

35.405

7 DEC 1964
TORIA

The Australian Communist



A JOURNAL OF MARXISM-LENINISM

No. 8

PRICE: 1/6

CONTENTS

Hold High the Banner of The October Revolution	1
Lessons of China's 15th Year of Socialist Successes	4
Problems In Breaking Ideologically With Revisionism	13
More on Thornton's Errors Regarding Man and Nature	21
The Struggle For Unity In The Communist Movement	30
On The Theory of Marxism By V. I. Lenin — 1899	37
India, The Soviet Union and Some Lessons	40

Hold High the Banner of The October Revolution

In October, 1917 the Russian workers successfully stormed the heavens. They proved in practice the life-giving truths of Marxism-Leninism. They proved that the capitalist state must be smashed by the working class struggling for socialism: that the working class must establish its own state power; that the capitalists even when defeated would resort to force and violence against the working class to restore capitalism and even when defeated would never give up the struggle to restore capitalism.

Every principle of Marxism-Leninism was put to the acid test of practice and proved to be correct. Despite incredible hardship the Soviet workers consolidated their power under the leadership of the immortal Lenin.

Lenin charted an uncharted sea guided by the principles of Marx and Engels which he himself further developed. The acid test was practice. In the possession of the Soviet working class Marxism-Leninism became a material force. It conquered all difficulties. Under the leadership of Stalin the Soviet people had new brilliant victories. Marxism-Leninism withstood all practical tests and emerged ever stronger from the struggle against Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev.

Put to the supreme test of Word War II and guided by Marxism-Leninism the Soviet people won an epic victory and safeguarded the peoples of the world.

The October Revolution and the victory of the Soviet Union in the war inspired the mighty Chinese people in their struggle to liberate their own country and in 15 short years to emerge as a powerful socialist country.

The peoples of Eastern Europe under the inspiration of the October Revolution and the victories of the Soviet Union in World War II established socialism. Thus in the 47 short years since 1917 one third of the peoples of the world have embraced socialism — a mighty inspiration to the oppressed peoples in the capitalist and colonial world.

Marxism-Leninism the all conquering weapon of the October Revolution has been reviled and refuted by Khrushchov and those who follow him.

The principles of Marxism-Leninism so brilliantly portrayed and vindicated by the October Revolution must be continually fought for. The bourgeoisie keeps them under constant attack. Staunch men and women imbued with the lofty Marxist-Leninist ideology continually reassert the truths of Marxism-Leninism and continually strive to strengthen the grip of Marxism-Leninism on the masses.

Experience demonstrates that the victory of Marxism-Leninism, the demonstration of its truth by the October Revolution does not automatically guarantee the victory of socialism.

Stalin was indeed a great Marxist-Leninist and nothing can tarnish the splendid leadership he gave the Soviet people, but he paid insufficient attention to equipping ever wider circles of the people with Marxism-Leninism, and insufficient attention to combatting those aspects of Soviet society influenced by the remnants of capitalism.

Socialism and the victory of Marxism-Leninism must be continually fought for. Any remission of the struggle for them opens the way to the strongly entrenched ideology of the bourgeoisie.

In the great Soviet Union product of the October Revolution Khrushchov, the foulest revisionist of all time came to the top. Every single concept of Marxism-Leninism he "brought up to date" i.e. he revised from Marxism its revolutionary essence.

In the name of communism he attacked Communism — Marxism-Leninism. He represented, and his circle still represents, the corrupt non-Communist elements who have emerged in the Soviet Union, i.e. the bourgeoisie within the Soviet Union and bourgeois influence within the Soviet Union.

In the very country of the victory of the October Revolution it is necessary for the Marxist-Leninists to wage anew the struggle for the victory of Marxism-Leninism and to defeat revisionism. They are faced with a long and difficult struggle. It is indeed a warning of what happens when the struggle for the victory of Marxism-Leninism is not waged continuously and to the end.

Within the great Chinese People's Republic the principles of Marxism-Leninism are the possession of the masses, their purity is consistently fought for. There is no remission in the struggle to uphold the banner of Marxism-Leninism; no remission in the struggle to combat bourgeois elements and bourgeois influences. The great Communist Party of China, headed by the greatest living Marxist-Leninist, Mao Tse-tung, proudly holds aloft the

banner of Marxism-Leninism. That banner rallies and reinforces the peoples throughout the world.

The Communist Party of China firmly holds aloft the principles of the October Revolution and rallies the people of the world against their desertion by the modern revisionists.

Khrushchov and his clique have done untold harm to the victory achieved by the October Revolution but they can never destroy Marxism-Leninism, nor the historic significance of the October Revolution.

Shoulder to shoulder with Marxist-Leninists the world over, Australian Marxist-Leninists will ensure the purity and victory of Marxism-Leninism and keep untarnished the glory of the October Revolution.

All mankind will be liberated along the path revealed by the October Revolution: Australia itself will be a splendid member of the world community of socialist nations.

On this 47th anniversary of the October Revolution all Marxist-Leninists will redouble their efforts for the victory of Marxism-Leninism.

Correction . . .

In the article "The Mass of Confusion Labelled 'Arena'" published in the last issue of *The Australian Communist* — No. 7 there were some misprints which altered the meaning of parts of the article.

On page 43 the paragraph commencing "Evidently 'Comrade Sharp'" should read "Evidently 'Comrade Sharp'" is unaware of the full treatment Engels gave to the **bourgeoisification** of the English working class, etc."

On page 45 the paragraph commencing "Evidently he thinks we should" should read: "Evidently he thinks we should not be EVEN to such gentlemen as Johnson and Home, etc."

On page 46 the paragraph commencing "The above does not mean" should read in the latter part: "It does not mean that a great struggle is NOT waged, etc."

On the same page the second line of the last paragraph should read "recognises that the development of former colonies does require an agrarian revolution, etc."

We apologise for these errors which altered the meaning of portions of the article.

Lessons of China's 15th Year of Socialist Successes

Last month the people of China celebrated with joy, happiness and enthusiasm the fifteenth anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China.

These fifteen years have seen great and glorious achievements in the building of socialism. The New Democratic revolution in China of 1949 was the most world-shaking event since the Russian Socialist Revolution.

The victory of the Chinese revolution was a victory for the road of October a victory for Marxism-Leninism. The Chinese Revolution breached the eastern front of imperialism, extended the influence of the October Socialist Revolution and promoted and developed the national democratic revolutionary struggle in various countries. It dealt a heavy blow to international imperialism.

The Chinese Revolution greatly strengthened the socialist camp and stimulated the great upsurge of the national liberation movements.

This article will discuss not so much the production figures of socialist construction in China but will deal more with the political and ideological campaigns which have inspired and consolidated the economic advances.

China's great achievements in socialist revolution and socialist construction are linked with the widespread and effective socialist education given to the mass of the people. It is necessary to educate workers throughout the entire historical period of the proletarian dictatorship.

In socialist society the class struggle continues even though the economic system has been transformed. This is particularly so as imperialism still exists in the world and is continually trying to undermine socialist construction. The reactionary forces still remaining in a socialist country have links with imperialism and, although overthrown will not accept defeat. They present a constant challenge and try to make a comeback. To help this aim imperialism acts on the ideological front. By propagating old reactionary ideas (which die hard) it tries to poison and corrupt the working class with and restore bourgeois ways of life as a base for a counter revolutionary comeback. The servants of reaction help with ideas of "peaceful evolution".

The modern revisionists, in order to blunt the revolutionary consciousness of workers, sing the praises of class collaboration, pacifism and spontaneous advance of the workers and, in a one-sided way, emphasise the value of individual "material incentive". Trying to coexist with the class enemy in both the ideological and political spheres they seek to bring about economic degeneration which leads to the restoration of capitalism.

In this class struggle any weakening of proletarian ideology means a growth of bourgeois ideology.

In the 15 years of China's socialist construction a distinguishing feature has been the concentrated attention on placing working class politics in the primary position. Politics have been in command. The large-scale socialist educational movements have constantly deepened the revolutionary consciousness of the people.

During the period of economic rehabilitation (1949-52) the masses were liberated from the oppression of old China and an economic and ideological struggle was waged against landlords, city bosses and traitors to the working class.

The workers were considerably influenced by old ideas, old habits and lacked a clear understanding of the new society and the new way of things. It was necessary to give elementary political education about the history of the development of society, how practice is the source of knowledge, how class society originated and developed, and the design of labor.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party mass movements were launched in 1952 on the eve of embarking on planned economic development. One was against corruption, waste, and bureaucracy, and the other against capitalist bribery of workers, tax evasion, cheating on Government contracts, theft of state property and stealing economic information from Government forces. These were mass political campaigns which were needed to consolidate the gains of the revolution, help the smooth progress of national construction and take the offensive against the attacks of the capitalists.

The active participation of the workers with nation-wide discussion on how the capitalist class exploits them, deepened class consciousness and created favourable grounds for the launching of a movement to increase production and practice economy, and for large scale economic construction.

By 1957 guided by the general line of the Communist Party, the country had successfully completed the transition period

of socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts, and capitalist industry and commerce. This great victory on the economic front could not have been gained without victory on the ideological and political fronts. At this time, under the influence of the international current of anti-communism and modern revisionism, the bourgeois rightists at home launched an attack on the Communist Party and the people. The Party and the people met this challenge with the development of a campaign throughout the country.

