

What Kind of Party?

Marxism and Revisionism in Australia

by Brenda Kellaway

“To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of Petty Politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole Capitalist System, of Capitalist evolution, to sacrifice these primary interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment-such is the policy of revisionism”.

(Lenin, 1908, Marxism and Revisionism, page 12, progress publications, 1980)

Recent events around the world have proved once and for all that reforms under the Capitalist system will be rolled back by the Capitalist class at the earliest opportunity. In Australia the hard fought for working conditions of prior generations have been whittled away to such an extent that many Australians no longer have sick pay, holiday pay, proper lunch breaks, eight hour working days or even secure employment. In Greece and other European countries, Austerity measures have been put into place for the greater population whilst Capitalists continue to make extravagant amounts of money. In America the Government bailed out the banks however, the money went to the salaries of the CEO's rather than into the economy.

The rolling back of reforms does not occur randomly because of the narcissistic nature of individual Capitalists or because of particular world economic crises, although they do contribute. This phenomenon largely occurs due to the nature of the Capitalist system itself. In their drive to continually increase profits the Capitalist class attempt to find new markets. However, more importantly Capitalists continually strive to find new ways to increase profits, by increasing production, whilst at the same time paying less in on-going costs. To illustrate this point one only needs to look at the enormous profits that multinational companies have made by moving their businesses to poorer communities like Bangladesh. Whilst the cost of materials may be lower in these countries, companies move to the third world because the one production cost they can dramatically alter is an employees' wage. Capitalists make their enormous profits by paying workers very little and in the third world this wage decreases dramatically with wages being closer to the subsistence level. It is because the Capitalist class continually strive to make a profit, and to increase their profits,

that workers find themselves in constant struggles with their employers for better wages and conditions.

It is clear that the only way to stop this continual battle for a meagre existence for basic working and living conditions is to change the system. We need to change the system yet many people, including many in Communist Parties, still continue to attempt to work within the Capitalist system. These people try to change the system from within, from within the Capitalist parliamentary system rather than focussing their efforts on changing the Capitalist system towards a new Socialist system. These people therefore fall into the trap of revisionism and ultimately liquidationism.

Communists do work towards any pro-worker changes in order to attempt to improve the immediate conditions for the working class. However, if we focus our attention on these reforms instead of abolishing Capitalism altogether we limit ourselves to the behest of the Capitalist class. If we focus on reforms alone we condemn the working class to continual struggles for their basic working conditions and we also liquidate our Communist Parties into parties of social reformism, parliamentarianism and opportunism.

Revisionism and the direction of Communist Parties in Australia;

In Australia reformist /revisionist policies continually resurface, often in the typical forms as revealed by V.I. Lenin in his many publications on the subject. Policies that previously surfaced in the old Communist Party of Australia under the leadership of L. Aarons, leading to that Communist Party's ultimate dissolution, are still being promoted in the Communist movement by certain individuals.

These revisionist/opportunist policies are characterised by;

- *Broad Left Coalitions; in attempts to unite so-called broad 'left coalitions' or broad left movements made up of differing groups with different political objectives, into one whole movement. These 'broad coalitions' often mean in reality coalitions with the petty bourgeoisie, with those who have no inclination towards changing the system, with those who associate with the ruling Capitalist classes.*
- *Stage theories; where the attempt to replace Capitalism with Socialism directly is replaced with attempts to alter Capitalism by stealth, from within the Capitalist System and by using the Capitalist apparatus to do so. This incorrect theory suggests that we need to destroy the Capitalist System in small steps or stages thereby putting off the need to attempt to replace Capitalism with Socialism which is seen to occur only in the dim dark far away future.*
- *Parliamentarianism; in attempts to work within the Capitalist System in order to bring about a change towards Socialism. To be elected, even if there is limited association with communist policies. This is often associated with opportunism.*

- In Coalitions with the ‘Distorters of Marxism’; in attempts to form alliances with as Lenin regards them the ‘distorters of Marxism’, the Trotskyites, the Anarchists, Utopian Socialists etc. Attempts to form alliances with these organisations appear to be for opportunistic reasons alone, in numbers games with those of dubious connection to the working classes.
- hegemonic styled leadership; a dictatorial styled leadership where decisions are made outside of meetings by a small group/groups of people, in place of Democratic Centralism.

Revisionism regularly reasserts itself within societies and even Communist Parties because of the fact that the petty bourgeoisie, the middle classes, regularly join the ranks of the working classes bringing their ideology with them. We are also constantly bombarded with Capitalist ideology at school, at work and in the media. Lenin points out in his booklet '*Against Revisionism in the Defence of Marxism*' (pages 43- 44) that the Communist movement also spends a varying amount of time training recruits. He states (page 44) that this revisionism also relates to the growth of Capitalism and the rate at which the working class joins the movement to fight for Socialism. With larger rates of people joining the movement to fight for Socialism you will get varying degrees of training and education. Lenin states;

“Marxism, is most easily, rapidly, completely and lastingly assimilated by the working class and it’s ideologists where large-scale industry is most developed. Economic relations which are backward, or which lag in their development, constantly lead to the appearance of supporters of the labour movement who assimilate only certain aspects of Marxism, only certain parts of the new world outlook, or individual slogans and demands, being unable to make a determined break with all traditions of the bourgeois world outlook in general and the bourgeois democratic world outlook in particular”.

(Lenin, 1910, *Against Revisionism in the Defence of Marxism*’ subheading ‘*Differences in the European Labour Movement*’, page 44, progress publishers 1970 edition).

Communist education is vitally important. With greater understanding of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice such deviations are obviously less likely to take hold of an entire party. Many revisionists underplay the importance of Communist education and instead support the following of any petty bourgeois campaigns calling this ‘activism’. The revisionist definition of ‘activism’ generally means a form of Tailism, of the following of any petty bourgeois campaigns in place of any real attempt to lead the working class. Whilst there are some petty bourgeois campaigns that are worth supporting, these campaigns should be

supported on the basis of Marxism- Leninism rather than supporting a social liberal ideology.

Stages theories; Broad left Coalitions: Unity of the Left;

“This opportunist theory of stages has now been rejected...”

