

335.46

STATE LIBRARY
* 2 - JUL 1964 *
OF VICTORIA

The Australian Communist



A JOURNAL OF MARXISM-LENINISM

No. 5

PRICE: 1/6

E. F. Hill's Report to Historic Conference of Marxist-Leninists

PART I

The following is the first part of the political report delivered by E. F. Hill to the recent conference of Marxist-Leninists which decided to repudiate the revisionist leadership of Aarons, Dixon and Sharkey and establish the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist).

The second part of the report will be published in the next issue of the Australian Communist.

Before the conference is a draft Marxist-Leninist programme for Australia. That programme sets before the Australian workingclass and all Australian toiling people the revolutionary perspective of a socialist Australia.

It places Australian Communists in the great army of proletarian internationalists. It calls upon the Australian workingclass to play its rightful part in the international workingclass movement.

It shows Australian Communists gathered here as the rightful heirs of all that is good, clean, honest and revolutionary in the Australian workingclass. It raises aloft the banner of Marxism-Leninism which has been thrown down by people who masquerade as Communists.

That programme is a fitting basis upon which to reconstitute the Communist movement in Australia and to repudiate the Aaronses, the Dixons and the Sharkeys. It is a programme bound to attract the support of the Australian working people because it is true: it expresses truly their innermost desires and aspirations.

It is a historic milestone in the Australian revolutionary movement: this Conference itself is a truly historic conference. The fate of the Australian workingclass really turns upon the success of our conference and our reconstitution of the Communist Party: it is the greatest and noblest responsibility that one could possibly undertake.

Hence we must approach our deliberations fully conscious of this immense responsibility: fully conscious that upon us has

devolved the noble task of upholding the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

There is no doubt that we will do that: there is no doubt our conference will successfully reconstitute the Communist Party and put the Communist Party of Australian (M.L.) upon the correct path of socialist revolution.

The nature of our times imperatively demands that we uphold the banner of Marxism-Leninism: demands that we organise the highest possible quality Communist Party closely linked with the masses.

Experience has shown that there are fearless champions of Marxism-Leninism in the Australian workingclass movement — men and women who have not been daunted by intimidation, lies, slanders and have not been led astray by bribes and flattery.

Experience has shown that the relative handful of Marxist-Leninists who from the very outset of the struggle against revisionism in Australia took a firm stand have been joined by the cream of the workingclass movement.

Experience has shown that daily, hourly throughout the world new forces join the ranks of Marxist-Leninists and oppose revisionism.

TIME FOR SUPREME OPTIMISM

Experience has shown just that development in Australia culminating in this wonderful conference. There is no power on earth that can prevent the advance of Communism; there is no power that can prevent the advance of Communism in Australia.

Our epoch is the epoch of the world supremacy of socialism. The socialist system has become a world system — the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the great October Socialist Revolution goes on apace.

The national liberation movement is battering at the very foundations of imperialism. Here in South-East Asia the Indonesian people are waging a great battle against imperialism: so too the people of South Vietnam, South Korea, Laos, Japan. The New Guinea people are on the move against Australian imperialism.

The struggle against imperialism is a concrete reality and the workingclass movement goes along hand in hand with the movement for national liberation. The common enemy is monopoly capitalism with its imperialist interests.

The Australian workingclass is restive — its militant demands and struggles for improved living conditions challenge the monopoly capitalists. There is as never before the prospect of ending capitalism for ever — with socialism a world system, the national liberation movement on the march and an awakened workingclass more and more open to scientific socialist leadership.

This is a time for supreme optimism when the scientific vision of those two men of genius — Marx and Engels — who stood

almost alone, is about to become a world reality because it is backed by millions of people imbued with their ideas.

We do not see the postponement of socialism to some remote and dim and distant future as do the revisionists — Aarons, Dixon and Sharkey. It should be known that Sharkey has often said that he cannot see the end of capitalism for a hundred years or more and this within forty-seven years of the October Revolution and fifteen years of Chinese liberation.

We believe along with the 81 Parties' Statement that the main content of our time is the transition from capitalism to socialism—that the 81 Parties' Statement means what it says: that it is our job to give it body and soul, flesh and blood in accordance with its revolutionary principles here in the conditions of our country.

IMPERIALISM IS ON TRIAL

Imperialism is ever more on trial. The general crisis of capitalism which grips the economy, the politics, the ideology of capitalism has intensified.

The world capitalist system is going through an intense process of disintegration and decay. U.S. imperialism has put itself forward as the champion of imperialism: it strives might and main for world domination. It seeks to oust the older colonial powers from Asia, Africa, Latin America and establish its own neo-colonialism: it seeks to dominate the economies of the capitalist countries—Europe, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

It seeks to consolidate its position in these two sets of countries as part of its plan for world domination and then direct attack upon the socialist countries. For the destruction of socialism it must secure its hinterland — the intermediate areas between it and the socialist countries.

Hence it creates enemies everywhere — the national liberation struggles are in the first place directed against the U.S. imperialists who support, guarantee, underwrite every reactionary move seeking all the time their own ends. The U.S. imperialists encounter more and more vigorous and revolutionary opposition. The people of Vietnam, Korea, Laos, Indonesia all rise up against the U.S. imperialists who are forced to rush hither and thither whilst the peoples in these countries tighten the nooses around the necks of U.S. imperialism. We salute the heroic fighters for national liberation. We thank them for the immense help they are giving us: the immense contribution they are making to the peace of the world: we determine that we will not be found wanting in our international proletarian duty.

Within our country the U.S. imperialists arrogantly pursue their plans for domination. They arouse the opposition of wide sections of the people. Their economic penetration proceeds apace. Every Australian is keenly aware of the alien influence of U.S. imperialism.

From its gigantic monopoly bases in Australia such as G.M.H., Fords, International Harvester, the oil combines, it strives might and main to subvert the Australian working people to its own ends.

It uses the foul agency of the D.L.P., N.C.C.: it enlists the support of the reformist A.L.P. leadership, it owns the Menzies Government. U.S. imperialism and its agents emerge as the No. 1 enemy of the Australian people and the Australian nation. The U.S. aggressive military blocs, SEATO, ANZUS are a menace to the security of Australian people.

They threaten to involve Australia ever more deeply in the dirty wars in Malaysia, Vietnam, Laos and the other areas threatened by U.S. aggression.

U.S. imperialism has developed bases in Australia: its U.2 planes fly all over the country. The U.S. base at Exmouth Gulf is supported alike by the Menzies Government and the A.L.P. leaders. It is a direct threat against the people of South-East Asia: against their liberation movement: it is a direct threat to the people of Australia.

The U.S. 7th Fleet moves around our shores, potentially directed from the U.S. base at Exmouth Gulf. U.S. policy determines the attempted quarantining by the Menzies Government of the Chinese People's Republic.

MENZIES' REACTIONARY POLICY

All this meets and must meet with increasing opposition from ever-expanding circles of Australian people. The workingclass is directly menaced by the aggressive war plans of the U.S. imperialists: by their ever-intensifying exploitation and attacks upon the wages and living conditions and rights of the workers: the toiling people of the countryside are more and more intensely exploited by the U.S. machinery and oil companies, food processing companies, the invasion of land, the dictatorial trade policy of the U.S. imperialists: sections of the capitalist class menaced by the extension of U.S. monopoly investments and competition come into increasing conflict with the policy of U.S. imperialism.

At the behest of U.S. imperialism the Menzies Government pursues an utterly reactionary foreign policy. Not only has it entered into SEATO and ANZUS but in every international issue it takes up the most reactionary stand: it fiercely exploits and suppresses the New Guinea people and as part of its neo-colonialism imposes on them the farce of a so-called free election: it denies them immediate and unconditional independence: denies them elementary rights and living conditions: imposes a head tax: sends out punitive expeditions all in the interests of the great

monopolies. It ruthlessly suppresses the Australian Aborigines and denies them elementary human rights.

The Menzies government has attacked the living standards of the Australian people: it ended the adjustment of the basic wage: its arbitration tribunals backed by all the punitive force of the State (fines, gaol) keep wages and conditions at a minimum standard.

At the behest of the monopolies, headed by the U.S. imperialists, it has resisted every move by the workers for improved wages and conditions.

It has extended and strengthened the whole repressive apparatus of the State. Above all it has strengthened and re-organised the standing army, chief weapon of the monopoly capitalists.

It has imported a never-ending stream of U.S. admirals, generals, diplomats to give it advice on how best to organise its forces: it has arranged the integration of Australian armed forces with those of the U.S.

The main direction of all this is against the Australian working-class and toiling people and the peoples subjected by Australian imperialism. It has strengthened the courts — organ of repression and in particular the Industrial Court, direct weapon against the workingclass. It has increased considerably the range of repressive legislation. Its 1960 Crimes Act amendments radically increased the number of political offences and drastically increased the penalties for these offences, including the death penalty, life imprisonment and fifteen years imprisonment for direct working-class activity and in particular for offences constituted by united action between the Australian workers and the national liberation struggles.

VINDICATION OF LENIN'S ANALYSIS

It has extended and developed the system of telephone tapping and hypocritically has legalised it. It has extended and strengthened the secret police (security service) with the direct object of disrupting the workingclass, gaoling its activists and resorting to forgery, frame-up, provocation, diversion, planting agents in workingclass organisations and doubtless along with all other such cloak and dagger organisations planning even worse crimes.