This anti-rightist struggle succeeded in dealing a smashing defeat to the bourgeoisie and greatly strengthened the workers understanding of the class struggle.

These events demonstrated clearly to the workers that the overthrown classes will stage a come-back whenever an opportunity presents itself and the question of "who will win" on the political, ideological field will only be settled after a long period of repeated class struggle.

Continuing the ideological struggle the people throughout the country launched a campaign for rectification, self-education and self-remoulding. During this campaign the difference between the bourgeoisie and the socialist world outlook was shown in order to develop a socialist outlook towards labor. This was followed by education of the general line for building socialism "going all out, and aiming high to achieve greater, better, more economical results in building socialism."

Holding high the red banner of the general line, the workers strode forward confidently. The ideological foundation laid during those years enabled the workers to overcome successfully the difficulties brought about by three consecutive years of natural calamities.

In 1958 a new movement was launched — "To compare, learn, catch up with the advanced and help those lagging behind". The campaign represented a high level in economic, political and ideological work. On the economic side it was organised around the tasks of increasing output, improving quality, widening the range of products, raising labour productivity, cutting cost and speeding up the accumulation of capital. This movement although developing slowly in the first year has now become better organised, has reached a new level and has grown into a broad movement embracing the great majority of enterprises and workers and has become universal in the mass movement in industry.

The key link in this movement is to compare ones-self and one's activities with others so as to ascertain where one lags behind the more advanced. This inevitably reveals the gap in one's performance and reveals the best method by comparison of levels of output, quality efficiency, production costs, management, political and ideological work with more advanced individuals and enterprises. For example, two hundred thousand workers are taking part in this campaign in the Liaoning Province alone. Thirty thousand workers from all over the country have gone to learn fore efficient methods from their counterparts in Shanghai.

By pooling the experiences of all experts in certain fields production problems are swiftly solved and advanced experiences popularized. In the movement it is not only necessary to replace obsolete methods of production with the advanced, but progressive ideas must prevail over backward ones, all kinds of ideological obstacles must be overcome, and the initiative of the masses brought into full play. Such a mass movement cannot develop spontaneously. Without the thinking of Comrade Mao Tse-tung and the line and principles and policies of the Chinese Communist Party all these mass movements are unthinkable.

The movement "to compare, learn, catch up and help" is the result of applying in the mass movement of production the law of unity of opposites. The application of dialectical materialism brings into clear relief the contradictions between the advanced and the backward and the gap between. With a better understanding of the reasons for the gaps the people can take measures to resolve the contradictions, close the gaps and improve production. This is simply the application of Marxist dialectics in economic construction, a method consistently advocated by the Chinese Communist Party.

It is in the climate of this great campaign and previous campaigns that the great debate on modern revisionism and Marxism-Leninism is taking place in China. The Communist Party is publishing all material for and against Marxism. The people understand the debate and hence see the theories of revisionism as a weapon of imperialism and reaction to subvert the ideals of Marxism-Leninism in socialist construction and prepare for the restoration of capitalism.

These contradictions in the working class movement are met very effectively in the practice of this present campaign "to compare, learn, catch up and help". The reverse can be seen in the Yugoslav economy which, under guise of socialism, is in fact capitalist. The 15 years of socialist construction in China has given a great lesson to the whole working class, and the

experiences gained have added enormously to the treasury of Marxism. These great gains for socialism have been achieved by the correct, all-sided application of Marxism in socialist construction, the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the correct leadership of a Marxist-Leninist party basing itself on the masses, the makers of history.

In some socialist countries there has been one-sided concentration on economic development and the ideological, political side of the struggle for socialist construction has been relegated to the background. This has its basis in the incorrect concept that the class struggle within the country has ended. Once there is any relaxation in ideological and political work, economic and political work will go astray. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said: "Political work is the life blood of all economic work". To give all attention to production and technique in socialist construction is a form of economism in socialist construction and if enterprises rely solely on "material incentives" to stimulate workers' initiative this will bring about a progressive lessening of the revolutionary initiative of the workers and an unhindered growth of bourgeois individualism.

It brings about a weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat and also reduces the role of leadership of the Communist Party. It is, therefore, no accident that modern revisionism has found fertile grounds of development in some socialist countries. The proposition of the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. of the "State of the whole people and a party of the whole people" is the absurd outcome of the failure to develop the ideological struggle in socialist construction.

The modern revisionists talk much about the peaceful road to socialism, the great power and attractiveness of socialist economic development. They say, in distorting the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems that the power of these great advances in socialist economy will create mass movements in the capitalist countries and the monopoly capitalists will hand over state power.

This rubbish is only another side of the social democratic theories of "peaceful evolution". History has refuted this anti-Marxist idea. Finland, a capitalist country, has had a common frontier with the Soviet Union since the October Revolution but still remains a capitalist state. The people of Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, with common frontiers were likewise changed only through revolutionary action of the people with the assistance of the Red Army. It is utter nonsense, a betrayal of

revolutionary Marxism to propagate the ideas of "peaceful evolution" and complete disregard of the power of the monopoly capitalists state machine. This is meant to create passivity among the workers and subvert the revolutionary struggle.

The emphasis the Chinese Communist Party places on the ideological political struggle means to educate the mass of the workers in the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism, to give them a firm class stand and correct political orientation. This is the best guarantee of victory in the struggle against bourgeois ideas, corruption and counter-revolutionary activities.

One of the primary tasks facing a socialist country is the education of the youth. In China the task has been taken up of educating the youth in the spirit of China's revolutionary traditions, developing a bitter hatred of imperialism, including revisionism.

At the same time consideration is given to the reality that the young people came from different strata of society. They have been brought up in conditions of peace and stability, and because of this it is easy to lapse into a false sense of peace and tranquillity and to look for a life of ease and security. This is understandable as they have not experienced the severe tests of the revolutionary struggle and lack an understanding of the exacting demands of the revolutionary struggle.

The youth become an easy prey to the corrupting influences of bourgeois ideology and it is inevitable that new bourgeois revisionist elements will crop up among young people. Therefore, class education is necessary to young people who grow up in socialist society.

Lenin pointed out "It (the youth) can learn communism only by linking up every way in its studies, training and education, with the continuous struggle the proletarians and toilers are waging against the old exploiting society". Chairman Mao Tse-tung has said. "It is necessary to strengthen the class education of the youth to ensure that the revolution in our country will not be perverted in generations to come".

This historic direction charts the Communist Youth League of China. Its youth work is based on the standpoint of proletarian class education to arm the youth with a Marxist-Leninist class viewpoint, a mass viewpoint, a labor viewpoint, a dialectical materialist viewpoint, in other words with the communist world outlook of Mao Tse-tung's thinking.

The revisionist line is based on the standpoint of class reconciliation and liquidation of the revolution; the corruption of the revolutionary will of the young people, with the deceptive paci-

fism and humanism of the bourgeois and bourgeois individualism in order to do everything possible to draw the young people away from the path of revolution and even lead them onto the path of opposing the revolution.

The Chinese attitude to socialist education is to arm the youth with Marxist-Leninist teachings on class struggle; the revisionist to corrupt youth with policies of class collaboration which means capitulation to the bourgeoisie.

The mass socialist education practised throughout China of course includes socialist education of the youth. Intensive use is being made of the history of the revolutionary struggles acquainting them with the life before revolution, the oppression of the landlords, etc.

The great practical experience of the question of agriculture in socialist construction in China has developed an entirely new page in the treasury of Marxism-Leninism. Marx many times explained his view on the correct relationship between agriculture and other branches of industry under capitalist conditions. He wrote, "The number of workers employed in industry, etc. and completely released from agriculture is fixed by the quantity of agricultural products which the agricultural workers produce over and above their own consumption". He also wrote "in fact all production of surplus value and thus all development of capital has for its natural basis the productiveness of agricultural labor".

As the Chinese point out this means that agriculture is the foundation of the development of the natural economy and that the growth of capitalist industry is conditioned by agricultural development.

An insoluble contradiction exists between agriculture and industry in capitalist society based on capitalist private property. Agriculture is the foundation of the development of the national economy. Is this law still valid in socialist society? Not only valid but even more important. After the October Revolution Lenin pointed out "in as much as our international situation has improved, all political questions become focussed on one point, doing all we can to raise agricultural productivity. An increase in that activity is bound to lead to an improvement in our industrial development".

The Central Committee of the C.P.C. and Mao Tse-tung have always attached great importance to agriculture. He said: "All China is a great agricultural country with over eighty per cent of its population in the villages, its industry and agriculture must

be developed simultaneously. Only then will industry have raw materials and a market and only so will it be possible to accumulate fairly large funds for the building of a powerful heavy industry. The entire economy will benefit if we can achieve and win greater growth of agriculture and thus induce a correspondingly greater development in light industry. With the development of agriculture and light industry, heavy industry will be assured and its markets and funds thus grow faster".

It is over five years since the communes were brought into being. This is just a movement in history. But even in this short period, they have shown their unrivalled superiority and made great achievements. Since their establishment the communes and their production brigades and teams have followed the distribution income principle of "from each according to his ability to each according to his work".

"Social being determines man's consciousness". The peoples communes, a new social institution, are bringing about a new revolution in the minds of the peasant masses. Reliance on the collective effort and love of the collective is becoming more and more a wide-spread, deep-rooted social practice. There has been a tremendous growth of the communist spirit. The developed mentality of the peasants over long periods of private ownership is being quickly transformed. This is of great significance and a guarantee of the victory of socialism and the future transition to communism in China.