(Lenin, 1902, ‘What is to be Done’, page 146, under subheading ‘Political Agitation and its restriction by the Economists’, ‘Lenin Selected Works volume 1, part 1’ Selected Works in 3 volumes, 1967, progress publications)

The revisionists in Australia state that there are stages within Capitalism that revolutionary parties must go through prior to changing the system to Socialism. In Marxist-Leninist ideology there are no stages prior to attempting to defeat Capitalism. If we say to the working class that there are stages we are in effect putting off attempts to change the Capitalist system to a Socialist one, to forestall any real movement and to deny that there may be different and yet unforeseen circumstances and opportunities to defeat Capitalism. These revisionists effectively divert attention and focus away from defeating the Capitalist system. The stages theory is nonsense there is no prescriptive way to reach Socialism in any given country, if there was it would be easy to defeat the Capitalist class.

As part of this ‘stages’ theory the revisionists incorrectly suggest that we need to create some form of unity with the middle classes prior to attempting the overthrow of the Capitalism. For example H. Middleton from Australia states;

“...we are involved in the ‘battle of ideas’, in an effort to win leadership of the working class and its (potential) allies from social democracy. Only in this way can we even start to build left and progressive unity and the wider mass movement without which we cannot hope to challenge the economic and political power of monopoly, let alone move to the second stage of the transition to socialism”.

Note here there is the suggestion that a move to defeat Capitalism and replace it with Socialism is a ‘Second’ stage. This revisionist theory states that prior to leading the working class, we must first unite this mythical and nebulous beast ‘the left’ to fight for Socialism. There is no attempt to specify who this ‘left’ might be. Are we talking about the Labor Party? The Anarchists? The Greens? Who exactly is ‘the left’ that we need to unite prior to uniting the working class? Middleton incorrectly alleges that our immediate aim is to unite these groups into some sort of hotch potch united front, in order to enter into the Capitalist parliamentary system.

Middleton in her statement above suggests that we need to win over the middle classes as a first stage before we can even think about winning over the working class. This implies that we must lead the Social Democrats, the Anarchists, the Trotskyites to a better ideological

position prior to leading the working class. It is an incorrect understanding of working in the broad movement and ultimately will lead to dissolution of the Party into the Broad movement and/or Social Democracy.

It is not possible to unite these differing groups with differing ultimate aims, differing ideologies and objectives into a united front except around specific goals for example; a united front against fascism. In attempting to unite these differing groups ultimately we are forgetting the class we most of all need to attract, the working class. The working class aren't interested in the Social democrats; they are the ones who have sold them out for years via contract agreements in which their working conditions have slowly been whittled away piece by piece.

In Australia worker's rights and working conditions were particularly eroded by means of an agreement in 1983 called 'The Accord'. This 'Accord' was initially organised between the unions and the Labor Party and subsequently unions and the government. It is basically institutionalised wage restraint and is an excellent example of class collaborationism. Pat Clancy a then former member of the Socialist Party of Australia, a union leader and revisionist supported this "Accord" alleging that anyone who disagreed with this position was an 'economist', 'a left Sectarian' or a 'Trotskyite'. Clancy stated regarding the Accord;

"The conclusion that must be drawn is that the organised left in Australia regards the Accord as a document providing the best possibility for developing the class struggle in the particular circumstances now prevailing in Australia".

(Clancy, 1986, page 16, 'A Left View of the ACTU/ALP Accord, The Broad Left Conference Bulletin Number 1/86)

This 'Accord' between unions and government has kept wages in Australia capped and has all but destroyed the bargaining power of the working class. This revisionist, Pat Clancy, was also a great supporter of organising a so-called Broad Left movement. In the "Draft Statement for the Broad Left Conference" Clancy et al. states;

"the left should respond to this challenge with its own renewed offensive seeking to build broad alliances to defend basic social and economic rights..." (page 3).

(Clancy, 1986, page 3 'A Left View of the ACTU/ALP Accord, The Broad Left Conference Bulletin Number 1/86)

Pat Clancy along with others was responsible for many attempts to set up such "Broad Left" alliances all of which failed.

In his article entitled 'Unity', Lenin states;

"There can be no unity, federal or other, with Liberal-Labour Politicians, with disrupters of the working class movement, with those who defy the will of the majority. There can and must be unity among all consistent Marxists, among all those who stand for the entire

Marxist body and for the uncurtailed slogans, independently of the liquidators and apart from them.

Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is unity of Marxists, not unity between Marxists and opponents and distorters of Marxism".

(Lenin, 1914, 'Unity', Pravdy No 59, Lenin Collected Works, 1972, Progress Publications, Volume 20, page 230)

It is clear that when Lenin speaks of unity he is not speaking about unity with differing groups with differing ideologies and objectives but of unity amongst Marxists, of unity within the working class movement. He also makes it very clear with respect to how he views stages theories with the quote;

"This opportunist theory of stages has now been rejected..."

(Lenin, 'What is to be Done', page 146, 'Lenin Selected Works volume 1, part 1', progress publications 1950)

Lenin continues to discuss how these 'stages' theories can "*restrict the scope of political agitation*" and can have the effect of being a "*harmful restriction of the political struggle*" (pages 146-148).

In stating that there is a prescriptive way to work towards Socialism, that there are particular stages that we must follow, revisionists deny any possibility of unexpected opportunities to progress our movement towards socialism. This 'stages' theory restricts the Communist movement from taking appropriate actions in accordance with the particular events or circumstances of a given period in history.

Of course we do work with people who already have some political awareness in the broad movement. We attempt to win those already with some class understanding to a greater understanding of the class nature of Capitalism and into our movement. We support any reform that is for the benefit of the working class. However, we only act in unity with the Social Democrats towards specific goals. We don't work towards some nebulous, touchy feely, unity of the entire left, that is not possible because we have different ideologies and different goals. As Lenin states;

"to achieve a 'fighting unity' in deed and not merely in word, we must know clearly, definitely, and from experience exactly wherein and to what extent we can be united"

(Lenin, 'A Militant Agreement for the Uprising' Collected Works, Vol. 8, progress publications 1974, in ABC series, 'The Party', page 58, progress publications, 1986).

In Middleton's latest leaflet "Comments on an infantile disorder in Australia", which from now on for expediency will be referred as ' Middleton's Infantile', Middleton attempts to define who this 'left' coalition might be by dividing this so called unified whole into three differing groups. Apparently Middleton is unaware of her own contradiction in dividing this unity into different groups. She states there are three differing groups "Left unity",

“People’s Unity” and “Working class unity”. Middleton here confuses loose alliances around specific fighting platforms with unity of Marxists and in using completely generalised terms does not define which political or community groups may fit into which category. She then alleges to use the term “left” in a precise way.