All this it has done under the slogan of democracy. The Menzies Government has increasingly placed the direct representatives of the monopoly capitalists in key positions in the State apparatus. It has made Australia a typical example of state monopoly capitalism.

It is a classical vindication, substantiation of Lenin's analysis of the State — an apparatus for the repression of one class by another — a weapon of the monopoly capitalists for the suppression of the Australian workers — to enforce exploitation, to smash

down with force and violence (gangs, fines, the army, the police) the opposition of the workingclass — to smash down with force and violence the opposition of the people to its war plans and those of U.S. imperialism.

Experience shows that as the crisis of capitalism develops — as the capitalists are confronted with greater and greater difficulties they resort more and more to force and violence. Force and violence are not merely the firing of guns but the whole coercive apparatus of the State ultimately backed by the firing of the guns.

The Menzies government participates in actual unjust wars; it prepares to participate in more unjust wars. Its state apparatus is conditioned to that. Its enormous expenditure on arms (now far in excess of £200,000,000 a year) is aimed at internal and external repression. It is a classic example of the correctness of all Lenin's teachings on imperialism and just and unjust wars.

The Menzies government wages war on behalf of the monopoly capitalists and at the behest of U.S. imperialism to safeguard the system of exploitation. Lenin taught us to ask the question — in whose interests is the war being waged: in every case the Menzies government wages war, and prepares for new wars, in the interests of the monopoly capitalists, the very people who exploit the workingclass.

Lenin taught us to ask the question in whose interests is it to resist such wars and we answer without hesitation: in the interests of the working people. It is to their interests to strike from the hands of the U.S. imperialists, from the Menzies government the weapons of aggressive war.

Only a strict scientific workingclass approach can determine this question. Any failure to identify the enemy of peace — U.S. imperialism, and the Menzies Government, on behalf of Australian imperialism, can only confuse the workingclass.

The Menzies government — headed by Menzies, self-confessed admirer of Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito — signed the Tripartite Pact legalising nuclear weapon testing. The Menzies government never in history has signed a progressive pact. Has it suddenly changed its character: has the leopard changed its spots? Despite all the hullaballoo about it, the Menzies government signed yet another reactionary pact when it signed the Tripartite Pact.

It did so to delude the people that it was taking a step for peace when all the time it was intensifying its war plans. Instead of supporting the Chinese government's proposal of July 31, 1963, for a conference of heads of governments to arrange the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and destruction of the existing stockpiles, it along with the A.L.P. leaders, the revisionist leaders, certain leaders of peace bodies isolates out the French tests and thus allows U.S. imperialism to go ahead with perfecting its nuclear armoury.

Peace and war: the nature of the state: these are critical questions today — questions which the modern revisionists headed in Australia by Aarons, Dixon and Sharkey, would confuse at the very moment when above all absolute crystal clarity is demanded. Vital questions of our day indeed!

PEACE IS NOT INEVITABLE

Peace must be fought for every inch of the way — peace while imperialism lasts is not inevitable. Imperialism engenders war: war is a constant feature of imperialism. World war can be prevented if the socialist camp is united, the national liberation struggle is prosecuted and the workingclass in the capitalist countries is increasingly vigilant.

The forces for peace are superior to the forces for war. Unfortunately the disruption imposed on the socialist camp and the world Communist movement by the Soviet Party leaders is a source of weakness: it is in the interests of U.S. imperialism but the great Soviet people and the people of other socialist countries will not tolerate this disruption. We hail with great joy the discussions between the Communist Parties of China and Rumania.

Repression of national liberation, attempted destruction of national sovereignty is inevitable while imperialism lasts. Resistance by the peoples of given countries is inevitable: it contributes to world peace.

So the Australian people must wage ever more vigorous struggles against the imperialist war plans, must identify U.S. imperialism as the main enemy and its agent the Menzies government — supported in all essential respects by the A.L.P. leaders.

Only the most vigorous campaigning and the widest united front of all people opposed to the plans of U.S. imperialism and the Menzies government can guard the peace. Failure to identify the enemy, failure to unite against the enemy makes for spurious peace activity and enables the enemy of peace to adopt the very slogans and tactics of peace and under cover of that to prosecute aggressive war plans.

The activity of the revisionist-led peace bodies actually assist the enemies of peace — they put up general slogans of peace not directed against anyone and that is the very position of the imperialists who claim that their plans are all directed at this peace. Hence the peace bodies become centres of revisionism.

The call for peace of the revisionist Khrushchov merges with the call for peace of the U.S. imperialists. Hence the Tripartite Pact on banning all but underground tests of nuclear weapons is hailed by Khrushchov as a great contribution to peace and also by the U.S. imperialists when it suits them but in fact it legalises the war preparations of U.S. imperialism.

The so-called hot line between Moscow and Washington is hailed as a contribution to peace when it is the very reverse because it tries to confuse the people into believing that wars are accidental and can be stopped by a telephone call, which is the complete denial of the Marxist-Leninist proposition that imperialism is the cause of war.

Likewise the prohibition of outer space for nuclear weapons. So too the Soviet leaders permitted the rape of the Congo, the murder of Lumumba, by participating in the U.N. decision to put troops into the Congo and now have done the same thing in Cyprus.

They have spoken of Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson as men of peace, as reasonable men, as representatives of realistic U.S. circles as against reactionary circles — again a complete denial of the nature of imperialism and the nature of the monopoly capitalist state of which these gentlemen are the direct representatives — it could not be otherwise.

The Aaronsons, Dixons and Sharkeys speak at this very moment of the significant easing of international tension. How can it be said that international tension has eased when the people of South Vietnam are being killed by the U.S. imperialists?

Are not the people of Vietnam international: are they outside the concept "international"? Is Indonesia outside the concept "international" in its rightful opposition to Malaysia which we join? Is Cyprus outside the concept "international" menaced as it is by the U.S. and British imperialists facilitated by the Soviet revisionists?

No this emphasis on significant easing of international tension is designed to help the aggressive war plans of the imperialists. Yes, said the revisionist newspaper Guardian, there was no need to hold the Federal elections when they were held (twelve months before the due time) because there had been a significant relaxation of international tension and the Marxist-Leninist newspaper Vanguard said that precisely because international tension had not eased and was about to be intensified the Federal elections were held early. Who was correct? — the revisionists or the Marxist-Leninists?

We repeat, the Australian people must fight might and main to defend the peace against its violators the U.S. imperialists, the Menzies Government and the A.L.P. leaders facilitated by the revisionists Aarons, Sharkey and Dixon.

That demands stepping up the campaign in support of the people of Vietnam, against the rape of Cyprus and the Congo, against the imperialist Malaysia, against the U.S. bases in Australia, for the complete destruction and prohibition of all nuclear weapons.

On The Tasks Of The Communist Party (M-L)

IN March, 1964, the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) took up the banner of Marxism-Leninism from where it had been dropped by the present-day Australian revisionists.

Its formation guarantees Marxist-Leninist leadership to the workingclass.

Before the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) are immense tasks. Those tasks will be performed because Marxism-Leninism is all powerful — it is true.

But the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) will not be successful merely because of its formal creation. It must be a Marxist-Leninist Party strictly adhering to Marxism-Leninism and aware of the danger to it from the right and left and, indeed, from all alien trends.

It can only develop and lead the workingclass by unflinching adherence to Marxism-Leninism. Those admitted to its ranks must steadily strengthen their knowledge of Marxism-Leninism.

In the first place, they must individually study the classics of Marxism-Leninism. There is no substitute for the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-Tung—no substitute at all.

Regrettably the heritage from the revisionists is an ignorance of the basic — even elementary — truths of Marxism-Leninism. Political economy — the very foundation of an understanding of capitalism — has been neglected. But Marx put forward scientific political economy very well in Value, Price and Profit and Wage, Labour and Capital — each a small pamphlet readily available.

To those who initially find it difficult to read Marx and Engels, Lenin offered some very good advice. He said — do not be put off by difficulties — read them through quickly — even skip over the difficulties — then return to read again. On a second or third or fourth reading, what was not clear originally becomes clear.

Test your reading by practice.

Test Marx's statement that profit is made by selling at value by your own knowledge of capitalist society, by your own experience of exploitation.

The simple truth that profit is made by selling at value opens the whole apparent mystery of capitalist exploitation yet it is safe to say that the revisionists have deliberately refrained from developing knowledge about it.

Hence our members must master Marxist-Leninist political economy and turn from these pamphlets to Marx's Capital.

Of course, it all takes time — work — but it is vital to the workingclass. There are those to whom one can turn for assistance — there are adjuncts such as discussion groups but there is no substitute for one's own reading and study.

An invaluable statement, too, is that of Lenin in his essay on Karl Marx where the whole range of Marx's views are covered in summary form.

Marx and Engels in 1848 wrote the Communist Manifesto, a brilliant and easily read statement of the whole of Communism.

Today, works like Lenin's "State and Revolution" and "Imperialism" stand out in their importance. If our members equip themselves with the basic principles in these works they will independently, critically, find their way through the mass of contemporary material and be able to approach all points of view, indeed all learning, from a firm Marxist-Leninist standpoint.

It is a commentary on revisionism that at this advanced stage of the revolutionary movement, attention must be called again to these basic works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The modern revisionists here in Australia, as elsewhere, have almost buried them.

Struggle Against Past Errors

In fighting to strengthen the Party, we will not forget Lenin's and Stalin's great work on the principles of the Marxist-Leninist Party — "What is to be Done", "One Step Forward", "Two Tactics of Social Democracy" and Stalin's brilliant summary in Chapter VIII of the "Foundations of Leninism" nor Liu Shao Chi's works "On the Party" and "How to be a good Communist".