The communes have been singled out by revisionists for unscrupulous and violent attacks. These attacks reveal the difference between the line of Marxism-Leninism and that of bourgeois policy towards socialist agriculture and socialist construction.

In celebrating the 15th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the international situation is developing very favourably for the people of China and the peoples of other Socialist countries and the oppressed peoples.

The struggle against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys has developed to new heights in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The working people in the capitalist countries have made new gains in their struggle against monopoly capitalism. As long as the system of exploitation of man by man continues revolutionary struggle is bound to grow.

The contradictions within the imperialist camp are becoming more acute day by day. The peoples struggles are being waged

against U.S. imperialism and its aggression and its attempts to dominate the world are being defeated. People all over the world are seeing U.S. imperialism as the most vicious enemy and more and more it is becoming isolated. The struggle being waged by the people against U.S. nuclear war preparations and nuclear blackmail in defence of peace has never been broader.

On the 15th anniversary we greet the great Chinese people for their unswerving and glorious struggle against U.S.A. imperialism and the inspiration they have given to the colonial people in their struggle against the imperialists and all reactionaries and the revolutionary struggles of all oppressed peoples of the world.

The Chinese people, holding high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism have done their utmost to preserve the unity of the socialist camp. The Chinese people have striven for peaceful co-existence with countries of different social systems and have upheld the five peace principles of Bandung.

This is the very reason why the imperialist and all reactionaries have centred their hatred on the Chinese people.

The attempts to isolate China and "bring her to her knees" are in vain.

The Chinese people, led by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party of China and Comrade Mao Tse-tung and guided by the general line for building socialism, will continue relying on their own strength.

The greatly-inspired enthusiasm for socialist construction has brought into play the initiative of the broad mass of the peasantry who demanded large scale capital construction on the farms, diversified economy and an end to agricultural backwardness. The people's communes introduce large scale, co-operative farming and make better use of natural resources. They are a new form of social organisation. They are successful, they meet the needs of the concrete situation in China.

Problems In Breaking Ideologically with Revisionism

The reconstruction of the communist movement in Australia resulted in the formation of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) and the struggle for a complete break from revisionism ideologically, politically and organisationally. The Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) is in its infancy and it is necessary continuously to sum up its experiences and development.

To break with revisionism politically is not so difficult. It became apparent to many people that the policies of revisionism were a complete departure from Marxism-Leninism and were fraught with grave danger to the working class and working people in their struggle for emancipation. It was not so difficult to see that on a world scale Khrushchov, the leader of international revisionism was collaborating with U.S. imperialism. Khrushchov's praise of Eisenhower, Kennedy and then Johnson as "men of peace" and "reasonable men" when in reality they were and are the leaders of the most vicious imperialism, made it fairly clear to large numbers of people that there was something wrong.

When that was reciprocated by the representatives of that same vicious U.S. imperialism in praise of Khrushchov as the best leader the Soviet Union ever had, as the initiator of the "winds of change" blowing through the socialist world and when the capitalist stockmarkets fell catastrophically on a report of Khrushchov's death, it was obvious that the capitalist class headed by the U.S. imperialists loved Khrushchov. When a Communist is loved by the imperialists then most certainly many people see that there is something wrong.

This is not to mention the clear fraud of the so-called Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (since the date of which the U.S. imperialists have made more than 25 nuclear bomb tests); the fraud of the so-called hot line between Moscow and Washington; the fraud of the ban on the use of outer space for nuclear weapons. All these things were presented by Khrushchov as great contributions to peace whereas in reality they are direct contributions to war because they protect and conceal the instigators of war — U.S. imperialism. The real activities of those

U.S. imperialists are, for example, against Cuba with Khrushchov's assistance towards U.N. (really U.S. imperialist) "inspection" — fortunately foiled; the actual intensified attacks on Vietnam after Khrushchov had obligingly said that the Soviet Union although a co-chairman with Britain of the participant nations in the Geneva conference wished to disengage itself from South East Asia; the actual backing of U.S. imperialism of Indian aggression against socialist China — aggression fully and actually backed by Khrushchov. Then the plans of Khrushchov to sacrifice the socialist gains of the German people to the U.S. imperialist backed West Germany were paralleled only by his treacherous activity in collusion with Tito to destroy socialism in Hungary in 1956 in the interests again of U.S. imperialism — plans which were at least partially foiled. All these things have awakened the people — the more so since the defeat of Khrushchov within the Soviet Communist Party.

In Australia, the revisionist policy of following and supporting all these moves of Khrushchov has awakened many Australian people. It is paralleled by class collaboration in the trade unions; preaching of the parliamentary road to socialism; degeneration of the "Tribune" and "Guardian" into extremely poor and superficial commentaries on passing events; abrogation of people's struggle, etc. The activities of the Australian revisionists have awakened many people to the need to restudy Marxism-Leninism and to restore it to its proper place as the most treasured possession of the working class.

Thus to break from this sort of thing politically was not so difficult. Nor, broadly speaking, is it so difficult to put forward a correct political line. Naturally mistakes are made in this too — mistakes that must be frankly faced. Speaking, however, in a general way, up to date the Communist Party of Australia (M-L) has put forward a correct political line. It has made mistakes and has not been adequate in dealing with many questions. But it has drawn a certain line of demarcation between itself and the revisionists.

The political break is really subordinate to the ideological break and to achieve an ideological break with revisionism is much more difficult. Politics and organisation are governed by ideology. There are some ideas that to make a political break and to set up another organisation with a new name achieves the objective. That is quite wrong and would soon result in a case of the old firm under a new name. The break on all three fronts — ideological, political and organisational —

needs actual fighting for — it is not something that comes of itself. As we have said, it is not so difficult to make a break politically (if one can for the moment isolate politics). That is for various reasons some of which we have outlined and another of which is the splendid political line of the Communist Party of China. The Communist Party of China has a splendid ideology and flowing from that a splendid political line and a splendid organisational line. It inspires all Marxist-Leninists and, indeed, all oppressed people.

The mastery of ideology, politics and organisation has been a long and protracted struggle in the history of the Chinese Communist Party and it goes on at this moment and will continue to go on.

The task for Australian Marxist-Leninists is to equip themselves fully, ideologically, politically and organisationally. The main battle must be fought on the field of ideology. Only the independent cultivation of Marxism-Leninism — the ideology of the working class will guarantee correct politics and organisation. The cultivation of a Marxist-Leninist ideology requires protracted study and struggle. Bourgeois ideology is much older than working class ideology; it is very strongly entrenched. Our education as children, our whole environment is imbued with bourgeois ideology. Against this ideology working class ideology has arisen. Whereas bourgeois ideology justifies ruthless exploitation by the tiny minority of the big majority, justifies imperialist war, justifies force and violence against the working class, working class ideology opposes all these things and all the foul consequences of them. Marxism-Leninism — the world outlook of the workers is to class — demonstrates that the supreme task of the workers is to emancipate mankind from exploitation and oppression. It permits of no selfishness nor pettiness.

It demands selfless people who put the interests of the working class and working people before everything else — above any personal or group consideration.

Only the working class and working people can face the future fearlessly for they have nothing to lose but their chains as Marx and Engels pointed out in the 1848 Communist Manifesto. The working class has the noble mission of establishing a classless society from which everything that is foul will be eliminated. Only those who really put aside all selfish considerations, all pettiness, all the adverse influences of capitalism and really imbue themselves with the working class ideology of Marxism-Leninism can effectively lead the workers in their struggle for emancipa-

tion. Continually bourgeois ideology and influences will press in on the Marxist-Leninists. Continually pressures towards the heritage from capitalism of selfishness, arrogance, group interests will operate to pull them back. Love of the workers and working people — hatred of the enemies of the workers and working people — based upon Marxist-Leninist ideology will offset the evil heritage of the past. But it is not easy. It requires the frank facing of the past, the frank facing of these influences, far-reaching search into why we fall back; why we fail; why we do not attain the selflessness that Marxism-Leninism demands of us. No sacrifice, no inconvenience is too much for the great cause of Marxism-Leninism. Dialectical materialism reveals all the laws of society and nature. Revelation of those laws has placed in the hands of the workers an indispensable weapon to free themselves and, in freeing themselves, freeing all oppressed mankind. That is a goal for which it is worth giving one's whole life. The acquisition of a Marxist-Leninist ideology is not merely imbibing deeply of the Marxist-Leninist classics. That is absolutely essential but it is also a question of careful cultivation of a Marxist-Leninist outlook by each individual Marxist-Leninist assisted by each other Marxist-Leninist. It requires the full-sided integration of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete reality of the conditions in which we live. It requires the frank facing and overcoming of our shortcomings and failures — mutual help in this process. It requires the summing up of our progress in the acquisition of a Marxist-Leninist ideology for this is a long process and never attains perfection. By proper, mutual assistance big steps can be taken to develop a strong Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Ideology governs politics and organisation. About politics we have already written. Now let us say a few words on organisation.