(Middleton, Nov. 2012, *Comments on an infantile Disorder in Australia*, Page 4, Sydney)

In her ‘Infantile’ document Middleton has at least included working class unity however, the emphasis is still on building a “*Left oriented, politically progressive people’s front, strong enough to challenge and break the two party monopoly*”. By placing the emphasis on building left unity she subverts the revolutionary group, the working class into a secondary consideration thereby subverting the movement into the aims of social democracy. This can be seen even more clearly in the following quote from *Middleton’s infantile*;

“*...The development of a united front of the working class will greatly assist building the broader people’s front unity that is required for the progressive forces to successfully achieve the anti-monopoly anti –imperialist democratic government that we identify as a first stage of revolutionary change*”.

(Middleton, November 2012, page 8, *Comments on an infantile Disorder*, Sydney)

In the above quote Middleton clearly states that the working class are there to assist the broad movement to achieve a democratic styled government. Marxists want to change the Capitalist system to a Socialist one. This revisionist practice of subordinating the working class movement to a broad movement will only end in a continuation of Capitalism.

In stating that we can’t have a nebulous left unity to overthrow capitalism itself it doesn’t mean that we can’t have agreements with other organisations around specific goals or issues. In fact in certain circumstances, such alliances are necessary and should be encouraged. However, in these alliances we do not forget our main goal the overthrow of Capitalism and we do not take action that is going to divert attention away from our main goal. As stated below;

“*Lenin’s party was not against agreements with other parties for attaining specific goals’, however, in doing so they never would... betray their own theoretical and political tenents or conceal objectives; in fact they specified to the point the terms, scope and objectives of all their agreements with other Parties*”.

(ABC series, ‘What is the Party’, 1986, page 57, progress publications)

In these ‘left coalitions’ with these so-called broad organisations often what is forgotten is the fact that Communist Parties organise and campaign on behalf of the working class and in doing so they instigate campaigns that are of interest to the working class. These working class campaigns may not be of interest to the other groups in these so-called broad coalitions. The middle class do not have the same concerns as the working class. Our

foremost goal must be to attract the working class, the ones that Marx and Engels referred to as the ‘grave diggers’ of the Capitalist system, the ones who will be most motivated to change the system.

Recent surveys have revealed that in Australia of most concern to the mass of people is the standard of living, to be able to pay one’s bills, to buy food, to have employment and security, in other words the necessities of life. Yet the revisionists in Australia do not focus their campaigns on these issues important to the working class and instead practice a form of Tailism. These revisionists tail along behind whatever political discussion is trendy at any given time, particularly issues trendy in the media, instead of campaigning on issues of real significance and importance to the working class.

In efforts to justify her position Middleton labels the writer an ‘Isolationist’. Again clearly she misunderstands the theory and practice of Marxism. Marxism is not anything if not first of all scientific. The word ‘Isolationist’ or ‘Isolationism’ is normally associated with the practice of entire countries not engaging in current issues or trade with other countries. It was particularly associated with the U.S.A. in regards to their initial refusal to engage in the war with the Nazi’s in World War II. It is a term that is generalised and normally associated with mudslinging as it does not have a specific universally agreed definition. It is in fact rarely used for this reason particularly in regards to individuals and has been associated with attempts to defame Communist Countries like the Soviet Union and Cuba. Middleton has also failed to offer her own definition of the term in relation to this allegation.

Middleton alleges that the writer, and other Marxists are also left sectarian (Middleton’s ‘Infantile’, page 3). She states that those that are opposed to her revisionist views are “advocates against compromises with the Capitalist class, against working within conservative trade unions and generally boycotts elections”. According to this definition most Marxist-Leninists are Isolationist including Lenin, because they do not ‘compromise’ with Capitalists. Middleton conveniently forgets that the writer stood as a candidate in the Federal Elections in a Coalition of Marxist groups called the Communist Alliance in Australia in 2010. She also conveniently forgets those she criticises regularly participate with unions, other political parties, trades hall councils and other community based organisations. One fails to see how an individual in any country can be an ‘Isolationist’ unless the individual moves to a cave in the desert or like Utopian Socialists attempt to set up a commune which excludes themselves from the greater population.

Unity with the distorters of Marxism

The idea that we can unify this nebulous group of Anarchists, Trotskyists, Social Democrats, this so-called ‘left’ into one mass revolutionary group is ideologically incorrect and has led to some very basic mistakes in Australia. In the inner Sydney area there has been a tendency to align comrades with middle class left sectarians around issues prominent in the media, particularly in regards to election campaigns. These campaigns have been of less success

than the campaigns where the focus has been on working class issues such as campaigns for full employment.

This revisionist theory, the coalition of the left, can also be seen in another document by H. Middleton entitled 'A Proposal for a People's Government'. It states on page 6;

"We believe that a broad coalition of left and progressive forces will be strong enough to stand up to the power of the corporations and be capable of changing the direction of politics in Australia, and taking steps to redistribute the country's vast wealth".

Is a 'broad coalition' going to do this, overthrow the Capitalist system? 'Redistribute the country's vast wealth?'. Do the Greens for example even want this? The answer is no, some of the Greens are conservative and seek to keep the Capitalist system intact. Are the Anarchists going to do this? Again no, they don't believe in government. Do the Trotskyites want to do this? No, they believe in permanent revolution. How about the Labor Party? The Labor Party in Australia already have access to power and are often in government, they have never attempted to alter the system away from Capitalist control. The Labor Party support reforms as palliatives. Reforms are only made by the Labor Party to the extent that they can placate workers by offering them small concessions whilst at the same time retaining the Capitalist system. More recently the Labor Party in Australia has been supporting neo-liberal economic ideology and policy. It is important to understand that the Labor Party in Australia have strong connections to big business who add to their funding and therefore influence their policies. Are the Utopian Socialists going to change the system? Again no, Utopian Socialists are in the main sons and daughters of the wealthy and seek to achieve a utopian socialist societies often by attempting to use the Capitalist apparatus within Capitalism. It is absurd to think that any of these groups would participate in the overthrow of Capitalism.

