

40

DIFFERENCES
in the
COMMUNIST
MOVEMENT

Views of the
Communist Party of Australia

Price 1/-

DIFFERENCES *in the* COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Views of the
Communist Party of Australia



CURRENT BOOK DISTRIBUTORS
SYDNEY
1963

Erratum:

Line 26, Page 43, which reads: "The Chinese Comrades were informed of this, yet" . . . should read —

"The Chinese Comrades were informed on Hill's removal from the leadership, yet" . . .

*The following statement was
issued by the
Central Committee of the
Communist Party of Australia,
on August 23, 1963.*

Differences in the Communist Movement

Differences in the world Communist movement have aroused much public interest. They are being discussed, not only by Communists, but in many other circles.

The international differences have been reflected in the Communist Party of Australia through the activities of a splinter group headed by E. F. Hill, a former leading member of the Party, now expelled.

Because of the importance of the issues, and the wide public interest, the Communist Party of Australia has decided to publish its views on the main problems.

These views have been reached after discussions within the Party over a long period and especially since January 1961, following the meeting of 81 Communist Parties in Moscow in November, 1960.

The Communist Party of Australia actively participated in that meeting, raising its opinions on the issues debated at the time.

Our delegates to that meeting worked for unity and were fully satisfied with the discussions, in which differing viewpoints were frankly thrashed out.

Our Party welcomed the Statement unanimously adopted by the meeting as resolving the questions in dispute and opening a new chapter of unity in the world Communist movement.

The 19th Congress of the Party held in June, 1961, unanimously endorsed the Statement as being a correct analysis of the situation in the world today, and fully in line with our own Party Programme.

The Communist Party of Australia rejects the criticisms made by the leaders of the Communist Party of China of the policy and work of the majority of Communist Parties, including our own.

We consider that the Chinese Party has seriously departed from the 81 Parties' Statement, and that the Hill group is advocating in Australia a policy which likewise departs from it.

Such a policy, if put into practice, would inflict great losses on the Australian working class movement.

In rejecting these views, we by no means forget the great achievements of the Communist Party of China, which has led the Chinese people to victory over imperialism and feudal oppression and in building socialism. Nor do we subscribe to the imperialist anti-China campaign.

However, the leaders of the Communist Party of China not only advocate an incorrect line for the international movement. They try to impose this line upon other Parties, spreading their views in many publications in Australia and other countries.

We reject the Hill group's assertion that our Party should not have "taken sides", as this could only mean that we are not entitled to decide for ourselves but must follow others.

The Communist Party of Australia decides its own policy. It carefully considers all views, but does not blindly support the policy of any other Party.

Of course, what the Hill group really wanted was to force upon our Party the incorrect line of the Communist Party of China.

After failing dismally in this, the Hill group engineered a series of "resignations" which were hailed by the press as a "great crisis" and "a big split" in the Communist Party of Australia.

No such great crisis appeared, although the D.L.P. and other reactionary forces are trying to use the

actions of those who split away to disrupt unity in the labour movement.

* * *

The issues being debated in the world Communist movement are indeed momentous ones, dealing with questions of concern to all humanity.

The Communist Party of Australia therefore restates its policy for peace, defence of the immediate economic and political interests of the Australian working people, and for achieving a Socialist Australia.

We invite opinions and discussion on our views.

"The Most Burning Problem of Our Time"

The Communist Party has always fought for peace. The working class, on which the Party is based, is a constructive class having no vested interest in war. It is the working people who suffer most from war.

The underlying cause of the many wars which have devastated the world this century is imperialism, or monopoly capitalism.

A number of highly developed rival capitalist countries, in which great monopolies dominate, came to rule the whole world towards the end of last century. Seeking the highest profits, imperialism drives for markets, sources of raw materials, cheap labour, and spheres for the export of capital.

The first world war commenced in 1914, when not a single socialist country existed. It was caused by the clash of interests of two rival imperialist groups, one headed by Great Britain, the other by Germany.

The strength was then lacking to end the arms race and prevent war breaking out. But the First World War had one result which was unforeseen by the imperialists — the emergence of working class power in one-sixth of the world. The growth of the Soviet Union meant that imperialism no longer controlled the whole world.

In the period between the two world wars, the Soviet Union, the working class in the capitalist countries and the colonial peoples fought heroically against fascism and for peace, and their work helped millions to understand the cause of war.

But the peace forces were still not yet strong enough to prevent the clash of imperialist interests causing the Second World War to break out in 1939, after the preparatory fascist attacks on China, Ethiopia and Spain.

However, the Second World War was followed by a great expansion of working class power. First in Europe, then in Asia, country after country became socialist. This greatly weakened the power of imperialism to decide the destinies of mankind.

The Second World War had not even ended before the imperialist powers began preparations for a new war.

In the course of the Second World War, the U.S.A., home of the world's most powerful monopolies, became the dominant imperialist power.

Relying on its temporary monopoly of the atomic bomb which it had unnecessarily dropped on defenceless Japanese cities, the U.S. embarked on a policy of international blackmail and aggression.

Under U.S. direction, the remaining imperialist powers joined together in aggressive pacts such as NATO and SEATO. West Germany and Japan were rehabilitated and rearmed and brought into partnership in the U.S.-controlled alliances.

U.S. foreign policy is determined in the interests of billionaires, like the du Ponts of General Motors, the Rockefellers of Standard Oil and the Morgans of Wall Street, who have enormous investments throughout the capitalist world, including Australia.

U.S. foreign policy seeks to extend and protect monopoly investments in Asia, Africa and Latin America; to tie capitalist countries like Australia to U.S. economic, political and military plans, and to prevent other capitalist powers from challenging U.S. supremacy.

Above all, the foreign policy and military strategy of the imperialist powers dominated by the U.S.A. are directed against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, and towards holding back the national liberation movement in countries which are still colonies or are fighting for complete independence.

The U.S.A. which began the nuclear arms race, has extended war bases all over the world, now including Australia.

It is this aggressive imperialist policy which creates the danger of world war today.