The organisation of the old Communist Party serves its ideology — the ideology of the bourgeoisie. Its organisation has evolved into an organisation which is dominated by its political line of the peaceful, parliamentary transition to socialism — a reflection of bourgeois ideology. Its organisation concretely, specifically serves two main political considerations — parliamentary elections and trade union politics (non-revolutionary trade union politics). In other words, it serves bourgeois ideology and politics. Of course, Marxist-Leninists and the Marxist-Leninist party in a country such as Australia must pay close attention to parliamentary elections and trade union matters, but from a point of view fundamentally different from that of the old Communist Party.

Moreover, those two matters are part only of a many sided revolutionary struggle. Extremely important as they are, the parliamentary and trade union struggles are but two aspects of life and are part of the revolutionary struggle which absolutely must embrace all sections of the working people and must embrace to use Lenin's phrase "all other spheres and sides of social life and work in all of them in a new way".

Hence the Marxist-Leninist party must have an organisation which can operate in all spheres and sides of social life and which is not subordinate to parliamentary elections. It must be an organisation with its whole emphasis on winning the masses for Communism, wherever the masses are. Its members must be engaged in mass work. As a party it must have myriad connections with the masses and all the threads of mass work drawn together and directed under the leadership of its Central Committee. It must be an organisation capable of carrying out that mass work in all conditions, legal and illegal, secret and open, and taking special account of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie which is exercised in Australia under a constitutional monarchy — really bourgeois democracy. It must be an organisation which scientifically works out the activity of its members and certainly not the activity of its members commencing and centring on the collection of finance, selling a party newspaper and now and again participating in a parliamentary election. It must be an organisation that pays not less but more attention to the trade unions but in a correct revolutionary way. It must pay not less but more attention to parliamentary elections but in a correct scientific revolutionary way. Those things really must arise out of its mass work carried out in all "spheres and sides of social life" and working in them in a new way.

In Left Wing Communism Lenin said: "Everyone will agree that an army which does not train itself to wield all arms, all means and methods of warfare that the enemy possesses or may possess is behaving in an unwise or even in a criminal manner. This applies to politics to a greater degree than it does to war. In politics it is harder to forecast what methods of warfare will be applied and be useful for us under certain future conditions. Unless we are able to master all means of warfare, we stand the risk of suffering great and sometimes decisive defeat if the changes in the position of the other classes, which we cannot determine, will bring to the front forms of activity in which we are particularly weak.

"If, however, we are able to master all means of warfare, we shall certainly be victorious, because we represent the interests of the really advanced, of the really revolutionary class, even if circumstances do not permit us to use weapons that are most dangerous for the enemy, weapons that are most quickly death dealing. Inexperienced revolutionaries often think that legal methods of struggle are opportunist because in this field the bourgeoisie most frequently (especially in 'peaceful' non-revolutionary times) deceived and fooled the workers, and they think that illegal methods of struggle are revolutionary. But this is not true. What is true is that the opportunists and the traitors to the working class are those parties and leaders who are not able or who do not want to (don't say: you cannot; say: you won't) apply illegal methods of struggle in conditions such as those which prevailed, for example, during the imperialist war of 1914-1918, when the bourgeoisie of the freest democratic countries deceived the workers in the most impudent and brutal manner and prohibited everyone from speaking the truth about the predatory character of the war.

"But revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with **every** form of legal struggle are very poor revolutionaries. It is not difficult to be a revolutionary when the revolution has already flared up and is raging, when everybody joins the revolution simply because he is carried away by it, because it is the fashion, and sometimes even because it might open the way for a career. After the victory, the proletariat has to exert extreme effort, to suffer pain and one might say martyrdom to 'liberate' itself from such sorry revolutionaries.

"It is much more difficult — and much more useful — to be a revolutionary when the conditions for direct, open, really mass and really revolutionary struggle **do not yet exist**, to be able to defend the interests of the revolution (by propaganda, agitation and organisation) in non-revolutionary bodies and even in down-right reactionary bodies, in non-revolutionary circumstances, among the masses who are incapable of immediately appreciating the need for revolutionary methods of action. The main task of contemporary Communism in Western Europe and America is to acquire the ability to seek, to find, to determine correctly the concrete path on the particular turn of events that will **bring** the masses **right up** to the real, decisive, last, just revolutionary struggle". (Lenin Vol. 10, 12 Selected Works PP 139-140).

Its members must work in the sphere of mass work most appropriate to them — continually seek to broaden the numbers

of their friends, of sympathisers to the party and of party members. More and more friends (non-communist) in more and more mass organisations, more and more sympathisers to the party in more and more mass organisations and more members to the party. Work out from the party. Our party members must not be torn from this type of work — the ordinary natural sphere of their life in a mass organisation, in a factory to engage in so-called "party work" the beginning and end of which is collecting money, selling papers and participating in a parliamentary election. There must be more money collected, more papers sold and more effective, scientific participation in elections. The old sort of work means no non-communist friends, means no scientific mass work, means revolving in a narrow circle of party members and close supporters. It is sectarian in the true sense of the word — revolving in a sect. Nor should our party members be cut off from people in a given mass organisation or factory or sphere of life by proclaiming their Communism where the only effect that will have is to cut them off from the masses. That too, is crude in the extreme.

Communism can be brought to the masses in many, many ways and it is commonly a long, protracted and difficult struggle with many twists and turns. But if your Party organisation is designed to serve parliament—the parliamentary road to socialism as the predominant road (and it **must** be predominant if you conceive of parliament as the vehicle of change) then, of course, it is correct to have an organisation which simply preaches a version of Communism in the abstract and members who do that and nothing else. They do not **work** at winning the masses for Communism for that must be worked for in the given conditions in all spheres of life.

To impose the proclamation of communism in parliamentary elections as the predominant form of work and to base organisation on it is skipping over stages of development of the revolutionary movement — it is rank sectarianism.

Hence to repeat — correct organisation means an organisation with myriad ties with the masses over the complete range of the community. The form of their ties will vary from sphere to sphere. Infinite skill, infinite patience is called for. Revolutionary steadfastness, devotion, Marxist-Leninist ideology of the highest order will maintain and sustain members in those spheres where the immediate rewards of this painstaking work are hard to discern. They will perseveringly work to win friends, sympathisers, party members (perhaps not even attaining that) knowing

that their work is going into the inexorable maturing of a revolutionary situation and being prepared to take full advantage of it when it occurs.

It is impossible to deal with all the details of this nor indeed is it desirable for only communists thoroughly equipped ideologically and politically with Marxism-Leninism can determine in concrete practice the correct step forward. Moreover, in the conditions of bourgeois democracy in the capitalist countries a correct Communist organisational line remains to be worked out.

Therefore, there is very much to be learned—very much trial and error. But a correct organisational line must be fought for and every ideological pressure drawing us back to the old must be resisted.

The break with revisionism must be fought for and won ideologically, politically and organisationally and each aspect of it demands a very determined struggle. If one can separate them in our conditions the emphasis must be on the struggle to improve our ideology and the struggle to build an organisation of a type completely different from that of the old party. Imbued with Marxism-Leninism there is no doubt we will be successful.

More On Thornton's Errors Regarding Man And Nature

The thoroughly Marxist-Leninist proposition that man's will is part of objective reality has stung the revisionists, very hard apparently. Eric Thornton has replied at length to our criticism of his first article in the September Communist Review and in the same issue L. Harry Gould in his "Philosophy Corner" attempts to refute the brilliant speech of Chou Yang entitled "The Fighting Task Confronting Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences".

We advise readers to read Chou Yang and then L. Harry Gould. Both Gould and Thornton, like all the modern revisionist "theoreticians", avoid discussing the realities of to-day in the light of dialectical materialism, the philosophical foundation of the Communist movement.

They throw a "theoretical" ring around the discussion and try to confine it to their own erroneous theories of peaceful co-existence and unity. This is at the heart of the matter. When E. F. Hill correctly stated that man's will is a part of objective reality he did so in passing as it were, and only to underline his main thesis that our job is not merely to understand the world, but to change it.

This simple, easily understandable and true statement has touched off a storm. And as the revisionists expound on the matter it becomes more clearly revealed that at the bottom of their thinking is a repugnance of revolution, a pessimistic attitude not untouched by fear, and certainly an absence of confidence in the masses.

Early in his article Thornton says: "Will is action", says our Hillite, forgetting all about the numberless, daily-repeated cases of a man's will being incapable of realisation in practice, or even in any action at all. Capitalist society is replete with frustrated impotent will. Evidently the Hill group recognises only that will which is expressed in action; what then, would they have called the state of mind of the French Resistance fighter, bound and gagged before a Nazi firing squad? Had he no will to live, no will for the liberation of his country, because he was no longer able to act? And not all action is the result of will, some actions are involuntary, as in our reflexes, or in people under the influence of drugs".

It is not necessary to answer Thornton point by point for much of what he quotes and says is correct from the point of view of arguing against idealism. No one is arguing against the correct proposition that matter is primary, that is, man's consciousness is the reflection of the external world and that the world exists independently of man.

But that is not where the matter rests. Man is a part of nature and the decisive part. By acting on nature, he changes the world. Surely this is commonsense. Man makes history and **only** man makes history. But he does not make history lifelessly, without effort, without purpose or will. It is true that the objective circumstances in which man finds himself (into which he is born) are not of his choosing and that he has to subordinate his will to them. That is, he can only solve those problems which can be solved. In other words feudal man could not wage a successful, immediate struggle for socialism. Capitalism had to develop first.

But subordinating one's will to reality does not mean allowing the circumstances of the moment to overwhelm one. It means merely taking into account the objective situation and tackling that situation. It means bringing the subjective into correspondence with the objective, or uniting theory with practice.