These coalitions tend to be motivated by attempts to increase voting numbers and therefore to participate in the Capitalist parliamentary system. However, these alliances have proven to be less than advantageous even in this regard, as the numbers of votes have proven to be greater when the Party stands as Communists under the banner of Communism.

Coalitions with Social Democratic groups can also prove to be unreliable. Social Democrats can have dubious alliances and can even sometimes be 'treacherous' as the opportunists within those parties attempt to get themselves elected. An example of this unreliability is in regards to the recent elections in Australia when many social democratic parties made suspect preference choices. The Greens for example, who pride themselves on their position on the environment, gave their first preferences to Clive Palmer's party in three different states. Clive Palmer is a mining magnate who is allegedly responsible for causing environmental devastation in the Great Barrier Reef. There is a contradiction in supporting environmental issues and also someone allegedly responsible for destroying the

environment. In Communist Parties such alliances are often promoted by opportunists who wish to play the numbers games in order to get themselves into parliament.

In stating that we need to focus our attention on issues of importance to the working class and that many in the upper and middle classes are not motivated to change the Capitalist System, it does not mean that individuals from the middle classes can't participate in the class struggle alongside and in favour of the working class. There have been many members of the Middle classes that have played a leading role in the workers movement, on behalf of the mass of people. Marx, Engels and Lenin were all members of the Middle classes. What it does mean though is that those who come from the middle class need to be forever mindful that their actions are in favour of the working class and that they are working directly towards the overthrow of the Capitalist system.

As Marx said it is the workers, the workers are the 'grave diggers' of the Capitalist system not some group of so-called left organisations, the petty bourgeoisie and the middle classes.

Parliamentarianism and Unity of the left

In Australia and other countries there have been attempts to change society towards Socialism via means of the liberal democratic state, by parliamentary means, by winning elections. Attempts at pursuing a change of government in this revisionist way, leads to reformism and ultimately to the dissolution of the Party into a form of Labor Party. Of course a Communist Party may decide to use the petty bourgeois election process for agitation purposes, to advertise their policies and ideology via the election process and if opportunity permits via members of parliament however, this is only useful if the candidates are standing as known Communists.

The revisionists incorrectly see the bourgeois parliamentary process itself as a means to change the system. They regard any individual elected as a victory whether the individual actively supports or promotes Communist policies and ideologies or not. In this way they subordinate the working class movement into one of social reformism and social democracy. When Fred Patterson was elected into the Australian parliament in the 1940's he was able to use this platform for promoting Communist policies and for the winning of support for the Communist Party of Australia because he stood as a known Communist. However, other elected individuals, those who have not made it known they were Communists, have ended up simply working for social democratic types of reforms and have not advanced the movement toward changing the system at all.

Lenin pointed out that alliances with social democratic political parties or with social democratic governments has normally ended with the weakening of the movement towards

Socialism because it leads to reformist type policies instead of focussing on changing the entire system.

Lenin states;

"The experience of alliances, agreements and blocs with Social –reform liberals in the west and with liberal reformist (cadets) in the Russian revolution, has convincingly shown that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they do not enhance but weaken the actual significance of their struggle, by linking fighters with elements who are least capable of fighting and most vacillating and treacherous".

(Lenin, 1908, page 11, Marxism and Revisionism, Progress publishers 1980)

In other words by linking the most active and revolutionary elements to Social Democracy and social reformism we weaken the movement because then our revolutionary elements concentrate on the concerns of social democracy and petty bourgeois reforms. Not only this but as we have seen in other countries these elements of Social Democracy can't be relied upon as they are not interested in changing the Capitalist system toward Socialism. The recent experience in Greece with the SYRIZA party is an example of how unreliable these sorts of alliances with Social Democrats can be. The SYRIZA organisation reneged on a promise to withdraw from the EURO monetary system. In doing so, by supporting an oppressive monetary system, they effectively supported austerity and other anti –worker policies in Greece. The KKE on the other hand have consistently followed the correct line and have refused to agree that Greece should continue to support the use of the EURO.

Revisionist ideas of unity of the left and parliamentarianism are nothing new and in fact were a point of struggle in the old Communist Party of Australia's 1967 Party Congress. In the booklet 'what's happening in the CPA' it states problems occurred;

"in the 21st Congress of 1967, when the Party adopted the concept of the coalition of the left, contributing to and leading the movement for socialism as opposed to the concept of the communist party as the sole leader"...

(' What's happening in the CPA',Reason in Revolt website)

The discredited L. Aaron's himself discussed this idea of 'unity of the left' incorrectly alleging that in Eastern Europe;

"the toiling people, united in a coalition of a number of democratic political parties and mass organisations, used the existing parliamentary institution of those countries in the establishment of people's power"

(L. Aarons, 1955 'Australia's path to Socialism programme of the CPA 17th Congress, page 16, Reason in Revolt site)

However, as we have seen Lenin himself disagreed with this idea and proved that these coalitions weakened the movement towards Socialism.

This idea of the ‘Coalition of the left’ led to a variety of other revisionist views in the older Communist Party of Australia including that perhaps the Communist Party is not the Vanguard after all and that perhaps even the essential ideas regarding Communism, or Communism itself might be no longer true. What in essence occurred in the old CPA was that more and more focus was placed on the social reforms led by the petty bourgeois middle classes. Focus was placed on these reforms to such an extent that working class issues became secondary, they no longer recruited working class people, they no longer actively pursued a change of system and the party collapsed and disappeared into the social reformism of the middle classes.

In the article ‘What’s happening in the CPA’ the article actually agrees with the notion of the coalition of the left and states;

“All parties, groups and movements which contribute to Socialist Revolution will be free to exist and advocate their policies in the new society”.

(‘What’s happening in the CPA, Reason in Revolt website)

In other words they advocated the idea that the Communists were not necessarily the vanguard and that after Socialism there would some sort of pluralist political system including other political parties, apart from Marxist ones.

This revisionism led to the Soviet Union actually criticising the old CPA regarding this Coalition of the left and in 1970 the;

“New Times argued that the ‘coalition of the Left’ weakened the concept of the Communist Party and the working class leading to the overthrow of capitalism and the setting up of a socialist society. The Party was also accused of abandoning ‘Marxism-Leninism’ as the theoretical foundation of the communist movement. . .”.

(2002, Mallory, *The Communist Party of Australia, 1967-1975, the circumstances surrounding the formation of the Socialist Party of Australia, page 6*).