Can War Be Prevented?

The differences in the world Communist movement are not differences as to whether imperialism is the cause of war, nor are there any differences on the need to expose and fight the policies of U.S. imperialism, the chief instigator of war.

They are differences as to whether it is possible to prevent the imperialists from launching a new world war, and how to achieve this great aim.

For many years the Communist Party of Australia has held the view that in today's conditions it is possible to avert such a war, even though imperialism exists and is still powerful.

When the Party was discussing the draft of its programme "Australia's Path to Socialism", which it adopted in 1951, L. L. Sharkey wrote:

"The Draft Programme declares that war can be finally outlawed when the rule of monopoly capital and its servants has been ended and the rule of the people substituted in its stead.

"This does not mean that the people cannot impose their will to peace while capitalism still exists. Quite the contrary. The people can foil the plans of the capitalist warmongers and establish a durable peace."

(Communist Review, August 1951)

The Party took this view because of the historic changes which had taken place after World War II.

These changes greatly weakened imperialism, limited its capacity to dictate to the world and strengthened the hand of the peace-loving peoples everywhere.

Three Great Changes in the World

The first great change is that whereas the Soviet Union was the only socialist country in 1939, today there are 14 socialist countries, with 30 per cent of the world's population and 35 per cent of world production, a percentage rising with every year that passes.

The Soviet Union is rapidly becoming the most powerful nation in the world. It has already outstripped the U.S.A. in many fields of science and military technology. All the socialist countries are developing rapidly. Together, they constitute a tremendous and growing force for peace.

The strength of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries is not only material. They have great moral strength, reaching far beyond their borders, because of their national unity and economic progress, their peace policy, their support of national independence for all peoples, and their constant struggle for the banning of nuclear weapons and for general disarmament.

The second great change in the world is the breaking-up of the colonial system. Since 1945, dozens of nations have won political independence, and most now take up a neutralist position which in the main aids the cause of peace. They continue their struggle to end all forms of colonialism, old and new. The national liberation struggle undermines imperialism by taking from the imperialist powers great sources of wealth, manpower and bases. It is a powerful part of the great new forces for peace.

The third great change is the much increased strength of the peace movement in the capitalist

countries themselves. Headed by the working class, progressive people and peace fighters of different classes and views are uniting to oppose war and fight for disarmament.

Twelve years ago the Australian campaign to "Ban the Bomb" was called a "Communist plot to undermine the free world". Today, the vast majority agree that this is a very necessary step and welcome the nuclear test ban treaty. In Australia and all over the world, public opinion is for peace and against nuclear war. It has become much more difficult for the imperialists to launch world war.

The forces for peace throughout the world have many achievements such as stopping U.S. plans to drop the atom bomb in Korea in 1951 and Vietnam in 1954, halting the invasion of Egypt in 1956, and preventing the planned U.S. invasion of Cuba in 1962.

If it was correct to say in 1951 that world war could be prevented — and it has proved correct so far — then it is still truer today.

The 81 Parties' Statement says:

"War is not fatally inevitable.

"The time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed. World war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and all peace-loving forces . . .

"Experience shows that it is possible to combat effectively the local wars started by the imperialists, and to stamp out successfully the hotbeds of such wars."

The Communist Party of China signed this statement. E. F. Hill and his followers agreed with it then. Yet today the Communist Party of China and the Hill group say that this is "an illusion".

"Left" Impatience Weakens Peace Struggle

To cast doubts on the possibility of preventing war, whatever the motive for doing so, is to belittle the peace forces and thus, in reality, to assist the imperialists.

The "leftist" group which has deserted the Communist Party of Australia says that the Party's policy of uniting with all who want peace is weakness. They say we are "soft on the imperialists" and demand that the "peace movement must be anti-imperialist".

Their demand for a narrow, "pure" peace movement, limited to people who fully understand that imperialism is the source of war, arises from impatience in the long and difficult task of uniting all who want peace, and lack of understanding that the masses of the people, not small groups, determine history.

It shows lack of faith in the ability of people to learn from their own experience in working for peace that imperialism is the source of war.

The Communist Party of Australia has never sought to dominate the peace movement, and will continue to co-operate with all genuine peace forces, while also putting forward its own independent views and policy for peace.

Is Disarmament an Illusion?

The Communist Party of Australia stands by the 81 Parties' Statement, which declared:

"Through an active, determined struggle by the socialist and other peace-loving countries, by the international working class and broad masses in all countries, it is possible to isolate the aggressive circles, foil the arms race and war preparations, and force the imperialists into an agreement on general disarmament."

This view is now rejected by the Communist Party of China. Their letter of June 14, 1963, says:

"Certain persons now actually hold that it is possible to bring about 'a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars' through 'general and complete disarmament' while the system of the exploitation of man by man still exists. This is sheer illusion".

No Communist Party doubts that the struggle for general and complete disarmament will be long, difficult and complicated. It will be opposed by the powerful monopolists who profit from armaments and by the rabid militarists, just as even the limited ban on nuclear tests is opposed by the extreme war wing of the U.S. monopolies and by de Gaulle.

But the combination of forces described by the 81 Parties can eventually force disarmament on the warmongers. The struggle for disarmament expresses the dearest wishes of the peoples and helps to mobilise them to act for peace.

Should we abandon it because it is hard and complicated, or should we rely upon the masses and work to bring their decisive force into action?

The Communist Party of Australia declares unreservedly for the struggle, and will do its part to carry it to success in Australia.

In speaking of the struggle for disarmament, the 81 Parties' Statement says:

"It is necessary to wage this struggle on an increasing scale and to strive perseveringly to achieve tangible results", including the banning of atomic testing.

That is why the treaty halting most kinds of nuclear weapons tests by the three main nuclear powers has been hailed by widely representative voices from most parts of the world as a very important though limited advance in the direction of peace.

Yet this treaty has been denounced by the Chinese Communist Party and Government as "a dirty fraud" "which harms the interests of the people of the whole world and the cause of world peace."