Thornton gives the impression that he cannot see that. He pulls up half-way and does not fully examine the relationship between man and matter. In this relationship, or unity, man plays the decisive part, despite the fact that objective conditions preclude any leap over stages of historical development. Man is not merely a reflecting apparatus. His creative powers are limitless. To deny that man's will is a part of objective reality is to deny that man himself is a part of nature.

Mao Tse-tung in his essay *On Practice* explains this point very clearly. He writes: "What Marxist philosophy regards as the most important problem does not lie in understanding the laws of the objective world and thereby becoming capable of explaining it, but in actively changing the world by applying the knowledge of its objective laws. From the Marxist viewpoint, theory is important, and its importance is fully shown in Lenin's statement: 'Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement'. But Marxism emphasises the importance of theory precisely and only because it can guide action. If we have a correct theory, but merely prate about it, pigeon-hole it, and do not put it into practice, then that theory, however good, has no significance. Knowledge starts with practice, reaches the

theoretical plane via practice, and then has to return to practice. The active function of knowledge not only manifests itself in the active leap from perceptual knowledge to rational knowledge, but also — and this is the more important — in the leap from rational knowledge to revolutionary practice. The knowledge which enables us to grasp the laws of the world must be re-directed to the practice of changing the world, that is, it must again be applied in the practice of production, in the practice of the revolutionary class struggle and revolutionary national struggle, as well as in the practice of scientific experimentation. This is the process of testing and developing theory, the continuation of the whole process of knowledge."

This question of the leading part played by man is to-day very important. The revisionists, despite what they say, in action reject the decisive role of man and cower before imperialism. The philosophical justification that is advanced for this is to reject the absoluteness of struggle and the relativity of unity. In other words, to-day it is no longer necessary to struggle against imperialism headed by the United States: the way to win is through "unity" with it, and within this "unity" the superiority of socialism will be demonstrated and thus the contradiction between the two world systems will be resolved.

So unity becomes absolute in the struggle against imperialism and it becomes absolute right down the line. From peaceful co-existence flows peaceful transition to socialism in the capitalist countries and "unity" with social democracy. Struggle becomes "dogmatic" and "sectarian". Once a departure is made from the absoluteness of the struggle of opposites then a departure is made from Marxist dialectics. Reconciliation of opposites is the whole basis of reformism. Lenin wrote: "The unity (coincidence, identity, resultant force) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory and relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, as movement and evolution are."

But when Thornton examines the world in the light of his conception of dialectical materialism, he comes to an opposite conclusion and lays the emphasis not on struggle as Lenin did but on unity. The revisionists reveal their non-Marxist, non-revolutionary thinking every time they make a foray into the light of day, and attempt to put their ideas into practice. Let us return to Thornton's attempt to argue in terms of life. The paragraph quoted in full would never be written by a genuine revolutionary. It is negative and is quoted to illustrate the non-proletarian world outlook of Thornton. Yes, it is out of context

— but we urge everyone to read it in full. What we have to say about it would not be altered if the whole extraordinary article were reprinted.

Take the demonstration before Parliament House on September 15th. A lot of combined wills made that possible and this combined mass will, has not to date, been fully realised or, in other words, the demands for Bolte to resign and that the fare increases be abolished, have not been met. But, nevertheless, the demonstration was a victory, a victory of unity, a victory in the process of deepening the Australian workers' class consciousness. Each "failure of realisation" has within it a victory. It is precisely when the consciousness of the working people, through struggle and correct leadership, is raised to the stage when revolutionary ideas become a material force, that final victory against the exploiting class will be achieved. Theory, when gripped by the masses becomes a material force, said Marx long ago. Not much different from saying that man's will is a part of objective reality.

Thornton, in his writing, does not display the forward-looking revolutionary optimism so necessary in the struggle.

"The bound and gagged French Resistance fighter before a nazi firing squad — has he no will to live?" There is something very unhealthy about such a presentation. Of course the French Resistance fighter has a will to live, but he had a greater will, the will to free his country of the nazi scourge. Thousands of French resistance heroes were executed by the nazis, but their beloved France was freed, and mainly on their efforts, their will for victory. Paris was liberated by the Resistance, much to the concern of the British and Americans who demanded that the Resistance Movement surrender its arms. So in dying the French Resistance heroes won. Their sacrifice was not in vain. Victory cannot be won without sacrifice.

Surely that is how a genuine revolutionary should see the question. This harping on defeat — there is no other word for it — is dangerous and kills revolutionary ardour. Gould harps on the same thing with his picture of Peking, Canton and Shanghai destroyed by nuclear weapons "without the loss of a single American". It flows from the concept of "unity" with imperialism. In his previous article Thornton wiped out a 100 rifles with a blockbuster.

This "unity" with imperialism, the subordination of struggle to unity meaning the subordination of man to matter is advanced when the struggle against imperialism is reaching magnificent

heights, when millions of people are in action against imperialism and the future looks bright for the people.

But Thornton and his kind do not see this. They do not agree, for instance, that the contradiction with imperialism is at its fiercest in the countries struggling for their national independence. Have a look at the Guardian the paper which Thornton helps to direct. No longer does it consistently turn the heat on imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism, and rally the people of Australia to oppose it. No — it categorises U.S. imperialism — the Johnson side of it is manageable, acceptable to "unity" — but Goldwater — he belongs to the extreme right wing and is not so manageable and unity with him, harder. May be impossible. Johnson is a man of peace, and is sympathetic to peaceful co-existence — unity.

All this spurious juggling with the character of U.S. imperialism is plain to see. Behind it is the aim to reduce struggle against U.S. imperialism under the pretext of avoiding war. Provided a correct policy of unity is "developed" with Johnson and the "wing" he represents, the antagonism will cease and the two social systems will merge through peaceful competition to form one big happy world. All this while the heroic peoples of South East Asia, Africa and Latin America are locked in battle with U.S. imperialism. It is really incredible.

But read the Guardian, or any of the revisionist rubbish now being trotted out in the Communist Party's press and this is what it all boils down to — in cold, hard practice. The revisionists are busy undermining the revolutionary will of man and Chou Yang, whom Gould criticised and pathetically attempted to lampoon, deals with this precise question. He says: "On the pretext of what they call the characteristics of the transition from socialism to communism, they preach a new way of putting the question, namely 'the overcoming of opposites through their uniting (merging)', claiming that under socialist conditions 'new phenomena' or 'new processes' emerge in which 'dialectical opposites, contradictions, turn into differences and differences merge into unity'. Some of their philosophers even claim that the law of the unity and struggle of opposites is outmoded under socialist conditions. This theory of the merging or reconciliation of contradictions and the theory that the laws of contradiction are outmoded constitute a radical revision of materialist dialectics".

One of the chief exponents of this revision of the theoretical foundation of communism is P. M. Fedoseyev, the Soviet philo-

sopher who Thornton quotes at length in the latter part of his article, which is an all-out attack on China.

It should be noted also that Gould does not deal with any of the fundamental issues raised by Chou Yang.

The main contradictions in the world to-day are those that exist between imperialism and socialism, the colonial countries and imperialism, the working class and monopoly in the imperialist countries, and between the imperialist countries themselves.

These are all antagonistic contradictions and cannot be reconciled or merged in a "unity" nor can any particular one solve the general state of contradiction. The revisionists, however, say that if the contradiction between imperialism and socialism (more particularly between the USSR and the US) can be solved, then all other contradictions will be solved. Hence the importance to them of the erroneous philosophic concept of absolute unity and the conversion of antagonistic contradictions into reconcilable contradictions.

"Unity" with the imperialists means giving way to them, meeting their demands, step by step. Since Khrushchov's meeting with Eisenhower the process of retreat has unfolded. Border precautions have been relaxed, the Voice of America radio has free access to Soviet listeners, the so-called "cultural contacts" with the West has meant Western "cultural" penetration of the Soviet Union. The scientific exchanges are serious. Not long ago it was revealed that a top nuclear scientist of the U.S. had been working in the USSR for some time. Rocket scientists, no doubt, have been on exchange in the general welter of "co-operation" and "unity".

On the eve of Khrushchov's visit to Eisenhower there occurred the attack on China's policy towards India in the official Soviet Tass news service. This was followed by the arming of the Indian bourgeoisie. At a meeting in the Melbourne Town Hall, last year, C.P.A. President Dixon went to great pains to explain that military aid to India by Khrushchov was to save India from the imperialists. He assured the meeting that Soviet arms would not be allowed to be used against China.

Well, Mr. Dixon, you had better come up with some more "explanations" for Defence Minister Malinovsky has stated that India can get all the arms she wants and how, and against whom she uses them, is her own concern. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned it will not attach any strings to the deal. The Indian bourgeoisie are very happy. Their press is jubilant and sings the praise of Khrushchov as an ally in India's struggle against China.

Nobody in their senses can describe Khrushchov's military assistance to India as a stratagem against imperialism. And yet, that is how it is put across by the revisionists. It cannot be explained in terms of Marxist dialectics. It would even be a trifle difficult for Fedoseyev to explain, logically. But we shall await with interest Thornton's explanation. And then how is the demand for payment to the U.S.S.R. for the arms used in the Korean war against U.S. imperialism seen as Marxist dialectics?