It would be naive to believe that the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) will automatically free itself, or its members free themselves, from the bad influences of the past. The past was characterised by political degeneration and departure from Marxism-Leninism. The past was characterised by groups around this or that person, by intrigue, by personal gossip and slander.

All that requires recognition, and a determination never to let it rise again, or if it does to deal with it firmly. It must be recognised that it is an eternal danger imposed on us by the past and by the conditions of capitalism. It is nothing to be alarmed about but it must be recognised as a fact to be dealt with.

Firm adherence to Leninist principles of organisation offers the solution.

Time was when criticism and self-criticism were suppressed or distorted but now it is open to develop criticism and self-criticism, modesty, and all the qualities that go to make up good Communists.

Time was when there was excessive struggle. The revisionists gave a classic example of it in the Communist Party of Australia — intriguing, factionalising, gossiping, slandering.

It was one of the factors resulting in the destruction of their party because it is part of all that is alien to Marxism-Leninism.

A Communist Party does not develop without struggle — there are always correct views expressed, partially correct views, partially incorrect views, wholly incorrect views. It is the resolution of the differences in accordance with Marxism-Leninism that results in the correct integration of Marxism-Leninism with Australian reality.

No one person can pronounce correctly on all questions. Only a full functioning of democratic centralism can ensure that the Central Committee collectively reaches the correct conclusion on the major policy issues, or in the case of a branch, only the full functioning of the branch can ensure that the branch collectively reaches a correct decision.

Those who put themselves forward individually, or are accepted by a separate group within the Party, as being an individual leader have no place in a Marxist-Leninist organisation.

On the other hand, individual views will be put forward in the given organ of the Party with every encouragement so that they assist in the collective decision. The atmosphere for full, frank and free discussion of Marxism-Leninism and its integration with Australian reality must be developed.

Firm Discipline Essential

Discipline in the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) is iron because it is conscious adherence to the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism integrated with Australian reality.

It demands the full development of the individual's Marxist-Leninist knowledge and the subordination of his personal interests or sphere of influence to the whole Party. Little kings arose all over the Communist Party of Australia each with his own sphere of influence and his followers. So you will find some proclaim Sharkey king, others Dixon, others Aarons, some Hughes, and within the States a similar process goes on.

The fate of their followers hangs on the fate of the "leader". There is no unity; there is no solidarity; each is suspicious of the other; each is quite happy about the discomfiture of another. Such an atmosphere breeds disaster.

Such an atmosphere, amongst other things, creates favourable conditions for secret police penetration: secret police agents fasten themselves on to this or that group. Hence we must learn too from the past. Marxism-Leninism does not allow this sort of thing; it is totally alien to Marxism-Leninism.

There will be expressions of leftism in our ranks and there will be expressions of rightism. Each reflects the conditions in capitalism. Again there is nothing to be afraid of: it is necessary to recognise it. These things will be resolved if there is a high quality Marxist-Leninist standard throughout the Party.

The Communist Party of Australia was characterised by incorrect relations between the leadership and the membership — authoritarianism and a real denial of democracy both in the leading organs and amongst the rank and file.

The atmosphere arose where it was impossible or very difficult to express a view in conflict with that of the leadership even when that leadership had obviously become revisionist.

The classical illustration of this was the organisation for the Victorian State Conference in 1963 when the Central Committee leaders demanded (and proudly said they made no apology for it) that only people be admitted who adhere to their revisionism.

It was the logical outcome of revisionism.

Today these people prohibit or prevent their members even from reading Marxist-Leninist literature. The relations we must strive for in the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) are those of equality, democracy, discussion in accordance with Marxism-Leninism, where there are no superiors and inferiors, but a recognition that there are more experienced and less experienced, more talented and less talented, that the leadership is composed of the most authoritative and experienced.

No relations of hostility and suspicion can develop in a Communist Party properly organised according to Marxism-Leninism. It has been said that the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) will simply carry over all the evils of the past and that its formation is premature. Yes, that would be true if things simply went on as before.

But no Marxist-Leninist ever believed that. Eternal struggle is the only absolute of Marxism-Leninism. An eternal struggle against capitalism, against the past and positively for Marxism-Leninism and a Marxist-Leninist organisation is what is expected and required.

The Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) is not premature because without it there is no Marxist-Leninist Party in Australia, and a working-class without a Marxist-Leninist Party is a working-class without leadership.

The times urgently demand a complete break from revisionism — politically, ideologically and organisationally. Moreover, absence of a Marxist-Leninist Party leaves the field to the revisionists who masquerade under the name of Communists and assists the deception of the workingclass.

Again, the severe reverses suffered by the revisionists in Australia (as internationally) imperatively demand the existence of an Australian Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

The struggle against revisionism (and its father and mother imperialism) has progressed at an enormous speed historically — quicker than many expected — again a tribute to the all conquering truth of Marxism-Leninism.

Internationally the struggle against revisionism has reached a decisive stage: the forces for Marxism-Leninism must close their ranks to deal the death blow to it.

The membership of the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) is a membership of quality and it must always be so. Its smallness of size is no criterion of its strength. Its small numbers have strong mass connections: they will be strengthened. Its members already have a proud record of mass struggle — it will be even prouder. We do not demand that only finished Marxist-Leninists join our ranks: on that basis we would have no members. But we do demand a definite minimum of knowledge and a definite determination to master Marxism-Leninism.

Unlike the old Party we will not admit any person just because he is prepared to sign a form.

We unashamedly ask those many who support us but who are not prepared to fulfil our standards, not to try to join but to remain as our staunch non-Party friends and sympathisers. They will be welcomed.

The revisionists already sneer that this one or that one is not fit to belong to the new Party. Let them sneer. We will certainly exclude revisionists for they have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

Now we must work hard to clarify for the working class all the main principles of Marxism-Leninism — matters so shamefully confused by the revisionists. Fearlessly, we must explain the nature of revisionism and its historical place, the nature of the A.L.P., the united front, political economy and imperialism, the nature of the Australian State, dialectical materialism and fearlessly we must strive to integrate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with Australian reality.

Our Party programme is in course of publication: it stands in striking contrast to the revisionist documents. Our Party and the workingclass will give that programme body and soul, flesh and blood. Together we have taken a decisive step. Let us go forward in the great and glorious struggle for a socialist Australia.

In Memory of K. C. Miller, A Great Marxist-Leninist

By E. F. HILL

APRIL 2, 1964, marks the anniversary of the birth of the late Kenneth Craig Miller, one of Australia's outstanding Communists — a giant who towered over the pygmies who claim to be Communists and who in his lifetime slandered him.

At the recent conference of the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) many present paid tribute to the life and work of this outstanding man. In my concluding remarks, I said:

"Comrade Miller made an outstanding contribution to Marxism-Leninism throughout Australia and was an outstanding human being. He was outstanding in his capacity to master Marxism-Leninism, to read all of the contributions to learning of all of the world's great thinkers (not confined to Marxism-Leninism), and to assess them from a Marxist-Leninist point of view.

"In that regard, he was a real teacher to all of us. He was able, by the strength of his Marxism-Leninism to assess all forms of knowledge.

"He was an extremely well-informed person of outstanding all-round knowledge as all the great Marxist-Leninists were.

"Comrade Miller's contributions live in this conference. We have all seen it live. It will never be forgotten.

"When the founding of our party is spoken of in the future, everyone will know of the contribution he made and his name will be associated with it. There are comrades here who received their initial introduction to Marxism-Leninism through Comrade Miller's example and were assisted in their formative stages through his work, his guidance and patience and every other virtue that he had.

"Comrade Miller was a great comrade in arms in the struggle against revisionism on the Central Committee and State Committee and in every walk of life. We at this Conference should understand the immense contribution he made. Next month marks the anniversary of his birth and we will, I think, take it as a direction from this conference that this anniversary should be properly marked in the Australian Communist.

"This man of outstanding character and outstanding contribution is one who will always be with us and while we grieve at his death we rejoice in the contribution he made."

This does little enough justice to his life and work. In these days, when it is necessary to reassess so many questions Kenneth Craig Miller's independent mastery of Marxism-Leninism already helped to set us on the correct path. His assessment of the national liberation struggle in New Guinea is on record. Many

of his writings are in existence. His pamphlet on political economy written many years ago is a splendid contrast to the rubbish written by E. Aarons on the same subject. His contributions to the Guardian were always Marxist-Leninist. Under his leadership, the Guardian was acknowledged internationally and nationally, as by far the best Communist newspaper in Australia.

How low it has sunk from this day can be seen now, when every issue is a potpourri of comment on affairs of little basic interest to the workingclass or, where they are of basic interest to the workingclass, are treated in the most superficial and vulgar way.

Under the leadership of the present-day revisionists the Guardian has sunk to the level of a poor commentary on a few happenings in capitalist society. It is a travesty of the paper which K. C. Miller inspired.

Take for instance its recent eulogy of the late J. V. Stout. For our part we worked with and enjoyed the friendship of Mr. Stout, but that did not blind us to the vast gulf that separated us politically — a gulf which K. C. Miller never failed to see nor to point out so that the workingclass would understand the difference between reformism (for which Mr. Stout stood) and scientific socialism, for which K. C. Miller stood.