Such statements are a grave dis-service to the struggle for peace, and a blow against the attraction which socialism and the Communist Parties have increasingly exerted on the peoples because of their championing of the cause of peace.

The Communist Party of Australia, like the great majority of Communist Parties, welcomes the test ban treaty. This achievement helps the struggle to prevent the French tests, to remove U.S. bases from Australia, secure nuclear free zones, ban nuclear weapons, and win disarmament.

Peaceful Co-existence is the Basis for World Peace

There are two great opposing social systems in the world today. Struggle between them is constant and inevitable, but this struggle need not result in war.

The Communist Party of Australia stands foursquare for the principle that neither capitalist nor socialist countries should seek to impose their social system on the other by war.

The existence, for a period, of socialism and monopoly capitalism side by side in one world is historically inevitable. The question of which is the superior system can best be answered in peaceful competition between the two.

We Communists are supremely confident that the people of every country, without exception, will finally choose socialism.

Socialism is increasingly demonstrating its superiority over capitalism. The great advances already made by socialist countries in production, living conditions, science, education, freedom for individual development and high moral standards stand in sharp

contrast to the stagnation and slow rates of growth, crisis in education and science, denial of freedom, stunted development of human personality and moral decay evident in monopoly capitalism.

The Soviet Union will overtake the United States in total production, and production per head of the population. The other socialist countries will advance similarly. The appeal of socialism to the people of countries dominated by monopolies will become still greater.

Struggle Essential

This does not mean that socialism will be achieved by "force of example", or that peaceful co-existence will miraculously do away with monopoly capitalism. Only the struggle of the working class, leading the majority of the exploited people, can end capitalism.

Peaceful co-existence, does not mean ending class struggle. On the contrary, it provides favourable conditions for its development in capitalist countries. Cold war conditions favour the forces opposing progress.

Thus, in supporting the 81 Parties' view that the socialist countries make "peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems the cornerstone of their foreign policies", the Communist Party of Australia leads the fight against the pro-monopoly policies of the Menzies Government and its support for U.S. aggressive plans.

The Communist Party of China, which, together with India, earlier enunciated the Principles of peaceful co-existence, now says it is wrong to confine "the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries . . . to peaceful co-existence."

In their letter of June 14, 1963, the Chinese Communists charged that "certain persons have one-sidedly exaggerated the role of peaceful competition

between socialist and imperialist countries in their attempt to substitute peaceful competition for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and countries. According to their preaching, it would seem that imperialism will automatically collapse in the course of this peaceful competition and that the only thing the oppressed peoples and nations have to do is to wait quietly for the advent of this day. What does this have in common with Marxist-Leninist views?"

Nothing at all, of course. But it also has nothing in common with the theory and practice of any Communist Party in the world. The Chinese Communists have put up a straw man to knock down, instead of discussing seriously the real views of those Parties which support the 81 Parties' Statement in full.

The Communist Party of China seems to forget that only the oppressed peoples can and will *decide for themselves* when to make socialist and national revolutions, and that peaceful co-existence provides favourable conditions for them to do so.

The "left" group in Australia, crudely reflecting the Communist Party of China's view, alleges that our Party wants peaceful co-existence with the capitalists. All the experience of the working class proves this laughably false. The capitalists certainly do not agree!

In fact, the fight for peaceful co-existence in Australia is precisely a sharp *class struggle* for peace, living standards and democratic rights, directed against the pro-war, profiteering, anti-democratic policies of monopoly and the Menzies Government.

This is the *real content* of the struggle for peaceful co-existence in Australia and every capitalist country.

Internationally, the struggle for peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems is a

"form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism." (81 Parties' Statement).

The Cuban Example

Peaceful co-existence implies both struggle and negotiation, standing firm and compromising. The Communist Party of China rejects in practice negotiation and compromise. This is shown in its opposition to the nuclear test ban, and to the Soviet Union's actions in the Caribbean crisis last October.

The U.S.A. was building up for an invasion of Cuba. Kennedy had pledged full support for the Cuban exiles and was arming and training them.

The Soviet Union took additional steps to help the Cubans. Kennedy blockaded Cuba and threatened war. Cuba prepared to defend itself, the Soviet Union negotiated and peace was saved; peace which left Cuba sovereign and independent, stronger than ever, with Kennedy pledged before the world not to invade Cuba. And that promise has been carried out in the many months since, despite predictions that it would be violated.

This concrete example of peaceful co-existence, of struggle and compromise, was attacked as a "Munich", as the bartering away of Cuban independence. No Chinese proposal as to an alternative line of action was forthcoming, except absurd statements about "Cuba beating the U.S.A. on its own."

In the article "More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us", it is stated:

"...during the Cuban events certain people first committed the error of adventurism and then committed the error of capitulationism; wanting the Cuban people to accept humiliating terms which would have meant the sacrifice of the sovereignty of their country." (p. 189)

Leaders of the "left" group in Australia echoed these views.

The reality is quite different, as Fidel Castro stated:

"The actions of the U.S.S.R. which, to protect a small country thousands and thousands of miles away, put into the balance of a big war the well-being forged in 45 years of heroic labour and tremendous sacrifice is now evident in all its greatness.

"History has never known of such solidarity. That is internationalism. That is Communism.

"The imperialists have failed all along the line to strangle the Cuban revolution because in all cases, economically, militarily and morally, Cuba had the U.S.S.R. on its side."

The Communist Party of China, which claims that it "prints both sides", has never mentioned this statement by Castro, nor has the Hill group!

Peace Is Not Inevitable

While war is not inevitable, peace can only be won and preserved by vigilance and ever-broadening action of the peoples everywhere.

The U.S. imperialist warmongers have already worked out a military strategy of "preventive war", a term used to cover up the policy of striking the first blow with nuclear weapons. They quite openly calculate the possibility of hundreds of millions of deaths, and seek to justify this by the idiotic slogan: Better Dead than Red.

The danger of war remains great.