No, the more the story unfolds, the more clearly is it seen that the Khrushchov clique is acting in the interests of U.S. imperialism. Its great buddy is Tito who makes no bones about his position of support for the U.S. imperialists.

Come on you dialecticians and philosophers! — come out of the books and explain the above. Let us see how you apply dialectical materialism, and then we will see who are the dogmatists. Let us hear your dialectical arguments in support of the "State of the whole people" and a "party of the whole people". Explain to us the main contradiction in socialist society and then tell us, oh wise ones, how material incentives and the emphasising of profit making will resolve it. The pathetic attempt in the Guardian of recent date is worth framing. Anybody with a little understanding of socialist economics knows that socialist enterprises make a surplus from which State funds, reinvestment and workers' advancement are financed. That is not the point. The basic question is that overall planning and working to targets in the interest of the whole country is being thrown overboard and individual plants will enter into competition with one another as a spur to production.

What is this but a return to capitalism? It is Titoism; the shambles that has developed in Yugoslavia has arisen from precisely this competition between enterprises which has opened the way for all sorts of graft and corruption and has led to the emergence of a privileged class which is in control of the means of production. Khrushchov is on record as having praised this "socialism" and advised the Soviet experts he had with him on his trip to Yugoslavia to study the system closely with a view to its application in the U.S.S.R.

Tito's economy is now resting very heavily on foreign loans from imperialist powers. Foreign credits are now being sought by the Soviet Union — after 40 years of socialism!! What hideous treason has been covered by Khrushchov's talk of "peaceful co-existence".

At the various international conferences this betrayal comes right out for all to see. And in recent days the Khrushchov

double-talk on the U.S. aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has torn aside the mask even further. Asia is no fertile soil for revisionism. Amongst the ranks of the local revisionists here the idea is firmly held that countries like Cuba, North Vietnam and even Korea are expendable in the interests of preserving world peace and letting socialism be won by example. Thornton knows very well that these ideas have been expressed, but to him they are all part of that grand merging and unity which will somehow transform the opposites (by example) and, hey presto! victory for the proletariat. No, we cannot take the path of the Thorntons and the Goulds. It is the path of compromise, class collaboration and disaster.

We prefer the path of Marxism-Leninism so staunchly being upheld by the Chinese people and their leaders. There is no substitute for struggle and this means relying on man, lifting his will to struggle, showing him that he is decisive, all powerful, and that his enemies, despite their weapons, are weak. Long ago Kaganovitch, one of the Soviet leaders removed by Khrushchov, in a speech celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Institute of Red Professors, said: "What exactly does the unity of opposites mean in the ordinary language of our political party? The unity of opposites in actuality means not to be afraid of difficulties. Not to be afraid of those contradictions of life which spring up on our journey, but instead to conquer them with Bolshevik energy and staunchness".

And Joseph Stalin in a speech to the 15th Congress of the CPSU said:—"Our development proceeds, not by a smooth, unbroken movement upwards. No, comrades, we have classes, we have contradictions inside the country, we have a past, a present and a future, and the contradictions between these are still with us. We cannot therefore, glide smoothly forward. Our course is one of struggle, of ever developing contradictions and of their subsequent mastery, analysis and liquidation. Never, so long as there are classes, shall we be in a position to say: Well, thank God, now all is well! Never, comrades, shall we have that state of affairs. Always in our experience something is dying out; it struggles to go on existing, it defends its outworn activity. Always something new is being born in our life. But whatever it is, it is not just born, it screams and cries, asserting its right to exist. The struggle between the old and the new, between what is dying out and what is born — that is the basis of our movement." How different from the rubbish put out by Khrushchov.

To-day the people of Africa and Asia are struggling heroically. They are rolling back imperialism which many people will

remember, is what American leaders like Dulles said they would do to communism. But it is U.S. imperialism that it now throwing into the battle its last reserves, the revisionists. The struggle will be protracted, but it is going well and man will win through his will to win.

And that will to win to-day is a very definite part of our objective reality.

(Note:— Eric Thornton in his last article made much ado about some quotes which were included in an Australian Communist article without being acknowledged. The quotes were taken from notes made many years ago. There was no indication from where they came and we are much obliged to Thornton for referring us to their source. We will accept the criticism that they should have been acknowledged but no one is claiming the authorship of the article, which was a collective one, and they were included not from any desire to plagiarise but for the information of readers. The quotes come from A Text Book of Marxist Philosophy. The book was prepared by the Leningrad Institute of Philosophy in the late 30's. The translation was revised and condensed by John Lewis who, Thornton informs us, has become a revisionist. Well Kautsky once wrote Marxist classics and later became a revisionist — one of the greatest. But some of his earlier works still remain Marxist classics. If Lewis has gone the same way it does not detract one iota from the worth of the Text Book. The part from where the quotes come is an introduction condensed from the translation. However, in substance, it is still direct from the Text Book. An introduction by Lewis is included but the quotes referred to by Thornton do not come from this introduction. They come from the condensation of the original so, in fact, are not directly the work of Lewis, but rather of the authors of the Text Book.)

The Struggle For Unity In The Communist Movement

The problem of unity in the world communist movement continues to command great attention both from the ruling class and the working class of the world.

It is a problem encountered in every task undertaken by the working class. It is the concern, not only of the Communist Parties — but is of vital import to every class conscious worker.

The lack of unity arises through the existence of two trends in the revolutionary movement. It is a struggle between Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement of the Communist Parties on the one hand, and opportunism and revisionism on the other.

The ruling class hail this disunity as offering unparalleled opportunities to the bourgeoisie for consolidating their position and pursuing their onslaught against the forces of socialism.

The working class must continuously and soberly estimate the steps needed to be taken to re-build principled communist unity.

It is exceptionally easy to prattle about "unity".

Almost everyone does it. The ruling class likes to present a friendly, united face to the world. The U.S. imperialist likes to suggest that he has unanimity with his British counterpart. There are conferences for church unity. The Roman Catholic Church is seeking the unity path. So clearly the matter goes far beyond the word itself. Anyone can interpret it to mean anything which suits his own immediate book.

W. Brown, in the September issue of the revisionist "Communist Review", has a great deal to say on the subject — or rather it would be more correct to say that he uses many words, but in fact has very little to say that is worth while.

Discussing the Communist Party program, he tells us that it says: . . . "the working class cause demands of all communist parties and the great army of communists ever-closer unity of will and action. To work for and defend such unity in the struggle for peace and socialism against imperialism is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party and every communist". P. 267.

Leaving aside for one moment the question of internationalism to which we shall return shortly, Mr. Brown hammers home his point about unity with a quotation from Lenin. He fails to tell us the source or origin of the quote and says nothing about the conditions which prompted it, but says: "Lenin expressed the essence of this when he wrote: 'Discussing questions, expressing and listening to different views, ascertaining the opinion of the majority of organised Marxists, expressing this opinion in a decision binding on all and conscientiously carrying out this decision — this is what all clear-thinking people everywhere in the world call **unity**'" Two questions emerge here.

In the first place, we don't think this is the process as Mr. Brown understands it. The whole history of Mr. Brown and his revisionist friends, Aarons, Dixon and Sharkey in Australia has been that the last thing they have wanted to do was to discuss questions, express and listen to different views — their prime concern was to force down the throats of all and sundry, the views which they were instructed to force down people's throats, by none other than Khrushchov and the revisionist leaders of the C.P.S.U.

Time and again documentary evidence of this has been produced by the Communist Party of Australia (M.-L.) during the last twelve months. Not once have Messrs. Aarons and Sharkey been able to refute our statements. Yet W. Brown has the audacity still to talk about freely discussing questions, "listening to different views".

Clearly, if he thinks that bandying about Lenin's name in this way can justify bushranger tactics, he sadly under-estimates the intelligence of the Australian workers.

It is true that Lenin, in his brilliant years of service to the communist cause, had a great deal to say many times about the importance of unity in the proletarian movement.

Probably nowhere could he have put it more clearly than he did in the article on "Unity", Collected Works, 4th Russian ed., Moscow, Vol. 20, p.211 . . . "Unity — a great cause and a great slogan! But the workers' cause requires the **unity of the Marxists** and not the unity of the Marxists with the opponents and distorters of Marxism".

Again and again Lenin repeats that unity cannot be separated from principle and policy.

However, he had no hesitation, much as he loved unity, in welcoming violation of discipline and unity when, in the condi-

tions existing, unity would have been based upon a betrayal of revolutionary principles.

We would remind our readers of his joy and pride over the action of Karl Liebknecht, leader of the Spartacus Group in Germany during the First World War. Almost alone, Liebknecht, called upon the workers and soldiers of Germany to turn their guns against their own Government. He did so against the policy of the German Social Democrat Party. He mercilessly attacked his own leaders who had betrayed the revolutionary cause.

Did Lenin chide him in the name of "unity"? No, he hailed him saying "Karl Liebknecht and his friend, Otto Rühle, two out of one hundred and ten deputies, violated discipline, destroyed the unity with the centre and the chauvinists, and went **against all of them.** Liebknecht **alone** represents socialism, the proletarian cause, the proletarian revolution. **All** the rest of German Social-Democracy, to quote the apt words of Rosa Luxemburg (also a member and one of the leaders of the Spartacus Group) is a '**stinking corpse**'" (The Tasks of the Proletariat in our Revolution. Pt. 7. Vol. 10. Selected Works L. & W. ed.)