Yet the Guardian editorially and through the mouths of the revisionists Gibson and Brown painted Mr. Stout as a great socialist, and failed in any way to draw any line between socialist revolution and reformism. Such a thing could not have happened under the leadership of the strong Marxist-Leninist K. C. Miller.

On all the main questions of our time the Guardian—once so powerful — follows the line of revisionism introducing confusion and hesitation into the ranks of the workingclass. It fails to point to U.S. imperialism as the main enemy of peace. Instead it speaks of "significant relaxation of international tension".

It fails to point to the reformist character of the A.L.P. — its heroes are the reformist leaders of the A.L.P. It fails to deal with the need for socialism nor to draw the socialist lessons from all people's struggle. It has become a farrago of superficial nonsense.

But now the spirit of K. C. Miller's work is carried on in Vanguard which attempts to deal with all current questions fundamentally — to draw the socialist lessons — to show the socialist lessons in all people's struggles — to draw the line and demonstrate the difference between reformism and Marxism-Leninism.

K. C. Miller's life and work will be honoured by upholding Marxism-Leninism. As he put it himself, we Australian Marxist-Leninists — since his death organised in the Communist Party of Australia (M.L.) — inherit all that is best in the Australian communist movement. Part of that inheritance is the life and work of K. C. Miller.

Culture is a Class Weapon

In the armoury of reaction the weapons are many and varied, Not the least deadly is the use of cultural forms designed to paralyse the will of the intended victim, and obscure the face and the intention of the aggressor.

Propaganda in its crude forms may be more readily detected, but ideas of class collaboration sometimes penetrate under the cloak of "culture".

In many cases bourgeois art presents ideas with technical skill, and emotional and artistic appeal. In order to reject its corrupting influence it is necessary to be armed with the understanding that culture is a class weapon, and to be able to detect what class interests it serves.

The bourgeois state with all its organs of repression is clothed in the garments of "above class" deception — so, too, is bourgeois culture presented as transcending class interests.

This deception is exposed in "Problems of Art and Literature". Here Mao Tse Tung wrote, "all culture or present day literature and art belong to a certain class, to a certain party or a certain political line. There is no such thing as art for art's sake, or literature and art that lie above class distinctions or above partisan interests".

The function of all art which truly serves the people is to stimulate and inspire them to action, to engender courage and resolution, to unify and organise. Again Mao Tse Tung says: "The creative forms of literature and art supersede nature in that they are more systematic, more concise, more typical, more idealised, and therefore more universal."

Bourgeois decadent culture not only cannot perform the above functions but is also deliberately aimed at creating confusion, passivity and hopelessness.

An article entitled, "An Example of Modern Revisionism in Art", by noted critic Chang Kuang-Nien, and printed in abridged form in Peking Review, Dec. 13th, 1963, is a powerful exposure of revisionist influence in this field, and points to the need for vigilance to be able to reject anti-workingclass ideas, no matter how cunningly they are presented.

Poison of Revisionist Humanism

It is easier to reject the filthy concoction of violence and racialism, mystery and horror, served up in the American comic than the sugar coated pill of revisionist "humanism" — but both are poison. The bourgeoisie have always tried to inculcate the idea of universal love — "all men are brothers".

What of the fratricide of the imperialists, neo colonialists and racialists? There can be no such thing as universal love in class society.

The revisionists are quick to rush in and exploit this theme of abstract universal love. In the women's movement they play on the emotions of mother love, and try to make it a solvent for class struggle.

Madame Cotton, President of the Women's International Democratic Federation, writing in its journal, "Women of the Whole World", states, "the deep aspirations of man are the same everywhere".

Are the aspirations of the exploiter and exploited identical? The Madame Cottons would have the exploited believe so!

A feature of decadent art and literature is its alienation from life. This is not only an indication of its degeneracy, it also has the deliberate intention of creating an intellectual "elite" who move in a charmed circle, breathing air too rarified for the common man. Honest criticism of this so called "cultural" hocus-pocus is dismissed as Philistinism.

The publishers of "Arena" have in mind the fostering of just such an "elite". The editorial of No. 2 of this journal says, "as a Marxist intellectual journal Arena was something of a novelty".

We couldn't agree more!

It also states, "it is our object to give expression to different trends of Marxist opinion".

In fact the peddling of petty bourgeois diversions under the name of Marxism is no novelty, and furthermore its obvious object is to give expression to different trends of revisionist and reformist opinion.

Its editorial board believes that in left intellectual and university circles the response to Arena is positive. But in fact Arena is not only un-Marxist but pompous and dull; its "appeal" is confined exclusively to the mutual-admiration society of windbags responsible for its publication.

The development of the critical faculty which enables the reader, hearer or viewer to assess correctly the class character of an artistic creation is only the first step to countering reaction in this sphere.

Many fine writers and artists have put their talents to the service of the working class. Those who have degenerated politically, to embrace revisionism, will inevitably degenerate culturally. Out of the struggle to combat revisionism there will emerge new writers and artists of the workingclass who will truly use their abilities to inspire and organise the Australian workingclass through the media of cultural forms.

J. Nolan's Speech to Queensland State Committee (CPA); Feb. 23

OVER the recent period the ideological differences within the international Communist movement have become a public issue.

These differences are basic.

They effect the essence of Marxism-Leninism.

Such differences are the cause of great concern to all here who desire to uphold the purity of our proletarian science.

To ignore the differences now — to fail to attempt in an objective way to study both viewpoints — to make decisions on the basis of a one-sided or limited knowledge of both viewpoints — this would indeed be to act the role of the ostrich.

As I understand this problem, the differences are presented — on the one hand —

As a struggle against dogmatism — against left sectarianism.

This erroneous line, it is claimed, finds its main base in the stand taken by the Chinese Communist Party.

If applied locally to Australian conditions such a general line would lead to the isolation and virtual destruction of the peace movement and lead to the Party's isolation from the masses with all its resulting perils.

This dogmatic, left sectarian line, it is claimed, fails to evaluate correctly the changed historical conditions — the strength of the socialist camp — the power of the united forces for peace — it would lead to a nuclear war.

This, I believe, is the general viewpoint put forward by N. S. Khrushchov.

What then is the other viewpoint?

That modern revisionism, first emanating in its modern international form from the renegade Tito clique, is the main danger, and is in fact now showing expression in some forms in the stand of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. headed by N. S. Khrushchov.

The stand taken by the majority of our central committee, and unanimously by this Queensland State Committee has been in practice one of opposition to the line that modern revisionism is now the main danger.

It has, I believe, been one of general support for the line of Khrushchov despite some protests that we march along a road of our own.

As a member of the Queensland State Committee I have supported — and have contributed to this stand.

On the basis of my personal study of the problem I now believe this viewpoint to be incorrect.

I am mindful of the fact that the leading comrades of this committee, and our central committee in many ways have a greater intellectual capacity for the development and application of Marxism-Leninism.

However, with due modesty in this regard, it is my opinion — now — that this committee has erred in its decisions on the ideological differences.

It is my opinion — now — that this committee made these decisions based on one-sided information and confusion of the two viewpoints.

This confusion and one-sidedness has prevented us for a time from making an objective appraisal of the ideological differences.

Previously I firmly believed that the Chinese party was indeed taking a dogmatic left sectarian line.

I was guided in my opinion — in the main — by reports from leading comrades who had participated in recent international gatherings, and by quotations and extracts from Chinese publications, and reported statements of Chinese leaders.

Summarising what I, and indeed all party members are given to understand, is this:

- (1) **The Chinese party and those who stand with them have rejected the Leninist position of struggling for peaceful co-existence.**
- (2) **The Chinese party and those who stand with them want, or at least pursue, a policy that would involve the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union in war. Further they want a nuclear war . . . in particular they wanted one over Cuba.**
- (3) **The Chinese party and those who stand with them have made a public issue of the ideological differences — interfered in the affairs of fraternal parties — are splitting the Communist movement.**

I could name more points such as Test Ban Treaty, chauvinism, etc., but my contributing time is limited.

I could only assume on the basis of the information previously at my disposal that the leading Chinese comrades had gone **collectively insane!**

Indeed, how could one explain such rabid leftism, after their heroic inner-party struggle against three left lines — three left lines that resulted in tragic losses not only politically but in the flesh of their peoples.

Was it not the leadership of this party that cut their political teeth and were steeled in struggle against leftism.

This is the same leadership that brilliantly overcame three left lines — and a right deviation, to integrate Marxism-Leninism with the concrete conditions of China.

As a result the Chinese masses were able to throw off the yoke of oppression.

Indeed, they have either gone politically insane or are being misrepresented!

It was on this basis that I began to study more carefully the statements of Khrushchov.

It was on this basis that I began to carefully study the Chinese viewpoint (and not just quotes) on the issue.

I have been astounded at the distortion of the declared Chinese position.

Not to my credit, I have — on the basis of one-sided knowledge of the Chinese position — contributed to the confusion that exists within the party branches on this issue.

It is one thing to object to the views of a fraternal party.

It is another thing to one-sidedly present those views.

Let us look at the position of the Cuban crisis!

What was our information?

What were we told?

China wanted a war over Cuba. China wanted a policy of blow for blow . . . bomb for bomb . . .

That was all — nothing else.

Kennedy said so — Khrushchov said so — everybody said so.

In effect — they were nuclear bomb happy!

We must all agree that the best authority on the Chinese viewpoint is the Chinese.

Then listen to this . . .

This is what the People's Daily (official organ of the Chinese party) has to say on the bomb and on Cuba.

I quote . . .

