. 'The socialist revolution will not be only and mainly a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their own bourgeoisie -- no, it will be a struggle of all the colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism. And, now it will be the lot of the Soviet republic to group around itself all the awakened people of the East to wage a struggle jointly with them against international imperialism.' (Lenin — report at the 2nd All Russian Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East)."

"Frankly, comrades, the question of transition methods to socialism in the modern world seems to us sometimes to be decided more by what is considered to be the immediate State policy of socialist countries than on basic Marxist-Leninist ideology. Behind all of it there seems to be running the theme that we need peaceful relations with imperialism for a long time, so therefore don't irritate the brute. Recommending, preparing for and carrying out armed struggle in some important remaining imperialist strongholds would be very irritating, and so we get a lot of prattle about 'reasonable imperialists' being persuaded to accept peaceful capitulation while imperialists continue the same hard line. It would be hard to persuade people in S. Vietnam that imperialism is becoming reasonable."

On the question of social democracy the New Zealand statement said: "As we see it, in N.Z. social democratic ideology, as a variant of bourgeois ideology, is itself losing much of its hold in the ranks of the workers. We do not want to create

illusions that among the masses a working class ideological outlook is emerging, firmly based on struggle. This is not so, but the belief that the New Zealand Labor Party is going to solve their problems the next time it is elected, is dying rapidly. Social democracy's hold on the workers is tending to rely on the slim aspect that a majority of workers think they are a little better than the other capitalist parties. We consider that this is a logical development in the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism in the days of the decline of imperialism on a world scale. We are concerned that this aspect is not brought out clearly on a world scale. Instead, illusions seem to be growing that the nature of social democracy is changing. How did Lenin outline the rise of social democracy in the workers' ranks, and to what did he contribute its cause? In essence he said, that from a world angle, out of the development of imperialism it became possible for capitalism to create a 'labor aristocracy' in the major industrial countries, without seriously cutting into the rising profits and imperialistic expansion at that time, and that in fact, the dampening down of the class struggle in the industrialised countries, gave them a favourable balance sheet in any profit and loss account in that period."

The statement then makes some lengthy quotes of Soviet material including from the Fundamentals of Marxism and points out that the essential link between social democratic ideology and the lessening of its influence in the conditions of the decline of imperialism is missing.

First Break-Through Yet To Occur

"We would like you to consider our approach seriously, as the first break through by our Marxist-Leninist Parties on this problem has yet to occur in the classic countries of social democratic ideology in the ranks of the Labor Movement. We do not think that the revisionist confusion between the uniting and working with the masses who support social democracy and when necessary with social democratic leaders, right or left, and the strategic aim of eliminating social democratic ideology from the ranks of the working class, will lead to anything but defeat and the fundamental betrayal of the working class and the revolution. In view of the growth of revisionism in our world movement we consider such a development is taking place though it can still be corrected if the danger is recognised."

Finally, the statement deals with the question of Yugoslavia. It says, "we do not see that the Yugoslav revisionists have changed but we consider that others have. They no longer uphold the 81 Parties' statement. We ask, what is the use of making decisions if changes can be made without collective consideration . . . The Yugoslav revisionists remain firm on their third force concept in international affairs which means they stay outside the socialist camp."

In Memory of Michael James Hassett

It is with deep sadness and regret that we record the death of Michael James Hassett at the age of 72.

He died on the evening of Tuesday, January 14 after a long illness and is survived by his wife and son.

It is difficult to put into words the kind of memory that Mick, as he was affectionately called by his friends, has left behind.

When you talked and joked with Mick it was like coming face to face with the happy, sunny Australian tradition itself. For most of his life Mick worked in the building trade and in his youth travelled far into the Australian outback. He loved his country and the Australian people with whom he shared many a hardship.

All his life he stood straight and firm, like the gum trees he loved so much, on the side of the working people. Never did he waver, come what may, and in the current struggle with the modern revisionists he took his place in the ranks of the genuine Marxist-Leninists. His very presence among them gave them encouragement and strength.

Mick was a scholar as well as a great craftsman. He was the true scholar, deeply and widely read, but never out of touch with people. That is why he admired Henry Lawson so much whose every poem he knew by heart. He knew Lawson in his early years when he worked in Sydney.

His limitless stories were vivid and full of life and they helped many to understand the theory of socialism. There's the one about Sweeney's bag that is unforgettable.

Mick would say: "Years ago, with some of my mates, I used to drink at Sweeney's pub and at closing time every night, old man Sweeney would come around with a great bag. He'd open the tills and empty the dough into his bag. Some of the chaps there used to ask me to tell them what socialism would be like. Well, I would say, you'd still go to work, the trains would still run, the kids would still go to school and we would still come here to have a drink. The only difference would be that there'd be no Sweeney's bag."

And then with his eyes flashing like blue gum leaves in the sun he would tell you about his uncle.

"My uncle did well out of the land boom of the nineties. He bought a big mansion with a drive in Caulfield and tried his luck with a couple of horses. Soon, of course, he *went* broke.

"One day I was standing with him in the lounge room of his big house. I was only a kid at the time and we were looking down the drive. The gate opened and two men came in. 'Here come some of my creditors, Mick,' he said, 'you watch them break into a run when they get half way up the drive. You see, they'll both think that whoever gets to the front door first will stand the better chance of getting paid.' And sure enough they both broke into a run.

"When they reached the front door my uncle opened it and said: 'Sorry, gentlemen, a dead-heat. Re-run it tomorrow.'"

In his last years Mick, like many others, came to love and admire the Chinese people and their Communist Party and their leaders. He would get great joy out of reading their publications and listening to Peking Radio.

So it is fitting that in saying our last farewell we quote from a work of ancient China — The Way of Virtue.

"The heaven endures forever and the earth is eternal. Why are heaven and earth enduring and eternal? Because they do not live for themselves. Therefore they can live forever.

"The wise man desires to be forgotten, but he is remembered. He desires to be free of life, but he retains it. He desires nothing for himself, but he finds everything he wants."

Mick was just such a man.

Melbourne - January, 1964

Printed by Typo Art Printing Co. Pty. Ltd.
for J. J. Masterson, 89 Highbury Street, West Richmond