Clearly unity and principle are indivisible.

To return to this question of internationalism.

Mr. Brown prattles again and again during his article about internationalism. He is not the first to do so by any means.

"Only the lazy do not swear by internationalism these days. Even the chauvinist-defencists, even Messrs. Plekhanov and Potresov, even Kerensky, call themselves internationalists. All the more urgently therefore, does it become the duty of the proletarian party to draw a clear, precise and definite distinction between internationalism in words and internationalism in deeds". (Lenin. *ibid.* p. 30).

A very pertinent thought, indeed!

Mr. Brown, leave your platitudes for a moment, and take a closer look at your "internationalism". You indulge in much word spinning of your "true spirit of proletarian internationalism", "your deep respect for the great Chinese people and the revolutionary tradition of the Communist Party of China", etc. Very praiseworthy too!

How does it come about then, that you and your party leadership support your friend Khrushchov's supply of arms to

the Indian bourgeoisie for the purpose of aggression against the same "great Chinese people" — this Socialist country with whom you profess to have so much in common.

You great champions of peace — for what do you suppose the Indian bourgeoisie are going to use the arms — for marking out a basket-ball field?? How does this fit in with your wordy protestations of "peace" and "internationalism".

In the interests of your kind of "unity", we presume the Chinese leaders and Chinese people should also support this arming of the Indian bourgeoisie by the renegade Khrushchov? According to your fulsome chatter, they are only being "disruptive" if they oppose such a policy aimed directly at their national security and independence.

A fine internationalism indeed!

You will forgive us, if like yourself we also quote Lenin again. "There is one and only one kind of internationalism in deed: working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in **one's own country** and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) **such and only such a struggle** and such a line in **every** country without exception. Everything else is deception!! (*Ibid.* P. 4).

Assistance to the Indian masses, rather than arms to the Indian bourgeoisie would be more to the point.

It is a revolutionary lesson in itself, to pass from W. Brown's trite, vague, anti-revolutionary mouthings about "internationalism" written under the title of "The First International — Its Lessons" to Lenin's "Third International, Its Place in History".

Everyone should read the whole article for themselves. Quotes inevitably gloss over and lose some of the essential ideas.

"The First International (1864-1872) laid the foundation of the international organisation of the workers in order to prepare for their revolutionary onslaught on capital. The Second International (1889-1914): was the international organisation of the proletarian movement which grew in **breadth**, and this enabled a temporary drop in the revolutionary level, a temporary increase in the strength of opportunism, which, in the end, led to the disgraceful collapse of this International" . . . P.30. Vol. 10 Selected Works L. & W. Ed.)

And further: "The world-historical significance of the Third Communist International lies in that it has begun to put into

practice Marx's greatest slogan, the slogan which sums up the century-old development of socialism and the working class movement, the slogan which is expressed by the term: dictatorship of the proletariat" (Ibid. p. 31.)

This "world-historical significance" surely remains as true for the communist parties of the world today even though there is no centralised communist international as when Lenin wrote of the Third International in 1917.

Yet it is extraordinary, but true, that W. Brown can devote page upon page to prattling about "internationalism" and "unity", the "common cause of the working class" without once coming to grips with the fundamental question which is involved — namely the overthrow of the ruling class — the winning of power by the working class — the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Communists are for revolution. If they refuse to accept this responsibility they cease to be Marxist-Leninists. Once abandon the revolutionary goal, once abandon the dictatorship of the proletariat and all reference to unity within Communist ranks becomes meaningless. More than this, Communist truth — communist ethics are thrown overboard.

This is amply borne out by Brown's article. There are oblique references to the decisions of the 81 Parties' Meeting and carrying out these decisions. The fact that the Communist Party of Australia has amended these decisions is completely side-stepped. The 81 Parties declared revisionism to be the main danger to the communist movement.

The C.P.A. now accepts that "left sectarianism" is the main danger.

The 81 Parties decided that the betrayal by the Tito clique in Yugoslavia must be actively campaigned against.

The leaders of the C.P.A. now state that Yugoslavia is a socialist country with a contribution to make to the socialist cause.

They bemoan splitting, wring their hands and call for unity yet applaud the action of the Soviet leaders which violated the decision of the 81 Parties' Meeting and publicly attacked Albania raising matters of dispute openly, contrary to the 81 Parties' decision.

And so we could go on. But all these matters flow from the fundamental fact, that the revisionist communist leaders in Australia have abandoned the revolutionary road — for them

the Australian road to socialism is synonymous with "peaceful road" and none other — They reject the dictatorship of the proletariat and the creation of a workers' state and settle instead for some vague "Peoples' Government" in some vague alliance with the Labor Party.

It is necessary to do more than proclaim oneself a Communist Party — as Mr. Brown so amply demonstrates.

Only if one adheres to revolutionary Marxist-Leninist principles — in deed as well as word — if one accepts the need to carry the class struggle through to its logical conclusions — the dictatorship of the proletariat — if one develops revolutionary tactics based upon this concept — only then is one entitled to claim the honor of the title Communist Party.

The struggle for unity in the ranks of the Communist parties must be a struggle based on these principles, these ideas and not upon the ideas of class collaboration, compromise, peaceful transition . . .

It is necessary to say something about Trotskyism — W. Brown drags it into his article by the heels with the bald assertion that it is — "strongly drawn on by the Chinese leaders today", p. 268 *Communist Review*, September 1964. As we have come to expect, of course, there is no analysis, no documentation no fact — just the technique of the smear in the hope that some will stick.

But what is the true position??

Having been for many years in the political wilderness, the Trotskyites now draw fresh life from the policies and antics of Khrushchov and his friends. They all agree on such important questions as Stalin, the attitude to U.S. imperialism and the Yugoslav revisionists.

In June, 1963 at the Reunification Congress of the 'Trotskyites' so-called Fourth International, a resolution entitled "The International Situation and Our Tasks" stated "The situation created by the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. and still more by the 22nd Congress is eminently favourable for the revival of our movement in the workers' states themselves."

Further — "In relation to the Khrushchov tendency, we will give critical support to its struggle for de-Stalinisation against the more conservative tendencies". (From a resolution adopted by the International Secretariat of the Trotskyites so-called Fourth International, December 5, 1961.)

It is in fact, the revisionists who finish up making common cause with the Troyskyists in their onslaught against the ideas of revolution, against Marxism-Leninism.

At present alien views are attacking the fundamental truth of Marxism-Leninism in the international communist movement. The international communist movement is also a history of the battle for the expulsion of alien, opportunist ideas from its ranks.

Modern revisionism will unquestionably be defeated. The unity of the communist movement will be cemented on the fundamental principles of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism.

On The Theory Of Marxism By V. I. Lenin — 1899

(From the Article: Our Program)

In re-printing this article written by Lenin in 1899, we would like to make the following points:

At the time of writing the article, Bernstein was a highly-respected member of the revolutionary movement. Nevertheless Lenin did not hesitate to deal with and criticise his theories in the strongest possible language.

2. In the process of the Russian Revolution, Lenin did, in fact, elaborate and develop Marxist theory of the class struggle to embrace the theory of the violent overthrow of the ruling class — the smashing of their state apparatus and the creation of a new state under the leadership of the working class. So that this brilliant development of Marxist theory is now also included in any enunciation of the "firm foundation" of Marxist theory.

3. If, in the reading, communism is substituted for social-democracy — Khrushchov is substituted for Bernstein — the article is, in fact, a profound comment on today's situation in the communist movement.

International social-democracy is at the present time passing through a period of ideological vacillations. The doctrines of Marx and Engels were hitherto considered to be a firm foundation of the revolutionary theory, but now voices are heard on all sides that these doctrines are inadequate and obsolete.

Those who declare themselves social-democrats and intend to come forward with a social-democratic organ must define exactly their attitude to the question which is far from agitating the German Social-Democrats alone.

We stand entirely on the basis of the theory of Marx: it was the first to transform socialism from an utopia to a science, to fix the firm foundation of this science and to indicate the path along which it is necessary to proceed, while developing this science further and elaborating it in every detail.

Page 37

It laid bare the essence of modern capitalist economy, explaining the manner in which the hire of the labourer, the purchase of labour-power, masks the enslavement of millions of propertyless people by a handful of capitalists, the owners of the land, factories, mines, etc.

It showed that the whole trend of development of modern capitalism is towards the ousting of small production by large, and the creating of conditions which make a socialist system of society possible and inevitable.

It taught us to see under the veil of rooted customs, political intrigues, subtle laws and artful doctrines, the **class struggle**, the struggle between all species of propertied classes and the mass of non-possessors, the **proletariat**, which stands at the head of all the propertyless.

It made clear the real task of a revolutionary socialist party; it is neither drawing up plans for the reconstruction of society, nor preaching sermons to the capitalists and their hangers-on about improving the lot of the workers, nor making conspiracies, **but the organisation of the class struggle of the proletariat and the leadership of this struggle, the final aim of which is the winning of political power by the proletariat and the organisation of a socialist society.**

And now we ask: has anything new been introduced into this theory by its loud-voiced "renovators," gathered around the German socialist Bernstein, who have now raised such a noise? No, **nothing whatever**: they have not advanced the science, the development of which was bequeathed to us by Marx and Engels, a single step forward; they have not taught the proletariat any new methods of struggle; they only crawl backwards, picking up snatches of backward theories and instead of the theory of the struggle, they preach to the proletariat the theory of compliance, compliance with the most vicious enemies of the proletariat, the governments and bourgeois parties, who are untiring in their search for new means of baiting socialists. One of the founders and leaders of Russian Social-Democracy, Plekhanov, was quite right in mercilessly criticising the latest "criticism" of Bernstein, whose views have now been rejected also by the representatives of the German workers (at the Congress in Hanover).