In Australia, a much broader and stronger peace movement and a more determined united struggle against the Menzies Government and U.S. domination are needed.

Nuclear War would be a Disaster for the World

Since 1945, Communists in Australia and the world over have warned of the horrors of nuclear war, and sought to ban all nuclear weapons. Their unprecedented destructive power needs to be thoroughly understood. The U.S. A-bomb dropped on Hiroshima was the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT. It destroyed the whole city killing 80,000 people immediately, and injuring scores of thousands more, many of whom later died. Today there are nuclear weapons 5000 times as powerful!

The Communist Party of China says that to describe the horror of these weapons is to frighten the peoples, but we believe it rather makes them indignant and determined to prevent war. The steady growth of the world movement to ban the bomb shows this to be so.

We cannot believe that the Communist Party of China, which heads a socialist country, wants war. But we do consider that it does not seriously enough assess the danger of nuclear war.

Views such as that "the atom bomb is a paper tiger" or "on the debris of a dead imperialism, the victorious people would create very swiftly a civilisation thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future" ignore vital facts.

Nuclear war would not only make debris of imperialism but also would destroy hundreds of millions of working people, wipe out the main centres of civilisation and the accumulated productive wealth of generations, and render much of the earth uninhabitable for many years.

Socialism would eventually be built, but certainly not "very swiftly". The building of socialism requires advanced productive forces and most of them would be destroyed in nuclear war.

To set out to prevent war before the bombs begin to fall, to restrain the imperialists and prevent them from launching war is the only line in accord with Communist theory.

The burning determination of the peoples can prevent nuclear war, and this is in the interests of the earliest possible achievement of a socialist world.

Communists Support National Independence Struggle

From its formation 43 years ago, the Communist Party of Australia has done its utmost to rally the Australian people to support the aspirations and struggle of the oppressed colonial peoples for national independence.

To mention but some instances: support for China's struggle against imperialism since 1925, including the campaign against sending materials for Japan's war industry, and to boycott Japanese goods in 1937 and 1938; support for the Indonesian revolution in 1945 and 1946 and for the return of West Irian to Indonesia; support for India's struggle for freedom from British rule; support for the peoples of Indo-China in their struggle against the French and now against U.S. intervention.

The Communist Party of Australia has always campaigned for the rights of the Aboriginal people, opposed the "White Australia" policy, and fought for the right of the people of Papua-New Guinea to self-determination and against colonial exploitation of them by Australian monopoly.

The Communist Party consistently campaigns for Australian foreign policy to be based upon friendship towards and support of the struggle for national independence of the nations of South East Asia, South Africa and elsewhere.

The Communist Party of Australia campaigns against Australian support for U.S. intervention in Vietnam, for withdrawal of U.S. forces and observance of the Geneva Agreement. It demands the withdrawal of Australian troops from Malaya, opposes Malaysia as a scheme to maintain colonial rule over the peoples of the region, and calls for a pact of peace and friendship with Indonesia.

Our stand correctly merges patriotism with internationalism. Our stand for peace and friendship with South East Asia and in support of national liberation movements is part of the working class struggle against Australian monopoly capitalism, which is hostile to the newly-emerging nations of South East Asia and supports imperialist military pacts and aggressive plans in this area.

Yet the Communist Party of China and the Hill group say that our Party, and other Parties, do not support the national liberation movement and even oppose national revolutions!

The Communist Party of China says that peaceful co-existence is being interpreted by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in particular to mean peaceful co-existence between oppressor and oppressed nations.

This is in complete contradiction with well known facts. Extensive aid in many forms has been given to Indonesia, Egypt, India, Cuba, and many other countries newly independent or fighting for independence.

The struggle for peace, for general and complete disarmament assists the struggle for national liberation. In turn, the national liberation movement greatly helps the struggle for peace and disarmament.

To pose the fight for peaceful co-existence against the national liberation movement, or vice versa, is to split and weaken the anti-imperialist forces.

The People Against Monopoly in the Fight for Australia's Future

The guiding line for the work of the Communist Party of Australia laid down by its 19th National Congress in 1961, is summarised in the slogan—The People Against Monopoly.

This line arises from the realities of Australian life.

The tremendous growth of monopoly has led to domination of Australia by 60 monopoly families, headed by the Darling, Syme, Baillieu, Fairfax and Knox families. They control the whole economy together with U.S. and British monopolists, with whom they are frequently in alliance.

All the decisions of Governments, Liberal or Labor, are increasingly dictated by the monopolists. Their trusted men, Menzies, Barwick, Holt and others, are put into positions of power and influence.

Economic and financial policies are planned to help monopoly; taxation is used to pump wealth out of the pockets of the people into the monopolists' bank accounts.

War expenditure not only prepares for war to further monopoly interests, but also goes in large part to swell their profits.

Australian imperialism exploits and oppresses the subject peoples of Papua, New Guinea and other Pacific Islands. It dominates the economy of Fiji. It has investments in Malaya, Singapore, Indonesia and other Asian countries.

But Australian imperialism is not strong enough, alone, to maintain and extend its power in the South Pacific. It can only hope to do this by tying itself to U.S. imperialism.

Consequently, U.S. monopolies are given the utmost encouragement to invest in Australia, thus

giving them ever increasing power in our home affairs. This results in further subordination of Australia's foreign policy to the interests of American imperialism.

Basing itself on this analysis, the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of Australia determined that the main direction of struggle for the people's interests must be against the giant capitalist monopolies, which merge with Governments and the apparatus of state to form state-monopoly capitalism.

The Fight to Curb and Restrict Monopoly Power

The Communist Party of Australia works for united action of the working class and its allies to limit the power of the monopolies.

While explaining that only Socialism will smash monopoly power, the Communist Party of Australia shows that people's action can win public ownership, or nationalisation of the decisive monopolies.

The Party also works for agreement on even more limited demands, such as price controls, restriction of profits, capital gains tax, safeguards against monopoly takeovers, limits on foreign investments, etc.