This idea of ‘Unity of the Left’ or ‘Coalition of the Left’, does not strengthen the movement but it weakens it. Instead of attempting to lead the working class to victory this ideology suggests that we must unite these largely middle class groups first, as if they are the ones who will lead us to victory. Ultimately it will mean that we will dissolve our movement into the Social Democratic movement in the pursuit of reforms and parliamentary means to overthrow Capitalism. Even more telling is that this unity of the left policy has been attempted in Australia since at least 1950 and has never ever been successful.

Parliamentarianism, stages theories and the two Party System in Australia

The revisionists in Australia see an urgent task being to break the ‘two party system’ in Australia, to “break the two party stranglehold”, this ideology is also incorrect. In Middleton’s infantile (page 9), Middleton states;

“...it is necessary to build a left oriented, politically progressive people’s front, strong enough to challenge and break the two party monopoly”.

What would be the advantage to workers if we did? We might have three Capitalist based parties in Government rather than two; this would change the Capitalist system how exactly? How would it promote our cause being the overthrow of Capitalism?

There are already numerous countries where there are more than two Parties in government who support the continuance of Capitalism. Just one of many examples is Germany where the alliances of the Capitalist based Christian Democrats with other smaller Parties, have allowed the conservative Christian Democrats to stay in power. Angela Merkel’s party are able to make deals with the smaller parties thereby making it very difficult for anyone else to even oppose the Christian Democrats. What is to stop the Greens or other Parties forming alliances with other Capitalist groups in Australia? In fact there have already been instances in recent state elections, notably in Newcastle NSW, that the Greens gave their preferences to the Liberal Party instead of the more progressive groups that were standing such as the Progressive Labor Party. In the recent Federal Election the Greens gave their preferences to the Conservative Clive Palmer’s Party. In the 2004 Australian Elections the Australian Labor Party gave their Victorian Senate preferences to the far right wing Family First Party.

This policy of breaking the “two party stranglehold” is a reformist, class collaborationist policy because the focus is on participation in the social democratic struggle within the Capitalist Parliamentary system itself, instead of winning the leadership of the working class to overthrow it.

As Marx and Engels stated in the Communist Manifesto;

“The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties; Formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat”

(The Communist Manifesto, 1848, Progress publications, page 22).

In Australia this reformist policy of breaking the ‘two party stranglehold’ and ‘Coalition of the left’ has also led to some dubious choices regarding participation in local council elections. Instead of standing as Communist Party candidates comrades in Australia have

been actively encouraged to get themselves elected to local and other government bodies as part of other organisations. How is this going to promote the Communist cause? If the public is unaware that the candidate is a member of the Communist Party then how will this activity amass support for the Communist movement? A Communist Party always need to focus on changing the system, not participating in Social Democracy with scant advantage for doing so. A Communist Party always needs to analyse why they are participating in elections and what they hope to gain in participating.

Attempting to be elected in coalitions with other groups also presents another problem, if a comrade is elected as part of such a group are they responsible for carrying out the policies of the Communist Party or the policies of the particular group they have been elected with? Wherever possible if Communists are to stand in elections they should do so as known Communists or at least to stand with other like-minded Marxist organisations. In this way we can directly promote Communist policies instead of purely social reforms and we can also attract new members. We know that in entering into elections or even in being elected to positions, we will not change our society to Socialism. It is a reformist, Right Opportunist view that we can change the Capitalist system to a Socialist one by participation in the Bourgeois government.

Basimov and Leibzon in the book ‘The Revolutionary Vanguard’ (1975,p20, progress publications) state;

“After Engels died the Right wing grew stronger and began exercising more influence on theory, policy and organisational questions. Social-Democracy’s election successes led to the fetishisation of elections as allegedly opening up unbounded possibilities for the working class. In effect the parliamentary faction set itself above Party and its leading organs. In the drive for votes the Right-wing leaders were prepared to deprive the Party of its working-class character”.

Parliamentarianism has led to some Communists incorrectly believing that you can change the Capitalist system via being elected to parliament. However, those who have been elected have found the reality quite different. The constitution of a Capitalist country provides for the continuation of Capitalism therefore Communists in Capitalist parliaments have often been drawn into participating in that particular Social Democratic system rather than making any discernible change towards Socialism. They have even been asked to participate in anti-worker legislation and policies.

According to Basmanov and Leibzon, comrades in Finland were at one time offered “Participation in government provided it abided by the acceptable ‘rules of the game’.

The Communists apparently accepted posts in government but soon had to resign when they found out that the so called ‘rules of the game’ meant they had to sell out the working class by pursuing “policies prejudicing the interests of the working classes”.

(Basmanov and Leibzon, 1977, 'The Revolutionary Vanguard' page 68, Progress Publications)

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels stated '*the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes*'.

The Capitalist class will not simply hand over the Capitalist system to a Socialist one, even if elected. In Chile a Socialist government under the leadership of Allende, was elected to government but was immediately overthrown by military means.

This 'fetishisation' of elections has caused the revisionists in Australia to make some suspect choices in regards to whom they should align themselves with in election campaigns. Individuals in the Communist movement have stood in alliances with the Trotskyites in municipal elections. These alliances have been detrimental because of the Left Sectarian nature of those organisations. To Trotskyites the subjective factor is always the prominent factor in causing a revolution; they don't look at the objective situation that is why they alienate the working class. They alienate the workers by silly, adventurist and sometimes even criminal activities. The Trotskyites in Australia often see their main aim to be the acquisition of publicity, to be arrested is often their immediate objective. They see the class struggle as an adventure and as many of them come from the middle classes, they often become politically conservative later in life. The workers in Australia are not attracted by these adventurist activities of the Left-Sectarians.

According to Basmanov and Leibzon,

"Notions of 'this left sectarian idea sprang from the idea that the vanguard was that part of the class which acted in isolation, did not lead the masses but, on the contrary, did the work for them'"... Trotskyists "consider it beneath their 'revolutionary dignity to study the processes taking place in the capitalist economy and do not take the trouble even to consider the state of the mass movements, the readiness of the working people for the decisive battle". ... "For the Trotskyists the objective factor is virtually non-existent...everything is reduced to how these parties are led".