We know that a pile of accusations will be heaped upon us for these words. The cry will be raised that we want to convert the Socialist Party into an order of "true believers" who persecute the "heretics" for deviations from "dogmas" and for any inde-

pendent opinion, etc. We know all these fashionable and biting phrases. Only there is not a single grain of truth or sense in them.

There can be no strong socialist party in the absence of a revolutionary theory uniting all the socialists, from which they draw all their convictions and which they apply in their modes of struggle and methods of activity. To defend such a theory, which you absolutely feel to be the truth, against unfounded attacks and attempts to deteriorate it, does not by any means imply that you are an enemy of **all** criticism.

We do not by any means look upon the theory of Marx as something final and inviolable; on the contrary we are convinced that it only laid the cornerstones of the science which socialists **must** advance in all directions, if they do not want to lag behind events.

We think that the independent elaboration of Marx's theory provides only the general guiding principles which in **detail** must be applied in England in a manner different from that applied in France, in France in a manner different from that applied in Germany, and in Germany in a manner different from that applied in Russia.

We will therefore gladly afford space in our paper for articles on theoretical questions and invite all comrades to a frank discussion of controversial points . . .

India, The Soviet Union And Some Lessons

The Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party was held from the 15th to 27th of September, 1956. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was represented by A. Mikoyan, who gave a fairly long address to the Congress.

He begins with a lengthy eulogy of the Chinese Party and its accomplishments. He praises the manner in which the Chinese used state capitalism as a stage towards socialism. He distinguishes two strata in the Chinese bourgeoisie, the compradors and the national bourgeois and their diverse motives. He praises the Chinese agrarian revolution. He says, "The fraternal and indestructible union and friendship of the Soviet and the Chinese peoples are an authentic model of proletarian internationalism" and agrees with Sun Yat Sen's pronouncement: "The two peoples, Russian and Chinese, must work together on the road of liberty and justice". Then he quotes Lenin's statement that "the issue of the struggle depends finally on the fact that Russia, India and China, etc. form an immense majority of the population of the earth".

Everything very well, so far. Except that one might have expected some comment on the struggles against left and right deviations in the Chinese Party.

Next he says, "that in the last ten years, 1,500 million of men in the countries of the Orient have cast off the infamous yoke of colonialism and that there is no doubt the peoples who are still under the yoke will soon also cast it off", and he continues. "It must be recognised as harmful to put in the same sack, as is done sometimes, all the countries who do not enter the socialist system and to include them mechanically in the capitalist camp, considered as a whole".

According to Mikoyan "the people of these countries do not wish to go over again, in the 20th century, the road traversed by the peoples of the capitalist countries, centuries ago, a road of pitiless exploitation of the working people, of poverty, hunger and wars for they have already learnt by their now bitter experience what capitalism brings to the people".

So he argues that they are adopting state capitalism, something not the same as the state capitalism in the U.S.A.; and

if one asks whether the policy of these countries strengthens capitalism or on the contrary deals it blows, we must answer that the path of development of these countries and their policy weakens imperialism, deepens the crisis of the capitalist system, deals decisive blows to colonialism and thus hastens the end of capitalism.

Thus in 1956, Mikoyan is already providing justification for the Soviet Union's assistance to India, by a false analysis of the situation. Take India for example which to-day, though nominally independent, is still economically under the exploitation of British monopoly capitalists — and to a greater extent than it was before its political liberation. Have the Indian people resolved not to traverse the road of capitalism? The answer is that the Indian land owners and the Indian industrialists have resolved to traverse that road — and have already inflicted all its miseries on the Indian working people. What is the use of talking about the Indian people if you do not analyse the classes in India — and find, as you must, classes with antagonistic interests. History tells us that Nehru and his associates for more than thirty years have pursued a policy, the basis of which is anti-communism. They said to the Indian people; "get rid of the English and leave it to us. You will be all right".

It is true that Nehru and Co. were anti-imperialist, were bourgeois democratic revolutionaries, in fact, did for a time struggle against the imperialists. In June, 1920, Lenin wrote, "It is necessary to wage a determined struggle against painting the bourgeois-democratic liberation trend in backward countries in Communist colours". But this painting is exactly what Mikoyan was doing in 1956.

From the above a lesson can be learnt, namely it is always necessary to carefully examine the utterances of every politician even if he is a famous revolutionary. The examination must be based on facts and guided by correct theory.

In the case of India we have a country with big landowners and big capitalists. According to Marxist-Leninist theory at this period of time it is impossible to successfully build a new capitalist state. It is too late. Capitalism is on its death bed. This does not mean that no attempts will be made to do so. Marxist-Leninist theory and the facts irrefutably laid it down that Hitler and Co. must fail. But they made the attempt to succeed nevertheless. To-day Marxist-Leninist analysis of the present world situation shows equally irrefutably that American imperialism is approaching its end. Does that prevent ^{or does it} Rusk, Johnson and Co. continuing their absurd efforts?

In the backward countries, the proletariat and its ally, the

poorer peasantry and landless agricultural labour with possibly the help of a certain lesser section of the capitalists, will eventually instal the dictatorship of the proletariat and begin to build socialism — the reason being the increased contradiction between the associated imperialists, the landowners and native industrialists on the one hand and the working people on the other.

This is exactly what happened in China, and North Vietnam, and North Korea. The cause of the revolution is inside the country in question. It is increased by foreign efforts, those of the foreign exploiters. It is not caused by the efforts of communists states, unless you consider example a cause.

In the case of South Vietnam, Laos and the Latin American states, U.S. imperialism is a prime cause — and the irony is that the more fiercely imperialism fights against the liberation of the people, the more surely will the people carry the revolution to the end—and it may even be added the better job they will do in building socialism. So for example North Korea.

People will surely ask whether Mikoyan was intentionally distorting theory or really believed what he said. This question is not important. We are not concerned with people's sincerity, we are with their utterances and their deeds. It is with the latter that we have to deal. The Khrushchov clique gave and is giving substantial military and economic aid to the Indian reactionaries. Therefore, they are the enemies of communism and must be fought.

The Khrushchov clique has this naive idea. The Soviet Union has the nuclear bomb so has the U.S.A., therefore Brezhnev or Kosygin and Kennedy or Johnson can impose peace on the world and rule it. If any one objects, wave the bomb at him. It is a fearful weapon, could destroy a country or even the world. Yet this hypothesis is not true. Tiny Albania and little Cuba refused to obey Khrushchov or the U.S.A. China defies both the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. The Southern Vietnamese, the Laotians and many Latin Americans are doing the same. Evidently humanity is following its own path, not one dictated by bombs.

Many in the past have had similar illusions; for example Hitler, Tojo, Mussolini, Kaiser-Wilhelm, Napoleon. As their tracing, all these in the end were ruined in spite of their overwhelming military strength.

Surely we should now draw the lesson. In their internal and external policy, Australians should carefully examine the state of affairs and with the help of history, with the help of Marxist science find the right path and force the ruling class to drop

its foolish policies. This entails the control of Australia by the working class (not the Labour Party), otherwise bankruptcy and inflation by unnecessary expenditure on armaments, huge losses of Australian lives in futile wars.

We are told the ridiculous story that the Chinese will force communism on Australia. In reality General Motors Holden and the Arbitration Commission are doing a real job in that respect. Are they not increasing recklessly the antagonism between the foreign and local capitalists on the one hand and the Australian workers on the other. In fact they are confirming the theory of the Marxist-Leninists about the State and the capitalists.

In India to-day will the local reactionaries aided by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. prevent the march of India to communism. The answer is certainly in the negative. As they did in China, the U.S.A. will lose billions of dollars and the U.S.S.R. will do the same. Both are, in Australian parlance, backing a dead horse. Piling arms on the backs of a starving people, is that the way to stop revolution. History says no. The arms inevitably fall into the hands of the people and are used in the reverse direction. Like all other peoples the Indian people will determine their own fate and there is only one path by which they can rid themselves of starvation, unemployment, illiteracy and disease: the path of revolution.

The Indian people, seventeen years after their "political" liberation are starving, despite the Colombo plan, billions of dollars from the U.S.A. and hundreds of millions of roubles from the Soviet Union.

Is not this another proof of the correctness of Marxist theory? And at this moment, Britain is entering an economic crisis, Japan has record bankruptcies, Italy is in a crisis and Wall St. is at a high water mark of stock exchange gambling.

In Australia it is evident the financial heads see trouble coming. Credit is being restricted by reducing the available funds of the banks. Wool is falling in price. Fruit growers are in a crisis. Dairy products are over produced. And Bolte and others are searching for new taxes.

Imperialism, the last stage of capitalism, is on its death bed. The warmongers are busy. The latest is they are organising the doctors for an international "emergency" The British Conservatives have fallen, Khrushchov has fallen. China and the other countries led by Marxist-Leninists go rapidly forward. The lesson is clear. Marxism-Leninism can give you clear guidance. It is not to be found elsewhere.

Melbourne — November, 1964

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