The Party seeks to combine such anti-monopoly demands with united working class action for immediate industrial and political needs — wage rises, shorter hours, full employment, trade union and general democratic rights—and with the mass movements for educational reform, better pensions and other social services, housing and other public needs.

The Communist Party of Australia works to defend the interests of rural workers and small and middle farmers with a programme of demands in defence of their living standards and independence. This provides a basis for the working class and all working

farmers to join in common struggle to defend their interests.

In our view, this is the only way to bring the mass of the people into action against monopoly capitalism, the only way to prepare the forces for socialist revolution. It fully conforms to the line of the 81 Parties' Statement on these questions.

However, this also is attacked by the Communist Party of China and the Hill group in Australia. The Hill group declares this to be "reformist", that it "concentrates too much on economic demands with not enough attention to politics", that it is "not revolutionary enough."

Nationalisation

The Communist Party of China says that nationalisation is a "bourgeois fraud." But what is the actual position in Australia?

The Menzies Government has "de-nationalised" a number of profitable industries formerly run by the capitalist state (COR, AWA, Bell Bay, etc.) handing them over to monopoly.

In 1947, the Chifley Government's attempt to nationalise the banks was fiercely contested and defeated by the bankers and the capitalist class as a whole.

Why? Because the capitalist class sees that the successful functioning of any nationally-run enterprise demonstrates that capitalist ownership of industry is unnecessary, and this encourages the idea of Socialism.

The very idea of nationalisation is fiercely assailed by the Australian ruling class. Only strong, protracted mass struggle could force nationalisation of any monopoly enterprise.

It is dogmatic to say that "nationalisation is a fraud." The fight for nationalisation—and even more limited measures to curb and restrict monopoly—is progressive, helping to mobilise and educate the people for socialism. This view of the Australian and most other Communist Parties is supported by the 81 Parties' Statement.

The Communist Party's Fight for Working Class Unity

The Communist Party continually works to unite the workers of Australia for achievement of socialism.

All experience shows that when the working class is united, it can win its economic and political demands, and attract to its side the other classes and groups exploited by monopoly.

Within the labour movement, which embraces the trade unions, Australian Labor Party and Communist Party of Australia, there are different views on how to advance the interests of the working class.

In the trade union movement, there are differences about whether to adopt a militant policy of action and struggle against the employers, or to adopt the passive, reformist policy of reliance upon arbitration and cooperation with the employers.

The Communists advocate the line of united struggle. They base themselves upon the workers in industry and their demands, constantly striving to build up job organisation and union strength.

The Communists work for principled agreement with all trends of thought in the union movement, recognising that agreement between militant and reformist leaders strengthens unity and helps develop action.

Another difference within the trade union movement is on whether the unions should concern themselves only with industrial questions, or should also use their organised strength to fight for the workers' political interests.

The Communists advocate that the trade unions should also fight for political aims. The unions should struggle for legislative action for shorter hours and increased leave, for democratic rights, including

general issues as well as the right to strike, for abolition of penal legislation and for trade union independence. They should "make Peace union business," support the struggles of workers and oppressed peoples all over the world, and use their strength to fight reactionary governments.

The trade unions should use their strength to attain socialism. This is in line with the objective of the A.C.T.U.: "Socialisation of industry, i.e. production, distribution and exchange."

Which is the Correct Path for the Labour Movement?

The Australian Labor Party has two sides. On the one hand, it was founded on the trade unions and continues to exist as a party because of working class support. Its stated objective is socialisation.

On the other hand, the A.L.P. leaders oppose mass action and say that socialisation is only something to talk about, something in the dim and distant future. They maintain that their first task is to get into office and, when there, to run the capitalist system. They promise not to interfere, at least not much, with Big Business. They advocate cooperation between Labor Governments and Australian and foreign monopolies.

Within the Labor Party there is constant conflict between the two views. Some members want to change society, although usually lacking clear ideas about how, others merely want to govern.

The first viewpoint represents the influence of working class ideas, while the second viewpoint represents the influence of capitalist ideas inside the Labor Party.

There is no such conflict of views within the Communist Party of Australia. The Communist Party

believes in and works for the uniting of all working class forces to change society.

Reformism still has the support of the majority of the workers in Australia. But reformism can never solve the problems of the working class, never lead the workers in decisive struggle to end monopoly rule.

The difference between the reformist and revolutionary line has to be resolved in the course of the experience of the working class. By constantly explaining the way forward to socialism, and, at the same time, working for united action around common demands, the Communist Party seeks to enable workers to test out which policy is correct.

Defeat the Menzies Government

Our present work is directed to defeat of the Menzies Government. We reject as completely false Mr. Calwell's assertion that the Communists "don't give a rap whether the Menzies Government goes or stays." We advocate election of a Labor Government, while calling for support of Communist candidates and the truly working class policy they will advance.

We believe that defeat of Menzies and election of a Labor Government can be the first step along the road of struggle for a new direction of Australian home and foreign policy in the interests of the working class and its allies.

A Labor Government is already pledged to implement a number of reforms. It is also pledged to changes in foreign policy, including a nuclear-free southern hemisphere, recognition of the People's Republic of China, pacts of friendship with Indonesia and other South East Asian countries.

But the policy of the A.L.P. leaders (reformism or so-called "Democratic Socialism") is not the answer to the basic problems before the Australian working class and nation. Only a real socialist policy, founded

upon the scientific working class theory of Marxism-Leninism, can solve these problems.

Our aim is the formation of a single united working class party, guided by scientific socialism.

This can be achieved only through the experience of the working class in the class struggle, including experience of reformism in office.

This support for election of a Labor Government is determined by both the immediate and long range interests of the working class.

Immediate interests can be served by reforms, gained mainly by working class unity in action. The long range interests of the working class demand the building of a united movement for socialism. This will be helped by experience of the inadequacy of a Labor Government.

These views are based on detailed analysis of the situation in Australia, and application of Marxism-Leninism to it, extending over many years.

However, this line is now "not revolutionary enough" for the Hill group, which condemns it as "soft on imperialism, soft on reformism, creating illusions."