(1977, 'The Revolutionary Vanguard', pages 32-50, Progress Publications)

The Trotskyites will often act without regard to the political/ideological/social environment. During a campaign regarding Aboriginal deaths in Custody in the 1980's, the John Pat campaign in Sydney, a group of Trotskyites suggested to the campaign committee that they should burn white effigies as part of the campaign. Fortunately on this occasion they were dissuaded from this activity however, Trotskyites are well known for such irresponsible and adventurous activities. They are also known for stacking meetings and mounting cynical takeovers of community/politically based organisations rather than working with such organisations and attempting to lead them ideologically. Trotskyites refer to this activity as enterism (Entryism). To be associated with this type of organisation has no advantages to a Communist movement and has the disadvantage of bringing Marxism into disrepute.

As Marx and Engels stated in the Communist Manifesto;

"The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties. Formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat".

Democratic Centralism and hegemonic Centralism;

"Unity of action, freedom of discussion and criticism";

(*Lenin, 1906, Discipline and the fight against the pro-cadet social democrats, proletary, no 8, November 23, 1906, Lenin collected works, volume 11, page 320*)

Communists around the world practice a form of democracy called Democratic Centralism. In Democratic Centralism all members of a Communist Party participate in the discussion and decision making process. As Lenin suggests above, under Democratic Centralism all members have the opportunity to take part in discussion and criticism however, once a decision has been made by the majority and collectively, people agree to act according to the majority decision.

The Greek Communist Party, the KKE, describe Democratic Centralism as follows on their website;

"The structure and operation of the CPG is based on the principle of democratic centralism. Democratic centralism ensures the Party the ability, through broad, free discussion, to generalise the views and experiences of Party members".

It continues on to describe what Democracy means as follows;

"Democracy within the party means: Equality of all Party members with respect to their rights and obligations. Ensuring the right to express their opinions freely and responsibly on all Party issues, in accordance with the Statutes. The electability and removability of leading bodies or members...Regular and extraordinary accountability to the organisations and conferences that elected them. Systematic, information of party organisations about their decisions. Ensuring the personal Contribution, initiative and responsibility of all Party members in making and implementing decisions...".

(Please note that this definition continues on to describe Democratic Centralism more fully.)

However, in some Communist Parties revisionists overtly emphasise discipline in isolation from Marxist –Leninist analysis, communication, discussion, criticism, self-criticism and Collective Decision making. Instead they instigate the practice of a hegemony styled Centralism in place of Democratic Centralism. Revisionists who favour Centralism often mistakenly believe that decisions are made by the leading bodies and all the members below, like worker bees, simply carry out decisions of these all-knowing gurus. However, under Democratic Centralism the general membership actively participate in discussion and also the decision making process.

This tendency of revisionist decision making is also a product of the Capitalist System. Many organisations under Capitalism, including Capitalist controlled unions and Social Democratic parties, have hierarchical type structures where decisions are made from a leader or small group down to the rest of the organisation. As people move into the Communist Parties they bring these experiences of the hierarchical form with them and sometimes find it difficult to alter their habits to a more collective approach. In Democratic Centralism the base organisations also take part directly in decisions and contribute to the centre prior to decisions being finalised. The highest party body under Democratic Centralism is always a representative body from the base organisation and conferences or congresses are considered the highest party body.

The revisionists place unity above and beyond adherence to Marxist-Leninist theory and practice resulting in calls for unity for unity's sake in place of unity in order to overthrow Capitalism. Often these calls for unity include calls for unity around reformism, around moves to reform the system instead of changing the Capitalist System. These revisionists are known to subject those who oppose their revisionism to show trials, unnecessary suspensions and other dubious and unwarranted disciplinary measures for the superficial protection of unity, in place of unity of Marxists in order to achieve the overthrow of Capitalism. These calls for unity often translate into calls to suppress any and all criticism and self-criticism, in other words in attempts to suppress constructive criticism. In this regard their behaviour mimics the behaviour of the left sectarian Trotskyites who frequently place members on show trials, blatantly criticise people in public and openly criticise each other in a furious and resentful manner on the internet.

This revisionist behaviour was exhibited in the older CPA under the leadership of L. Aarons. In the 1960's and 70's a struggle was being waged in the old CPA. According to Mallory (2002) there were three separate issues that led to the collapse of the old CPA as follows; one regarding Czechoslovakia, another being the idea of the 'Coalition of the left' and a third issue was the admittance of a very notorious Trotskyite by the name of Denis Freney.

Edgar Ross, along with other comrades, notably Judah Waten and others opposed the revisionism in the Old CPA.

According to Mallory;

"A National Committee meeting was held on 28-30 November 1969 to consider documents for the 22nd Congress that was to be held in 1970. A majority supported the principles enunciated in the documents, however a significant minority opposed them. Edgar Ross, a leader of the pro-Soviet group, criticised the documents for failing to mention Marxism-Leninism, the nationalisation of monopolies and the Soviet Union. On the question of the coalition of the left, the Party was criticised for placing the 'Left Wing' of the Labor Party on an equal footing with every other left group in society. A further point of criticism was that the term 'communist' never appeared in the document. Judah Waten, another pro-Soviet member, criticised the documents for outlawing organised activity in the Party that would lead to undermining majority decisions".

(Mallory, 2002, 'The Hummer vol. 3 no7. 'The Communist party of Australia, 1967-1975, the circumstances surrounding the formation of the Socialist Party o Australia').

Ross and Watt were eventually expelled from the Old CPA for arguing against this revisionism. Later the Socialist Party of Australia formed as a result of the split and the Old CPA dissolved because of continuing along this line of 'coalition of the left' and the revisionism that resulted.

All Marxist-Leninists would agree that discipline is extremely important however, discipline is only part of Democratic Centralism. Democratic Centralism also includes, as Lenin states, freedom of discussion and criticism. Lenin states;

"the proletariat does not recognise unity of action without the freedom to discuss and criticise".

(Lenin, 1906, Discipline and the fight against the pro-cadet social democrats, proletary, no 8, November 23, 1906, Lenin collected works, volume 11, page 320);

At the core of Democratic Centralism is collective decision making. As Lenin reveals above working class people will not respond to a leadership that does not include them in the actual decision making process. It is vitally important that a Communist Party includes their members in collective decision making, in this way unity will be reinforced by the fact that they have taken part.

However, revisionists tend to make their decisions in cliques or factions that meet outside of the collective meeting process and then pass these decisions onto committees often as *fait au complis*. In this way these people act as a Party within a Party and this is very damaging to both collective decision making and party unity as other members become resentful regarding the lack of interest and regard for their opinions and contributions.