"We have always maintained that socialist countries must not use nuclear weapons to support the people's wars of national liberation and revolutionary civil wars and have no need to do so.

"We have always maintained that the socialist countries must achieve and maintain nuclear superiority. Only this can prevent the imperialists from launching a nuclear war and help bring about the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

"We consistently hold that in the hands of a socialist country, nuclear weapons must always be defensive weapons for resisting imperialist nuclear threats. A socialist country absolutely must not be the first to use nuclear weapons, nor should it in any circumstances play with them or engage in nuclear blackmail and nuclear gambling.

"We are opposed both to the wrong practice on the part of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. of withholding support from the revolutionary struggles of the peoples and to their wrong approach to

nuclear weapons. Instead of examining their own errors, they accuse us of hoping for a 'head-on clash' between the Soviet Union and the United States and trying to push them into nuclear war.

"Our answer is: No, friends. You had better cut out your sensation-mongering calumny. The Chinese Communist Party is firmly opposed to a 'head-on clash' between the Soviet Union and the United States, and not in words only.

"In deeds, too, it has worked hard to avert direct armed conflict between them. Examples of this are the Korean War against U.S. aggression in which we fought side by side with the Korean comrades, and our struggle against the United States in the Taiwan Straits.

"We ourselves preferred to shoulder the heavy sacrifices necessary and stood in the first line of defence of the socialist camp so that the Soviet Union might stay in the second line. Have the leaders of the C.P.S.U. any sense of proletarian morality when they concoct such lies?

"In fact, it is not we but the leaders of the C.P.S.U. who have frequently boasted that they would use nuclear weapons to help the anti-imperialist struggle of one country or another.

"As everyone knows, the oppressed peoples and nations have no nuclear weapons and they cannot use them to make revolutions nor is there any need for them to do so. The leaders of the C.P.S.U. admit that there is often no clear battle line between the two sides in national liberation wars and civil wars, and therefore the use of nuclear weapons is out of the question. We should then like to ask the leaders of the C.P.S.U.: What need is there for a socialist country to support the peoples' revolutionary struggles by nuclear weapons?

"We should also like to ask them: How would a socialist country use nuclear weapons to support the revolutionary struggle of oppressed people or nations? Would it use nuclear weapons in an area where a war of national liberation or a revolutionary civil war was in progress, thereby subjecting both the revolutionary people and the imperialists to a nuclear strike? Or would it be the first to use nuclear weapons against an imperialist country which was waging a conventional war of aggression elsewhere? Obviously, in either case it is absolutely impermissible for a socialist country to use nuclear weapons.

"The fact is that when the leaders of the C.P.S.U. brandish their nuclear weapons, it is not really to support the people's anti-imperialist struggles.

"Sometimes, in order to gain cheap prestige, they just publish empty statements which they never intend to honour.

"At other times, during the Carribbean crisis, for instance, they engage in speculative, opportunistic and irresponsible nuclear gambling for ulterior motives.

"As soon as their nuclear blackmail is seen through and is countered in kind, they retreat one step after another, switch from adventurism to capitulationism and lose all by their nuclear gambling.

"We wish to point out that the great Soviet people and Red Army have been and remain a great force safeguarding world peace. But Khrushchov's military ideas based on nuclear fetishism and nuclear blackmail are entirely wrong. Khrushchov sees only nuclear weapons."

I agree with this viewpoint.

I was shocked to read it.

I was shocked because only one aspect of the Chinese position was made known to me and then in a one-sided way.

No mention was made of adventurism.

In the last few days I selected 10 comrades. I asked them what they understood of China and Cuba. Their answer — almost exactly — China wanted a nuclear war.

This is slander, nothing less . . .

Take the policy of tit for tat.

Exaggerations and a one-sided appraisal has been made of this. What does tit for tat mean?

Does it mean as some would tell us that without regard for any consequences — without regard for who will be victorious — without regard for concrete conditions, we engage in any specific full-scale battle with the class enemy.

I know a Chinese comrade who fought in the Liberation Army. He told me the Chinese Army were champion runners — he told me they gained this skill in running from the enemy.

Not running because of cowardice comrades. They ran in order not to clash with a superior force or to meet the enemy on their terms.

I think this is even tit for tat, for don't forget they often ran back and annihilated a section of that army on their own terms.

Comrade Mao Tse Tung said: "How to give 'tit for tat' depends on the situation. Sometimes not going to negotiations is tit for tat, and sometimes going to negotiations is also tit for tat . . . if they start fighting we fight back, fight to win peace . . . peace will not come unless we strike hard blows at the reactionaries who dare to attack the liberated areas."

Is this dogmatism? Is this left-sectarianism?

Is this a rejection of the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence?

We co-exist with imperialism on the basis of our strength — nothing else.

We hold back the forces of war on the basis of our strength — nothing else.

What does Khrushchov have to say on this? I quote:

"It should be borne in mind, however, that naturally the President and I could not at one sitting clear away all the accretions of the 'cold war' that have piled up in the course of many years. It will take time to sweep away that rubbish and not only to sweep away, but to grind it to dust. Certain things that divide us are still too fresh. It is sometimes difficult for some leaders to discard old positions, old views, old definitions.

"But I can tell you in all frankness, dear comrades, that as a result of my talks and discussions of concrete questions with the U.S. President I have gained the impression that he sincerely wishes to see the end of the 'cold war', to create normal relations between our countries, to help to improve relations among all countries. Peace today is indivisible, it cannot be secured by the efforts of two or three countries alone. Hence it is necessary that all nations, all states participate in the fight for peace."

I take it we will all unite against war.

This is indeed a new contradiction.

It reminds me of a favourite saying of the late American comedian, Lou Costello . . . "That's a big . . . big lie".

Is this the Leninist concept of peaceful co-existence? Is this how we unite to hold the peace?

An American imperialist state will never participate in the fight for peace . . . never!

Imperialists are warmongers. Today American imperialism is the greatest warmonger.

We hold the peace as I understand it by the unity of all those forces opposed to the warmongers?

Again, on Khrushchov — I quote:

"I would like to tell you, dear comrades, that I have no doubt that the President is prepared to exert his efforts and his will to bring about agreement between our countries, to create friendly relations between our peoples and settle pressing problems in the interests of a durable peace.

"At the same time, it is my impression that there are forces in America which are not operating in the same direction as the President. These forces stand for continuing the 'cold war' and the arms race. Whether these forces are great or small, influential or influential, whether the forces backing the President — and

he has the support of the absolute majority of the American people — can win, are questions I would not be too hasty to answer."

Am I correct in assuming that he proposed that the leading cadre of imperialism wants or wanted peace?

Similar things have been said of Kennedy. There is a lot of talk these days of not seeing the imperialists as one block — of seeing the differences. I agree there are differences in their camp.

But let's look at how Khrushchov sees the problem.

He keeps talking of "men of reason". Meaning people who accept co-existence.

If we are to assume that a Kennedy or Eisenhower and others are "men of reason", men who will "exert" themselves "to create friendly relations between our peoples" . . . if they are indeed representative of a peace group within American imperialism, does it not follow that this group can become dominant . . . what then?

In other words for a time — long or short — a day or a night — even a second, imperialism will lose its warlike content — because this imperialist peace group, "men of reason" imperialists who "exert" themselves "to create friendly relations between our peoples" led by a Kennedy or a Eisenhower become a dominant force.

What rubbish!!

But this is a fair and reasonable conclusion to the views expressed by Khrushchov.

Is this the Leninist concept of peaceful co-existence? This is revisionism.

I have great respect for all comrades here!

I don't believe we are revisionists.

I do believe we have made a mistake.

I know that eventually this mistake will be corrected.

We have all been recently re-studying Left Wing Communism. Lenin is brilliant.

No communist would disagree with his analysis of this problem. But comrades, if we study Lenin in the present way — that is in relation to a one-sided appraisal of the Chinese viewpoint then we do great harm to Lenin's cause.

HERE IS AN EXAMPLE:

If we study Left Wing Communism and relate it to a distorted view of the meaning of the terms "paper tiger" then we harm Marxism.

Why do some leading comrades now fail to mention aspects of strategy and tactics stressed by Mao in his definition of a paper tiger.

Have we all forgotten that he stressed to both slight, and take note of the imperialists.

Comrades, who interferes in the affairs of fraternal parties?

Who is responsible for making inner party problems a public issue?

Who stands for disunity?

Practice has proven that it is N. S. Khrushchov and those on the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. who follow him.

We all here know that it was N. S. Khrushchov at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. who publicly attacked the Albanian Party and Government.

We all here know that it was Chou En Lai, the leader of the Chinese Party to the 22nd Congress who cautioned Khrushchov for raising the problem publicly.

How did Khrushchov react to this?

In his reply to discussion Khrushchov rejected the Chinese leader's caution.

He again attacked the Albanian Party leaders.

Here is something of what he said. I quote:

"Those who today stand for friendship with the Soviet Union, with the C.P.S.U., are regarded as enemies by the Albanian leaders.

"How can all this be reconciled with the pledges and assurances given by Shehu and Hoxha about friendly sentiments for the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union? It is evident that all their prattling about friendship is only hypocrisy and deceit.

"That is the situation prevailing in the Albanian Party of Labour; that is why the Albanian leaders are opposing the Leninist course of the 20th Congress of the Party. For to end the personality cult would virtually mean for Shehu, Hoxha and others to resign their leading positions in the Party and the State. This they do not want to do. But we are confident that the time will come when the Albanian communists and the Albanian people will have their say and the Albanian leaders will then be held responsible for the damage they have inflicted on their country, their people and the cause of building socialism in Albania."