They demand "more revolutionary" policies and tactics, because they say, the struggle of the Australian working class will "very soon be crowned by the all-embracing liberating success of socialism."

This wishful thinking makes them impatient with the line of our Party. In place of the slow, hard work of uniting with the workers who support the A.L.P., they advocate "stepping up the attack on reformism."

They say the leaders of the A.L.P. leftwing are the most dangerous of the reformists because they prevent the workers coming over to the path of revolution.

Lenin long ago advised Communists everywhere

against such impatience, in "Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder." "... we in Russia have been concerned by a long, painful and bloody experience of the truth that revolutionary tactics cannot be built up on revolutionary moods alone. Tactics must be based on a sober and strictly objective estimation of *all* the class forces in a given state (in neighbouring states and in all states, i.e. on a world scale), as well as an evaluation of the experience of revolutionary movements. To express one's "revolutionism" solely by hurling abuse at Parliamentary opportunism, solely by refusing to participate in parliaments, is very easy; but just because it is too easy, it is not the solution of a . . . very difficult problem."

One of the main differences between the Communist Party of Australia and the Hill group is whether to do the necessary hard, patient work or to take the easy road of hurling abuse. It is the difference between the working class revolutionary and the "petty-bourgeois in a frenzy."

The Hill group finds support for its impatience in some extraordinary views of the Communist Party of China about the contemporary world. For instance, the "People's Daily" editorials on the anniversary of the Moscow Declaration and Moscow Statement (Peking Review No. 47 and 48, 1962) said:

"The workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie, patriotic and revolutionary national intellectuals, and patriotic and revolutionary national bourgeoisie of various countries *who constitute more than 90 per cent of the world's population, are always for revolution.*" (Our emphasis.)

Can we accept the proposition that 90% of the world's population always favor revolution? Or is this an example of tailoring the facts to support attacks on most of the Communist Parties of the world?

How Can Socialist Australia Be Achieved?

The Communist Party's programme, first adopted in 1951, answers the question in this way:

"Socialism can only be achieved through working class struggle . . . Socialism will be achieved only by carrying on the class struggle to the establishment of People's Power in Australia.

"Socialism involves the abolition of monopoly capitalism, socialisation of the giant monopolies and their use for the benefit of society."

The question then arises: can this social revolution be achieved without civil war?

The Programme says: "The Communist Party at all times stands for a peaceful solution of the political, economic and social issues of our time."

Peaceful transition does not mean that the capitalists are expected to hand over without a struggle. The Programme states:

"The active people's movement, which unites the majority of our people under the leadership of the working class, is essential for winning a genuine People's Government. It will develop as a result of many struggles — large and small — which our working people will wage in defence of their interests.

"This mighty organised movement of the people led by a united working class will win real people's political power and a People's Government. The machinery of state will be transformed and the agents of the monopolies in positions of authority in the civil service, police, judiciary and the armed forces will be replaced by determined and loyal supporters of the people's power.

"Our parliaments will be filled by true representatives of the people's movement. . . .

"The People's Government . . . will immediately proceed to . . . break the power of the small clique of industrial, banking and land monopolies, as the essential condition for opening the way to the building of socialism."

" . . . in carrying through these decisive measures to implement the democratic will of the people, every effort of the capitalist class to defy the People's Government and Parliament will be resisted and defeated.

"The Government will rely on the strength of the organised workers to ensure that the programme decided upon by the people's representatives in Parliament is operated in practice, and that all attempts to resist or sabotage it are defeated and the enemies of the people brought to justice."

This Programme has been substantially the same since 1951, and none of the Hill group ever opposed it, until recently. Now they accuse the Party of having "lost its revolutionary spirit," of believing that the capitalists will peacefully hand over their privileges, and so forth.

These accusations are inspired by the propaganda of the Communist Party of China which has launched an all-out assault against the concepts that socialism can be achieved without civil war and that parliament can be "transformed from an instrument serving the class interests of the capitalists into an instrument serving the working people." (Statement of the 81 Parties.)

The Chinese Party, which signed the 81 Parties' Statement, now describes these views as "social democracy" and "Parliamentary cretinism," and accuses those parties which uphold the 81 Parties' Statement and seek to apply its principles to their own class struggle of "paralysing the revolutionary will of the proletariat," and "forsaking the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The Communist Party of Australia will continue its work of preparing the revolutionary forces of the working class with the aim of ending monopoly capitalism through class struggle.

We will continue to strive to create a people's movement strong enough to prevent the ruling class unleashing a bloody civil war.

We will continue to work for establishment of a People's Government which will smash monopoly power and the old state apparatus, putting in its place a truly democratic people's power led by the organised working class, and capable of successfully resisting all efforts of monopoly capitalism to regain its lost power.

In so doing, we are heeding Lenin's injunction to seek the forms of transition to socialism which accord with the conditions of our country.

As R. Dixon said in the discussion of the Programme unanimously adopted in 1951: ". . . the Draft Programme opens up new broad perspectives. It calls for the building of a people's movement, based upon an alliance of workers and farmers, which would create the conditions for the establishment of a genuine government of the people expressing the will and power of the people.

"A people's movement, capable of such tasks, could be built only through the development of a vast, all-sided activity in defence of peace and the needs and interests of the people, in which full account is taken of traditional democratic organisations and institutions in this country, including parliament."

Was it Right or Wrong to Combat the Cult of the Individual?

The Communist Party of China and the Hill group now strongly criticise the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for its exposure of the weaknesses and serious mistakes of the latter years of Stalin's leadership.

The Communist Party of China's letter of June 14, 1963, says:

"To raise the question of combating the cult of the individual is actually to counterpose the leaders to the masses, undermine the Party's unified leadership which is based on democratic centralism, dissipate its fighting strength and disintegrate its ranks."

The Communist Party of Australia's view is that it was the cult of the individual which had those bad effects. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, by boldly exposing the cult at its 20th Congress and combating it, restored correct relationships, strengthened the Soviet Party and helped the whole world Communist movement.