The revisionists in Australia often call for unity whereas in reality they are the '*disrupters*' of "*unity under cover of outcries for unity*" (Lenin, page 247, Selected Works Volume 1 part 2). When revisionists call for 'unity' they mean unity around reformism. They block any attempt

to return to Marxist-Leninist principles by labelling Marxists as 'disrupters', 'negativists', and 'Left-Sectarians' who 'attack' the party.

Lenin states;

" ...the liquidators reject reformism as a principle, but in practice they adhere to it all along the line. They assure us, on the one hand, that for them reforms are not the be-all and end all, but on the other hand every time the Marxists go beyond reformism, the liquidators attack them or voice their contempt".

(paragraph 12, Marxism and Reformism, Pravada Truda No 2, 2 Sept 12, 1913, in Lenin Collected works progress publishers 1977)

Constructive Criticism

"A political party's attitude towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the Party is and how it fulfils in practice its obligations towards its class and the working people".

(Lenin, Left Wing Communism-an infantile Disorder, in ABC series progress publications, 'What is the Party?', 1986, page 66)

One of the many strengths of the Communist movement is our ability to scientifically analyse any political, socio-economic or humanitarian issues that may arise. Communists commonly practice constructive criticism, and criticism and self-criticism. In this way Communists can make appropriate choices for future actions, to recognise any mistakes and to set about making improvements. This should be an on-going process however, some people find this process confronting as in our competitive Capitalist Society people are encouraged to equate errors with failure. Making mistakes is simply a human characteristic, the greater error being not analysing and attempting to correct any errors of judgement or analysing the more current socio-economic situation. It is imperative that Communist parties guide new people through the process of constructive criticism. As Lenin stated at the 11th Congress:

"All revolutionary parties that have perished so far, perished because they became conceited, because they failed to see the source of their strength and feared to discuss their weaknesses" .

(Lenin, 1922, Eleventh Congress of the RCP (B), in ' What is the Party, 1986, page 66 Progress publications,)

Revisionists, particularly those of opportunistic nature, tend to identify any attempt to alter any document, policy or strategy as a threat to their power base and position, unless they are the persons who have proposed the alterations. Some of them feel comfortable with stagnation as they are from the middle classes and are not serious about wanting to make any change to the Capitalist system. They will actively oppose any step forward in the movement that doesn't include some form of glorification for them or the shoring up of

their position. They will identify any attempt to alter a party's direction as an attack on the party, even if the offered alteration is very clearly a positive change. Opportunists will react negatively to any criticisms, constructive or not. Those of opportunistic nature seek to retain their positions and will attack any person, with or without good theoretical positions in order to do so.

Constructive criticism should not be viewed as an attack on the party. Nor should party programs or the party constitutions be seen as static or bible like. They should not be viewed as documents that they can't be questioned, altered or even replaced. It is a strength of our Communist Movement, that we continually appraise our approach to problems, changing or altering our approach according to necessity within the guidelines of Marxism-Leninism. In this way we have an advantage over other political organisations that vehemently defend redundant policies and strategies. We do not have unity for unity's sake but unity of Marxists in order to overthrow the Capitalist System. We do not have unity around reformist, revisionist policies as this will only result in a continuation of the Capitalist System.

The Party Program

According to Basmanov and Leibzon 'the revolutionary vanguard';

"support any revolutionary movement directed against the system But they do not confine themselves to acting against that system, they give an action programme for the future".

(Basmanov and Leibzon, 1977, 'the revolutionary Vanguard', page 8, progress publications)

Unfortunately some Communist party programs are not "action" programmes "for the future", and instead are more like general policy documents where a range of reforms are mentioned. A policy document of this type is not in itself a useless document; it can be used for recruitment and as a guide on a range of our Party policies. However, these types of revisionist, reformist party programs are not the same type of Party Program as the Bolsheviks' Program, leading up to their successful revolution. The Bolshevik program was much more specifically a program of action, what the party will actually do in that political environment in order to take power.

In Lenin's draft programme of the R.S. D. L. P he sets out the Party programme as follows;

The "immediate task the overthrow of the tsarist autocracy and its replacement by a republic based on a democratic constitution that would ensure;

The peoples sovereignty ie. Concentration of supreme state power in the hands of a legislative assembly consisting of representatives of the people..."

(Lenin, 1902, 'Material for the Preparation of the programme of the RSDLP')

He then continues to set out how the Socialist government may be organised.

A party program in the RSDLP sense is a program of action. The programme that was adopted by the RSDLP was in place for 14 years until it was accomplished. These RSDLP programs would stay in place until the objective was achieved or was modified or changed if it was proved the objective was not achievable. At the time their program, to overthrow the Tsar, was put in place many comrades thought that this would only be achievable in the far distant future. The Bolsheviks were a small and relatively insignificant group at that time however, consistent work towards their major goal led to the goal being achieved within a relatively short period of time.

Of course an achievable goal in Australian conditions might be to nationalise the Australian Banks or to introduce an industry policy, or a policy for full employment to give just a few examples.

Unfortunately in some parties the direct goals appear to be the revisionist goals previously mentioned of ‘breaking the stranglehold of the two party system’ and ‘unity of the left’, into a ‘peoples government...’. These are revisionist policies because they set our foremost goal to involve ourselves in as Lenin states, the ‘*Petty policies*’ of the Capitalist government and of transforming “*the primary interest of the proletariat*” into pursuing Parliamentary solutions, “*to sacrifice these primary interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment...Such is the policy of revisionism*”.

(Lenin, 1908, *Marxism and Revisionism*, page 12, Progress Publications, 1980).

This revisionist idea of ‘Coalition of the Left’ forms part of the previous Communist Party of Australia’s program from 1975 as follows;

“*Such an organisation brings together class conscious individuals who support socialism. It draws together activists from a wide range of political movements and thereby assists in the construction of an alliance for socialism.*”

Here is this idea that we need a broad coalition of left ‘activists’ in order to fight for Socialism. Where is the working class in this idea about what the party is? What does it even mean regarding ‘a wide range of political movements’? It is obvious that falling into revisionism was a large part of the reason for the liquidation of the older Communist Party in Australia.