Is this not interference?

It is more, it is a call to counter revolution.

How much more politely he handles the Tito clique whose hands are stained with the blood of Hungarian communists.

It is Khrushchov and those that follow him who are the real splitters.

His road is the road of revision.

To fight against this line is to fight for real unity — for Marxism-Leninism.

In conclusion, I formally move this resolution.

"This meeting of the Queensland State Committee of the Communist Party of Australia request the Central Committee to again reconsider its stand in relation to the ideological differences in the communist movement.

"We call upon the Central Committee to facilitate the distribution of all relevant material pertaining to the present dispute.

"In particular we request the C.C. to ensure the viewpoint of the Chinese Communist Party, as expressed in their numerous publications and booklets is made available along with the views of Khrushchov. Communists should be encouraged to read both viewpoints.

"We call upon the Central Committee to instruct all delegates to the forthcoming State Conference and the National Congress to study both viewpoints so that the decisions of Conferences and Congress will be genuinely based on their thorough knowledge of the issues."

Sharkey, Dixon, Aarons Are The Real Splitters

THE Communist Review of March, 1964, contains some extracts from a Report to C.C. Meeting by L. L. Sharkey headed—"Unity Against Dogmatism".

As Mr. Sharkey is nominally still the leader of the Communist Party of Australia it is necessary to look at what he has to say.

The article falls mainly under three headings—An attempt to analyse the tactics of the ruling class in the last Federal elections—with a grovelling apology to the Labor Party for its failure to win—a diatribe against the "Hill group" and "Dogmatists", and of course, as we have now come to expect when hearing from Mr. Sharkey, the usual tirade against the Chinese Communist Party.

Let us deal with the last-mentioned first. Mr. Sharkey tells us that his main points of disagreement with the Communist Party of China are as follows:

1. Their erroneous attitude to the socialist countries. They assert that each socialist country should go it alone instead of promoting a socialist division of labour among themselves, as is the case with the European Socialist countries.
2. The personality cult flourishes.
3. They assert the main force of contemporary development is not the socialist camp, not the working class, but the national revolutionary movement of the peoples exploited and oppressed by imperialism.
4. They believe the H-bomb is a paper tiger. Just like that! No explanation. No documentation. Just bold assertion. Members of the Communist Party and the Australian working class are supposed to accept without question that (1) This is a correct presentation of C.P.C. views, and (2) That it is the main basis for disagreement.

Any serious student of political affairs can and should obtain the Chinese publications for themselves. Just as soon as they do this, it becomes exceedingly clear that the real basis of Mr. Sharkey's disagreement with the Communist Party of China, and well he knows it, rages around the fundamental propositions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin about the correct road the working class must take to successfully achieve Socialism.

Certainly, he disagrees with the Communist Party of China on those points he singles out. But that flows from his disagreement on the fundamental questions of the revolutionary struggle.

It flows from his disagreement with the fundamental propositions put forward by Lenin in "State & Revolution". Does the road to socialism lie through the Parliamentary machine of the ruling class or must the working class smash the old bourgeois State machine and create a new working class State?

Marx, Engels and Lenin are clear and unequivocal on the subject. . . . the state is an organ of class rule, an organ for the oppression of one class by another. . . . (Lenin, *State & Revolution*, p. 9, Vol. 7, Selected Works, L. & W. ed.). "Revolution alone can 'put an end' to the bourgeois state" (Lenin, S. & R., p. 18, Vol. 7, Selected Works, L. & W. ed.). "A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Lenin, S. & R., p. 33, Vol. 7, Selected Works, L. & W. ed.).

Parliamentary Majorities

What is the attitude of the leadership of the Communist Party of Australia to these vital propositions? One gets a little enlightenment from an article by R. Dixon, Chairman of C.P.A., in the same Communist Review.

"Our efforts are directed towards securing a peaceful transition to socialism, but whether this will be possible or not, will, in the final outcome, depend largely on the nature of the resistance offered by monopoly to the revolutionary forces. Whether the transition to socialism is peaceful or non-peaceful, it will come about as a result of revolutionary struggle and will involve the overthrow of the political power of monopoly capital and the establishment of the power of the working class" (C.R., p. 73).

An ambiguous statement if ever there was one.

If he means what Lenin does, why not say so and be done with it? But when you read the whole of Mr. Dixon's article, see what Mr. Sharkey has to say, take into account all the propaganda issued by the Communist Party during the last Federal Elections, and examine the programme of the C.P. of A. it is clear that the ambiguous statement about "overthrow of the political power of monopoly capital and the establishment of the power of the working class" is included merely as a sop to those who still remember the revolutionary principles of Lenin's "State and Revolution", to satisfy those members who want something more than the ever-continuing talk of "directing efforts towards securing a peaceful transition to socialism".

What the Communist Party leadership has in mind is clearly the winning of socialism by Parliamentary majorities. Certainly, nobody in his right mind would choose winning Socialism violently if it could be done peacefully. But Lenin dealt with facts, not wishes.

The working class must be organized on the basis of facts. How does Mr. Dixon envisage organizing the Australian workers? "The majority of the Australian workers are either members or supporters of the Labor Party and these are the forces that must be won to a revolutionary position before socialism can be established here."

Well, that's not bad as far as it goes, but how does Mr. Dixon the "expert" on the problems of unity proceed?

"We are not setting out to destroy the Labor Party, which is the 'Left' sectarian approach." (No one will need do that, Mr. Dixon. When the workers through **correct** leadership and experience reach the position of demanding really revolutionary leadership from a Labor Party which will be unable to provide it, the working class itself will abandon its traditional allegiance to that Labor Party).

But to continue: "Starting from unity in action in the day-to-day struggles of the workers we envisage the development of working class unity on an ever wider scale—a unity that will lead at one stage or another to political unity, to the establishment of one party of the working class based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. For this it is necessary to combat and overcome reformist ideology among the workers, but this is something different from seeing the problem as the destruction of the Labor Party."

Why, Mr. Dixon?

Is the bourgeois character of the Labor Party (admitted to be a fact by you in this very same article) the same thing as the character of this "Marxist-Leninist" Party you speak about?

If you would hasten to deny this, how can you claim that if you fundamentally change the character of this bourgeois party, it would not be destroyed as we know it? But in any case, one only needs to look a little more closely to appreciate the utter absurdity of the whole proposition.

A Marxist-Leninist Party must consist of those who embrace the theory of Marxism—who extend "the acceptance of the class struggle to the dictatorship of the proletariat".

We presume you are including in your membership Mr. Calwell because you always insist on recognition of your estimate that he is not a right-winger, but of the centre. Mr. Sharkey repeats the estimate in his afore-mentioned contribution. L. Aarons follows the same line of reasoning in his article "Marxism and Mr. Calwell", also in the same edition of the C.R.

According to this last masterpiece, the only trouble with Mr. Calwell is that "he has never taken the trouble to study" Marxism. So there shouldn't be any trouble. Enrol Mr. Calwell in E. Aarons' next study group where he can study the "new creative" Marxism and his membership in your new future "Marxist-Leninist" Party is assured.

L. Sharkey tells us Mr. Whitlam may be a right-winger, but Mr. Calwell, ah! that's different. Mr. Calwell only accepts as right the existence of a U.S. base at Exmouth Gulf. Mr. Calwell only seeks to outdo Sir Garfield Barwick in his vilification of Indonesia.

Mr. Calwell only proclaims he stands as one with Menzies on Malaysia—but Mr. Calwell, he's no right-winger. When we've gone up all the steps of this mythical "unity" ladder he's going to be No. 1 recruit for the equally mythical "Marxist-Leninist" Party.

So that all the talk about the necessity "to combat and overcome reformist ideology among the workers" is just so much poppycock. Deeds, please Mr. Dixon, not words!

Your leader, Sharkey, in the same "Review" article almost falls over himself in his abject efforts to prove that it was through no fault of the Communist Party that a Labor Government was not returned at the last Federal elections, because a "Labor Government . . . promised a number of useful reforms".

Certainly, Labor policy proposed a few minor reforms, but then so did Liberal policy. So to offer this as a reason is absurd.

To use Lenin's phrase of many years ago, we support a Labor Government in office as the rope supports the hanged man.

We recognize that the workers need this essential experience of a Labor Government to test for themselves the deeds of "their" Government as opposed to its words.

Dimitrov, in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935 spoke of our "attitude of absolute opposition to Social-Democratic governments, which are governments of compromise with the bourgeoisie".

It's embarrassing in the extreme, we know, to have to be reminded of these "left" pronouncements of the great revolutionary leaders. But there it is, the printed word is a very stubborn thing and even if you rubbed from now until doomsday, you would be unable to erase this fundamental proposition either from the history books or the minds of the world's people.

Fantasy In The Mind

So this fantasy of stepping stones you have built for yourself in which you are combatting reformist ideology among the workers exists only in your mind. Let's face it, Mr. Dixon, you are in fact contributing to reformist ideology among the workers. Not one word of either this speech or any other of recent times attempts to criticize from a **class position** the theories of reformism.

Both Sharkey and Dixon try to bolster up their sagging courage by screaming about every second paragraph—"it's all the fault of Hill and the splitters—we must have unity".

The heading to Mr. Sharkey's "theoretical" contribution just says "Unity—Against Dogmatism".