The Communist Party of China, at that time, praised the C.P.S.U. for its action. In 1960, it signed the 81 Parties' Statement which welcomed "the victories of the Communist Parties in a number of countries in the struggle against deviations, elimination of the harmful consequences of the personality cult. . . ."

In the *People's Daily* Editor's Note to the C.P.S.U. Open Letter (Peking Review No. 30, 1963), it is now stated that the Communist Party of China and "Comrade Mao Tse-tung himself" criticised the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for "failing to make an all-round analysis, in failing to make self criticism and failing to consult with the fraternal parties."

Then it says:

"In that period, the *People's Daily* published two articles . . . which made a comprehensive evaluation of Stalin in a reasoned and positive form and tactfully criticised the error of completely negating Stalin."

One of those articles, "Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," said:

"The Chinese Communist Party congratulates the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on its great achievements in this historic struggle against the cult of the individual."

"During the latter part of his life, Stalin took more and more pleasure in this cult of the individual, and violated the Party's system of democratic centralism and the principle of combining collective leadership with individual responsibility. As a result he made serious mistakes such as the following: he broadened the scope of the suppression of counter-revolution; he lacked the necessary vigilance on the eve of the anti-fascist war; he failed to pay proper attention to the further development of agriculture and the material welfare of the peasantry, he gave certain wrong advice on the international Communist movement, and, in particular made a wrong decision on the question of Yugoslavia."

In Australia, the denunciation of the cult of the individual has not undermined the Party's unified leadership. On the contrary, it has strengthened it.

It is the Hill group, which supports the cult, that wants to weaken the authority of elected leading committees.

It is indeed strange that the Communist Party of China has now departed from its previous balanced stand and taken such a one-sided position. Especially when it is recalled that in 1945 the effects of Stalin's errors, as they showed themselves in China, were

criticised by the Chinese Party's "Resolution on Some Questions in the History of our Party":—

"In many places, where sectarianism in cadres policy was further complicated by an erroneous anti-espionage policy, large numbers of good comrades were wrongly indicted and unjustly punished; this led to the most lamentable losses inside the Party. Such sectarian errors weakened the Party to an immense extent. . . ."

History has confirmed the Communist Party of China's view of seven years ago:

"We Chinese Communists are firmly convinced that as a result of the sharp criticisms made at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. all of those positive factors which were previously suppressed as a result of certain mistaken policies will inevitably spring to life, and the Party and the people will become still more firmly united in the struggle to build a communist society such as mankind has not yet seen, and win a lasting world peace." (Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.)

The Australian people have a rich tradition in the struggle for democratic rights.

These are under constant attack from monopoly capital, and the Communist Party has played a leading role in defending them.

In a Socialist Australia, democracy for the working people would be immensely extended. We regard the criticism of the cult of the individual as of great importance in strengthening the Party now, and in helping to ensure that gains made will never be dissipated through violations of socialist democracy.

Absurdities Instead of Argument

In its attacks on fraternal parties in socialist and capitalist countries alike, the Communist Party of China has made far-reaching and fantastic assertions, in disregard of the facts.

Not satisfied with accusations of "revisionism" and "treachery" and "supporting, prettifying and collaborating with imperialism," the Communist Party of China tries to dig up a social, class basis for such charges.

It says that in socialist countries (especially the Soviet Union) there is a move to restore capitalism by social groups or classes which still exist in all socialist countries, while in capitalist countries "certain persons" in the leadership of the Communist Parties are corrupted representatives of the labour aristocracy.

Is this not fantasy? The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has adopted the great Programme for Building Communism, but the Communist Party of China sees in this programme steps "tantamount to helping restore capitalism." What is the "theoretical" basis for this? The Communist Party of China's letter of June 14, 1963, says:

"Certain persons may say that their society is already one without classes. We answer: No, there are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception.

"Since remnants of the old exploiting classes who are trying to stage a comeback still exist there, since new capitalist elements are constantly being generated there, and since there are still parasites, speculators, idlers, hooligans, embezzlers of state funds, etc., how can it be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary?"

What "new capitalist elements are constantly being

generated there" — i.e. in the Soviet Union? The only answer apparently is "... parasites, speculators, idlers, hooligans, embezzlers. . . ."

Truly a new contribution to Marxist thought! It is implied that there is a "class of hooligans, idlers . . . etc." Back in 1848 Marx described these, in the Communist Manifesto, not as a class but as a "passively rotting mass."

Not many years ago, the Communist Party of China was able to make a more balanced judgment on individuals under socialism and even communism.

"Therefore, not everybody will be perfect, *even when a communist society is established*. But then there will still be contradictions among people, and *there will still be good people and bad*." (Historical Experiences of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat — emphasis added.)

Correctly, nothing was said then of a "class of bad people!"

Something more is meant, of course. It is hinted at in talk of "Political degeneration and new bourgeois elements (which) may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries. . . ."

Hill and others say that the Communist Party of China believes that the leaders and functionaries of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Soviet state are a new class, which has become corrupted and comfortable, afraid of war and revolutions.

This is what the Trotskyites said in the 1930's. In our times, it is said by the extreme "Yugoslav revisionist" Djilas. It is strange indeed to find the Chinese comrades, who are always loudly opposing Yugoslav revisionism, propagating the Djilas "New Class" theory!

To back up the "theory" that capitalism is being restored "in a certain form," it is necessary to assert

that communism is not in the process of being built in the U.S.S.R. The Communist Party of China's letter of June 14, 1963 says:

"In their present level of economic development all socialist countries are still *far, far removed* from the higher stage of communism in which 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' is put into practice." (Emphasis added.)

This was not always the Communist Party of China's view about either the U.S.S.R. or China. In *Peking Review*, No. 44 of 1958, an article hailed the "Great Soviet Plan to Build Communism."