The Program of the RSDLP did have a preface, an explanation of policy, ideology and the political/economic environment of that period in history. This was later expanded when it was thought there was a need to educate workers and also as a reply to the opportunists who were attempting to influence workers at that time. However, the practical aspect of the Party Program of the RSDLP remained a dominant feature of the Party program.

Accordingly Lenin stated the following;

"The programme must formulate our basic views, precisely establish our immediate political tasks, point out the immediate demands that must show the area of agitational activity; give unity to the agitational work, expand and deepen it, thus raising it from fragmenting partial agitation for petty, isolated demands to the status of agitation for the sum total of Social Democratic demands".

(Lenin, 1899, 'A draft of Our Party Programme' Collected Works Volume 1, progress publishers, 1964).

Unfortunately some Party Programs consists largely of the preface section. Notably there are sometimes agreeable parts in these sections like some of the parts on the social reforms and on Socialism. However, the practical application areas are often scattered throughout the documents and are largely associated with this revisionist idea of forming a broad left, liberal democratic type government rather than a proletarian government.

As Lenin, 1899, states in his work entitled 'A Draft of Our Party Programme';

"The victory of socialism must not be connected, in principle, with the substitution of direct people's legislation for Parliamentarism".

However, we can't confuse the program with one in which every single practical aspect is planned out to the extreme, to the point where there is absolutely no room for any flexibility in regards to the implementation of the program. The program sets out the major objectives for that period until those have been achieved or until it is proved they are unattainable or altered. As Lenin continues to point out;

"We should strive therefore to avoid two extremes-on the one hand, we must not omit any one of the main, basic demands that hold great significance to the entire working class, and on the other we must not go into minute particulars with which it would hardly be rational to load the programme".

The Party Constitution

It is important for any organisation to have a strong party program and constitution. This is vitally important in regards to a Communist party in order to keep the party actively pursuing a change towards Socialism. A stronger Party program without revisionist policies but instead with Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, along with a strong constitution, can go a long way in preventing deviations from party policy like revisionism taking hold and overtaking a Communist party.

Of particular importance is to safeguard Democratic Centralism. A significant part of protecting Democratic Centralism is about protecting the rights of members. Weak constitutions will leave areas where it is possible for revisionists to manipulate situations in order to attack any Marxists in the Party. Having well set out and procedurally fair rules regarding the protection of members' rights is essential. It is important to have programs

that set out what exactly Democratic Centralism is along with the practicalities of how it works in that particular party.

The Greek Party, the KKE states on their website that Democracy means as follows;

“Democracy within the party means: Equality of all Party members, with respect to their rights and obligations. Ensuring the right to express their opinions freely and responsibly on all Party issues, in accordance with the Statutes. The electability and removability of leading bodies or members...Regular and extraordinary accountability to the organisations and conferences that elected them. Systematic, information of party organisations about their decisions. Ensuring the personal contributions, initiative and responsibility of all Party members in making and implementing decisions...”.

The KKE here mentions the accountability of leading organisations. The leadership should be accountable to the membership and not simply by the regular reporting of decisions but by the leadership actively seeking the opinions and ideas from the membership and even to have in place in the constitution at least some rules regarding how this is meant to occur. Often revisionists, particularly opportunists, will attempt to bypass this accountability and may instead participate in the withholding of important documents from committees or branch meetings, attempting to make decisions outside of collective meetings and the exclusion of individuals from activities or even meetings where the individual's activities are on the agenda. Some opportunists even attempt to use the meeting process to vilify individual members due to the lack of any rules regarding this in the constitution. It is important that constitutions include regulations to prevent these attempts to bypass Democratic Centralism. The following statement attempts to prevent such breaches of Democratic Centralism and comes from the constitution of the Communist Party of Canada in the ‘Rights and Duties of Members, Section One;

“Every member of the Communist Party in good standing has the right and duty to participate in formulating and carrying out the policies of the Party, including the right and duty to discuss any and all policies and tactics within the Party organization and in designated Party publications, the right to reserve their opinion in the event of disagreement with a decision or submit it to a leading committee, at the same time unconditionally carrying it out. Every Party member in good standing has the right to elect the Party’s leading committees and to criticize their work and composition. Every Party member in good standing has the right to be nominated and elected to all offices and committees as provided for by the Constitution. A Party member has the right to be present whenever decisions are taken regarding his or her activity or conduct, and the right to address any question or statement to any Party body, including the Central Committee and receive full information pertaining to the question.”

Note here it mentions the right of members to participate at every level, to have leaderships accountable to the members and to have procedural fairness by including the individual comrades in any discussions regarding their Party work.

In his work entitled 'Marxism and Reformism' Lenin states the following;

"Unlike the anarchists, the Marxists recognise struggle for reforms, i.e., for measures that improve the conditions of the working people without destroying the power of the ruling class. At the same time, however, the Marxists wage a most resolute struggle against the reformists, who directly or indirectly restrict the aims and activities of the working class to the winning of reforms. Reformism is bourgeois deception of the workers, who despite individual improvements will always remain wage-slaves, as long as there is the domination of capital...In Europe, reformism actually means abandoning Marxism and replacing it by bourgeois 'social policy'. In Russia, the reformism of the liquidators means not only that, it means destroying the Marxist organisation and abandoning the democratic tasks of the working class, it means replacing them by a Liberal-Labour policy".

(Lenin, 1913, Marxism and Reformism, Pravada Truda No 2, 12th Sept, 1913, Lenin Collected Works, Progress Publishers, 1977, paragraphs 1-13).

Without proper scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis, without the allowance for criticism and self-criticism, without opportunities for members to express their opinions for fear of retribution, we won't be able to lead the working class. The working class will not accept rule by hegemony, they will not accept being told to do something when they are not included in discussion and the decision making process and we will not be able to properly discern how to proceed without the input of our members. If we do not properly follow the decision making of the collective we condemn the party to Centralism, not Democratic Centralism. If we follow revisionist doctrine we condemn the working class to repeated struggles for the same reforms and a continuation of wage slavery under the Capitalist system. We need to exclude any revisionist tendencies from our Party programs and constitutions. We need to strengthen Marxism-Leninism and always to concentrate our efforts towards a change of system to Socialism.

Friday, 20 September, 2013

Brenda Kellaway.

Email contact; brendakellaway@hotmail.com

Postal contact; P.O. Box 367, Hamilton,

NSW, 2303. Australia.