Unquestionably this call for unity is being repeatedly used by the revisionists in the leadership of the C.P. of A. to drag into

line those within their ranks who continue to have doubts about the correctness of the policy of the leaders.

It would not be the first time it has been used in the revolutionary movement for thoroughly reactionary claims.

"The development of the proletariat proceeds everywhere amidst internal struggles—Unity is a good thing so long as it is possible, but there are things which stand above unity. And when, like Marx and myself, one has fought harder all one's life against self-styled socialists than against anyone else (for we regarded the bourgeoisie only as a **class** and hardly ever involved ourselves in conflicts with individual bourgeois) one cannot be greatly grieved that the inevitable struggle has broken out" (Engels to A. Bebel, Oct. 28, 1882, Selected Correspondence of Marx & Engels, Moscow, p. 427).

Marx and Engels had their share of revisionists too, both within the ranks of the German Social Democratic Party and outside it. They had to wage firm and repeated struggles on behalf of correct proletarian revolutionary ideas.

Marx, Engels and Lenin never hesitated to deal with this cry of "unity", uttered by those who are in the process of abandoning the class struggle—who are revising the fundamental propositions of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and they need a nice, easy path (no opposition, please!) on which to do it.

Crisis Is No Accident

This crisis, as with previous major crises in the ranks of the revolutionary parties, is no accidental thing. It does not arise from a clash of personalities or as the result of a local argument. The present big debate, it is clear to see, is a world-wide phenomenon, a reflection of the objective world situation, a direct result of the general world crisis of imperialism.

None would deny that this immoral, outmoded system is in its death throes. Socialism is now the prevailing system over one-third of the earth. The colonial revolution is hammering away at imperialism's doors—the hitherto backward peoples are on the march.

Each big crisis for imperialism gives rise to desperate measures to save the doomed system—the crisis for imperialism expressed in the 1914-18 war also found a crisis in the ranks of the working-class International, the second International of that time. Looking back now, it is easy to say—easy to see—that the revisionist leaders of the Second International betrayed the working class. They were renegades to the revolutionary movement.

But, back in the 1914 days—these very same leaders were respected far and wide as the leaders of the revolutionary movement. Should Lenin have denounced their treachery or should he have kept quiet in the interests of "unity"?

"Unity—a great cause and a great slogan! But the workers' cause required the **unity of the Marxists** and not the unity of the Marxists with the opponents and distorters of Marxism" (Lenin Collected Works, 4th Russian Ed., Moscow, Vol. 20, p. 211), and further "It is impossible to carry out the tasks of Socialism at the present time, it is impossible to achieve real international unity of the workers, without a determined rupture with opportunism, and explaining to the masses the inevitability of its bankruptcy" (The War and Russian Social-Democracy", Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 403).

So, clearly, Lenin made no bones about it. The leaders of the Second International had betrayed the working class. The working class must be told the truth. Was he a splitter?

Every revolutionary, without hesitation, would answer that Lenin upheld Marxism-Leninism. He was prepared to accept all the vilification and slander that the erstwhile leaders of the Second International could heap upon his head. There is no question that in revealing the bankruptcy of their position before the working class he performed a mighty service for humanity, he made vitally important contributions to the theory of Marxism—he assisted to develop and advance the development of the Third Communist International.

He assured the success of the socialist revolution in Russia. His failure to speak out, his flinching in face of the storm of abuse would have retarded the revolutionary movement for many years.

The same principle holds good for today. Those, who in the name of "creative Marxism", under the slogan "against dogmatism", slander the great Chinese Communist Party, the Albania C.P. and others, slander those who within our country insist upon upholding the principles of revolutionary doctrine, the sum total of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 81 Parties' Statement, have in fact broken with Marxism-Leninism.

They are the real splitters.

They have split with fundamental revolutionary doctrine. They are splitting and confusing the working class. Every one of our readers is advised to read and re-read their statements. Sift out their false theories, compare them with the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Compare them with the whole experience of the revolution throughout the world.

R. Dixon, in his article in the Communist Review mentioned earlier, claims that the world-wide discussion "deepened our understanding of Marxism-Leninism both in its general principles and its application concretely, to the conditions here in Australia". Our readers are invited to test the validity of this claim for themselves.

We have endeavoured to do just this with one or two important propositions—namely the attitude of a sincere revolutionary party to the capitalist state, to a capitalist Parliament.

Class Character of A.L.P.

We have touched upon some matters in relation to the Labor Party. Mr. Dixon, of course, claims that because we believe in facing the facts, and point out the class character of the Labor Party and the ruling class position of its leaders, that we stand opposed to unity with Labor Party rank and file, Labor Party supporters.

Nothing, of course, is further from the truth. The precise way to achieve unity with those workers who support the Labor Party must lie both in working unitedly with them for the fulfilment of common demands at the same time as we discuss truthfully the fact that the Labor Party is a Party of capitalism. How else can the workers be won to support a revolutionary path?

Mr. Dixon is critical of our attitude to the "Left" in the Labor Party. He and his colleagues are incapable of seeing the differences within the Labor Party as a situation which if taken proper advantage of can deal a blow against reformism as a whole—the "left" included.

No! They hold up slightly more progressive sections of the Labor Party, clothe them with such virtues and honesty as to create even more illusions within the ranks of the working class about reformism.

As to Mr. Dixon's claim (p. 70, C.R.) to be deepening his understanding of Marxism-Leninism, one has only to look both at this particular issue of the Communist Review, to read carefully the Communist Press to conclude, as so many workers are doing, that it is more and more simply becoming a mouthpiece for the policy of the Labor Party.

What new theories have they advanced? Nothing, but to rob the Moscow Declaration and 81 Parties' Statement of their revolutionary content—nothing but to abandon the struggle against revisionism and all by themselves declare "dogmatism" to be the main danger facing the Communist Parties. Nothing, but to throw overboard Lenin's revolutionary proposition about smashing the State apparatus and substitute the proposition of "peaceful transition" and Parliamentary majorities to legislate socialism.

No longer do Mr. Dixon and his colleagues merely stumble down the barren, sterile path of theoretical confusion. They are literally rushing headlong into the abyss where they will finish with a bourgeois party enunciating a completely bourgeois theory. They will become a left wing of social democracy attempting to bolster up imperialism for a little longer.

Man's Will IS A Part Of Objective Reality

IN the March issue of the *Communist Review* there is an article entitled "Wishful Thinking Versus Objective Reality". It is written by Eric Thornton, a member of the Melbourne Guardian's editorial staff.

The article commences with an attack on E. F. Hill for his correct statement in the first issue of the Australian Communist which says:

"Man's will is part of objective reality, and in turn influences objective reality. Marxist-Leninist Parties are based upon recognition of the universal laws revealed by Marxism-Leninism and the recognition of the fact that man himself, as a conscious being, is capable of influencing the operation of these laws.

"Knowledge of those laws, gives him freedom to act within them. Ignorance, or denial of them, makes his actions blind and irrational. Hence the Party of Marxism-Leninism must act in accordance with those laws. Centralism gives it that capacity to act. Marx said: 'The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point however is to change it.'"

Thornton says that this statement identifies man's will with objective reality and therefore "deserves to be included in an anthology of schoolboy howlers".

Let us examine what the learned Mr. Thornton says.

His article starts off: "Dialectical materialism holds that man's will is a form of consciousness of individuals or groups and classes which when translated into practical, material activities can and does affect the working out of objective laws in nature and society, by retarding or accelerating their operation. But 'left dogmatists' in the person of E. F. Hill, their local ideological leader, have distorted this correct idea by putting forward the proposition: 'Man's will is part of objective reality.'"

And so right at the very beginning Mr. Thornton commences to tie himself in knots.

Thornton cannot distinguish will from thought because he cannot distinguish objective reality from matter. Not a strange thing for a man whose knowledge mainly comes from books. Will cannot be treated in the abstract.

Man's will is the product of reason—that is a synthesis of the objective and subjective and as such becomes again the objective as soon as it becomes practice. Will cannot be divorced from practice.

Thought is the reflection of the material world—but will is not just thought. Will is action, practice and as such cannot be separated from objective reality.

In *Capital*, Volume 1, Marx makes this fairly clear when he says: "Labor is, in the first place, a process in which both **MAN AND NATURE** participate, and in which man of his own accord starts, regulates and controls the material reactions between himself and nature. He opposes himself to nature, **AS ONE OF HER OWN FORCES**, setting in motion arms and legs, head and hands, the natural forces of his body in order to appropriate nature's productions in a form adapted to his own wants. By thus acting on the external world and changing it, he at the same time changes his own nature" (our emphasis).

Man Is Not Passive

Thornton says quite plainly that man's will is the reflection of reality. And then he leaves it at that.

If man's will was only a reflection of reality it would not be will; it would be thought. But man is not just a passive creature.

In contrast to evolution in nature the development of society does not proceed of itself. As Engels noted "everything that sets men acting must find its way through their brains", and consequently social processes, once the necessary material conditions are there, depend in large measure on the meaning people put into their actions and on the aims they pursue, that is, on the subjective factor.

Needless to say, people do not determine this meaning or these aims arbitrarily; in the final analysis they are historically conditioned by economic development. "Hence," said Marx, "man-kind only sets itself such tasks as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or are at least in the process of formation."

In the transition from capitalism to communism, the role of the subjective factor—of consciousness—grows steadily. Man, at first the passive object of history, changes into the active subject. Concentration of industry creates objective conditions by virtue of which the workers become conscious of their class solidarity.

Thornton's article is worth careful study for it reveals the inner reasoning of a revisionist which combines negation of struggle with dogmatism.

So it is logical to find in Thornton's article a sneering criticism of the Marxist-Leninist proposition that all imperialists are paper tigers and that "no one has yet observed a will strong enough to

enable 100 unarmed men, or men armed only with rifles in an exposed position, to withstand an assault by one aeroplane armed with a block-buster bomb”.

Here we see defeatism, pure and simple.

And worse than that, a complete lack of understanding or, rather, a failure to grasp the essence of the very rich revolutionary lessons of the last 100 years.

We do not advocate self-destruction, least of all the Chinese whose military brilliance has been well confirmed over recent times.

But the revolutionary forces always start off being immeasurably weaker than the class enemy. The task is to preserve them and build them, and strengthen their morale. This cannot be done by adventurism or capitulation.

Has Thornton not read of the Cuban revolution—how it started with 12 men and seven rifles? And the present struggle in South Vietnam: surely this struggle is proving in practice that man is decisive and is superior to weapons.

It is clear that Thornton has no understanding of the essence of Marxism, which is struggle.

Let us return to the question of will for it is vitally important today when people like Thornton are trying to weaken and undermine revolutionary consciousness and action. The hallmark of an opportunist is that he meekly accepts reality and will not struggle to change it; so therefore makes the best of a bad thing. This ideology runs right through Thornton's lifeless article.

Must Find Way Out

A philosophical system in which the sensed is regarded as something exclusively external and foreign to the logical, where all the independence of the material sensations vanishes into “pure” thought, is naturally incapable of finding a way out.

That can only be done if the subject is regarded as the materialistic and, at the same time, the organic centre of an active process which unites sensation and thought.

This activity of the social subject is the same thing as the material practice of social man. In this we have the sensuous apprehension of the world of objects by purposeful, directed action, an apprehension which thus includes a reasoned relationship to surrounding reality.

It is this concrete, human, sensuous activity which Marx opposed to the purely ideal activity of German philosophy.

In Volume XI of his Selected Works (12 volume edition) on page 394 Lenin writes: “If the perceptual world is objective reality, then the door is closed to every other reality or quasi-reality (remember Bazarov believed the ‘realism’ of the im-

manentists, who declare god to be a real concept). If the world is matter in motion, matter can and must be infinitely studied in the infinitely complex and detailed manifestations and ramifications of this motion, the motion of this matter; but beyond it, beyond the ‘physical’, external world, with which everyone is familiar, there can be nothing.”

Thornton is apparently unaware of the well-known dictum of Marx on that form of labour which appertains exclusively to man. It is this, that in contradistinction to animals, man “not only changes the form of that which has been given by nature—but also realizes at the same time his own conscious aim, which, like a law, defines the means and character of his actions and to which he is compelled to subordinate his will.”

In actuality, both the conscious aim of action and the understanding of the material conditions of its realization are included in the process of social practice; are brought forth by it and evolve on its basis.

The recurrence in practice of various phenomena with which man comes into contact, the reproduction of phenomena, the substitution of one object for another, the union of very different objects in the reproduction of conditions of social life—all these create the basis for generalizations and conclusions.

Engels points out that the notion of the causal connection of phenomena, which expresses the objective connection of various aspects of the material world, arose from the very fact of man's purposeful changing of nature by his activity.

Man, by reproducing the conditions necessary for the occurrence of any given phenomenon, by acting upon one phenomenon and thereby evoking from it another—often something not previously met in relation to the first circumstance—rises to the level of an understanding of causal relations.

Practice, by its creation of the unity and mutual conditioning of the sensed and the logical moments of knowledge, is, at once, a verification of the correctness of both of them, and a measure of the truth of knowledge as a whole.

In this same verification there is realized in its turn the mutual transition of the sensed and the logical, and we notice that the verification of any theory—the transformation of it into life—is at the same time a creation of a new objectivity that can be perceived.

Practice is the crown and completion of the ideal and, as such, unites in itself both the moment of universality, attainable at once by reason, and the great diversity of sensed material.

“Practice,” Lenin wrote, “is higher than theoretical knowledge,

because it has not only the property of generality, but also direct actuality."

Ideas have as their basis human action, the attribute of man alone; they give him his uniqueness, since they have no place in any other forms of the movement of matter.

The transformation of scientific theory into life, and the possibility, on its basis, of uniting and dissociating the different forms of movement of the material world that are found outside the human head, and of manipulating them according to previously formed aims—these disclose the close connection of theory with objectivity.

"Objective reality is not merely that which exists. It is that which exists independently of us, of our consciousness."

So Thornton writes. And here is his fundamental error. He is confusing objective reality and matter. Matter exists independently of us and of our consciousness, no matter what we do it continues to exist. Matter is that of which the whole universe, including ourselves, is composed. It is eternal and always in motion. Our concept of it varies with the increase of science, e.g. from atoms to electrons, but the philosophic definition remains correct.

Materialism says that the things which act on our sense organs and cause our perceptions really exist independently of our consciousness. Idealism says that they only exist as sensations as ours, that is in our minds. One idealist even went so far as to deduce his immortality from this—arguing that if his consciousness perished, the whole universe also perished, as it was only an idea in his mind—and of course that would be inconceivable so he would live forever.

We, the materialists, therefore call the world we see, hear and feel objective reality—meaning it has an existence of its own, independent of our (subjective) thoughts. But we do not say that the material world is the only objective reality—that things which we can't see, hear and feel do not exist. For example men's thoughts, emotions and will exist, social classes exist, ideologies exist.

Here is the point at which Thornton becomes confused. He is caught in a tangle of words and he goes on to contradict himself. He for instance admits that mass consciousness is an objective factor in any given situation, that it determines mass activity in the material world which means that it does alter objective reality in a thousand ways by, for example deposing governments, building a new army, expelling imperialists, conducting an agrarian revolution, constructing factories, etc.

Thornton continues by accusing Hill of believing in the absolute supremacy of the human will, of pragmatism. This is pure misrepresentation for Hill, even according to Thornton, said

that man is free to act within the universal laws if he knows them.

Objective reality is composed of matter and its actions. Now we are part of objective reality and objective reality to some extent is not independent of us and our consciousness. Matter, from which we are composed, is eternal but we are not.

We can alter or destroy the temporary shapes that matter assumes. We act on it and change it with the help of our consciousness, that is, of our knowledge of science, tools, etc., as illustrated above. And, of course, we can, to some extent, change ourselves with medicine and surgery. A large part of objective reality, namely the sun and stars, we do not act on to any measurable degree and that part exists independently of us and our consciousness, at least up to the present.

Our thought and will are part of objective reality. They are both actions of our brain and even confused thought such as that of Thornton is objectively real.

No one can deny its existence!

Thornton then returns to his original error. To repeat he writes: "objective reality is not merely that which exists. It is that which exists independently of us, of our consciousness".

This is perfectly true as an answer to idealism which places the existence of objective reality in our consciousness and denies its real existence. It is not true if it is interpreted to mean that we, with ideas derived from our sensations caused by the external world, cannot alter objective reality.

For the rest Thornton imputes things to Hill and the Chinese comrades that are absolutely false. We and the Chinese do not think world war inevitable. On the contrary we think it can be prevented by a correct policy and not by kow-towing a la Khrushchev to the imperialists. We fully recognise the changes that have taken place including the wresting of colonies from the imperialists, the decisive place occupied by the socialist countries, the change in the balance of forces. However, we affirm with absolute confidence that these changes do not change the universal laws discovered by Marx and Lenin, any more than they change the law of gravitation.

We have not forgotten Engels' observation that necessity would force even the capitalists to renounce weapons when they reach a certain point of destructiveness and expense. We would remind Thornton and his friends that Mao tse Tung said in 1947 that the atom bomb would probably never be used again. The last 17 years have borne out that statement.

Thornton accuses us too of undue haste of wanting to skip over necessary stages. We, however, still accept Lenin's advice that a revolutionary should never fix dates, he should do the correct work and wait till the proper time comes. No one, Mr. Thornton, has yet been able to fix the date for a revolution, even a month before that event.

Marxist-Leninists place great emphasis on ideological understanding in order to guide men's actions correctly. But Thornton says "the most fundamental way in which man changes the world is not according to his will, but by being drawn, of necessity, into production and production relations, in which his will plays only a minor part."

Such a statement, as shown above, is at complete variance with Marxism-Leninism.

The whole purpose of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Communist Party is to lift man's consciousness, to bring into the working class movement the ideas of socialism and a new morality.

It teaches, simply and profoundly, that man makes history.

How? By being passive?

No, by daring, and daring again, and again and again until final victory.

There is no place in the working class movement for people who whimper and snivel over difficulties, who are afraid of block-busters or atom bombs, who are afraid to stand up and say "we are for revolution".

Today the world revolution is unfolding magnificently. Millions of people are in struggle against imperialism. They are exerting their wills and every day, every hour, every minute are creating new favourable conditions for further action and further victories. The national liberation movement is, for us, a very real part of objective reality.

It is no accident that Thornton's article was published in the Communist Review. The job of the Party of Aarons, Dixon and Sharkey is to weaken man's will to struggle. The only conclusion that can be drawn from Thornton's article is: "Give it all away—it's far too difficult."

And we say "no", a thousand times "no", to this rubbish.

Melbourne — May 1964

Printed by Typo Art Printing Co. Pty. Ltd.
for Donald E. Scott, 19 Kerr Street, Blackburn