In *Peking Review* No. 43, 1958, a resolution of the Chinese Party's Central Committee corrected views which hailed the communes in China as heralding immediate transition to communism, but then set out the following perspective:

"... the transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people is a process which may take . . . *five or six years or even longer*. Even with the completion of this transition, people's communes, like state-owned factories, are still socialist in character. *Some years after* that the social product will increase greatly, the communist consciousness and morality of the entire people will be raised to a much higher degree, universal education . . . differences between worker and peasant, town and country . . . mental and manual labour — the legacies of the old society . . . — and the remnants of unequal bourgeois rights — will gradually vanish; and the function of the state will be limited to protecting the country from external aggression. . . . *At that time Chinese society will enter the era of communism*." (Emphasis added.)

It therefore could scarcely be said that five years ago the Communist Party of China believed that China was "far, far removed from communism."

Their estimate for China may have been over-optimistic, but that is no argument against the plan for building communism in the U.S.S.R. Still less does it indicate that there is danger of the restoration of capitalism there.

In fact, the successes already achieved in communist construction prove that the aim set by the C.P.S.U. Programme for building the base of communism by 1980 is well within reach.

In arguing against the Soviet statement that the State in the U.S.S.R. has now become a "State of the whole people" the Chinese comrades use the same method of dogmatic assertions, quoting the book without really examining the facts. They say that there are class differences between worker and peasant and that this invalidates the concept of the "State of the whole people." They ignore the fact that there are no longer antagonisms between worker and peasant in the U.S.S.R.

Their slanderous suggestion that "leaders of certain Communist Parties represent the interests of the labour aristocracy" has no more foundation in fact than their charges that the C.P.S.U. is "restoring capitalism."

Both these arguments are put forward, it appears, not because their authors are convinced they are true, but as part of a frantic search to find something to build up a case and buttress up other assertions.

The Communist Party of China uses the question of relations with Yugoslavia as a means to bolster its case that the majority of Communist Parties are "revisionists" and "traitors to the working class."

Yugoslavia

The Communist Party of Australia has waged the necessary struggle against the ideas of Yugoslav revisionism as called for in the 81 Parties' Statement.

There is now no sympathy or support anywhere in our Party for these ideas. Should the need arise, the necessary steps will be taken.

In line with the 81 Parties' Statement and in accordance with the facts of the Yugoslav economy, the Communist Party of Australia regards Yugoslavia as a socialist country, taking as welcome and sensible the efforts to strengthen relations between Yugoslavia and other socialist countries.

* * *

Taken as a whole, the arguments advanced by the leaders of the Communist Party of China are couched in language which is uncomradely in the extreme.

The manner of reasoning, and quoting from Marx and Lenin as from a catechism and in the most abstract fashion, departs from their previous practice and violates what Lenin described as "the most essential thing in Marxism . . . the concrete analysis of concrete conditions."

Lenin also said:

"We do not regard Marxist theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the cornerstone of the science which socialists *must* further advance in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life."

The Communist Party of Australia tries to follow this advice in its theoretical work.

How Not to Work for Unity

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued a statement on July 13 entitled "We Want Unity, Not a Split" (Peking Review, No. 29, 1963.) Is this true?

The C.P.C. attitude towards other Communist Parties and to the 1960 Statement of the 81 Parties does not help to create conditions for unity. Nor does its deliberate disruption of non-party world organisations such as the peace movement, the trade unions, and organisations of women and youth by trying to force its own views on them and abusing all who disagree. Indeed, the question arises: Is there a real desire for unity, or is it a split that is wanted?

The Communist Party of China publishes and circulates widely many articles and pamphlets attacking the stand of many other Parties, including our own. It says that the majority of Communist Parties are: "revisionist" — that is, revising Marxism-Leninism in the interests of the capitalist class; "betraying the interests of the entire international proletariat and the people of the world" "departing from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism," "catering to the needs of imperialism"; "protecting the interests of monopoly capital, betraying those of the proletariat, and degenerating into social democrats"; "deliberately deceiving the peoples of the world and helping the imperialists in their policies of aggression and war; "running hither and thither in response to the baton of certain persons abroad," and many similar insulting phrases.

These accusations are made in a general form, without any proof.

If the Chinese comrades believe their own charges, how could they desire unity with "collaborators with

imperialism," "revisionists," "traitors," "social democrats"?

By putting the argument on such a basis, they prevent proper discussion. This indicates that they are working for a split, in which those calling themselves "true Marxist-Leninists" will cut themselves off from those they label "revisionists."

The Hill group has in fact foreshadowed the appearance of a "new" Party in Australia, following the Chinese Party lead:

"If the leading group in any Party adopt a non-revolutionary line and convert it into a reformist party, then Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the Party will replace them and lead the people in making revolution." (Letter, June 14, 1963.)

In practice, the Communist Party of China leaders and their allies, the Albanian Party leaders, are now more or less openly working to split other Communist Parties.

E. F. Hill was removed from the leadership of the Communist Party of Australia and then expelled for continued factional activity, contempt of Party democracy, violation of the Party Constitution and refusal to obey decisions of Party conferences and leading bodies.

The Chinese comrades were informed of this, yet Hill was invited to China for discussions and feted by Mao Tse-tung.

On July 23, Hsinhua News Agency reported that "representatives of the Belgian Communist Party were invited to Albania." It turns out that these "representatives" were *expelled* from the Belgian Communist Party at its last Congress!

This is a strange new contribution to Marxist-Leninist teachings on the Party and on relations between Communist Parties!

A new category of Marxist-Leninists is discovered — those who place themselves *outside* the Party. Relations between Communist Parties are now relations with splinter groups, which have no support among the Party or the masses.

This, from the Communist Party of China, which has so often correctly said it is wrong "to interfere in internal affairs" of other Parties!

This, from the Chinese comrades, who have so often asserted the right of all Parties to decide their own policies, and who have sharply criticised what they considered attempts to impose "the programme, resolutions and line of one's own Party on other fraternal Parties" as the "common programme" of the international communist movement.

The appearance from time to time of differences within a Communist Party and in the world movement is inevitable. This can serve to strengthen rather than weaken the movement if they are treated as differences between Communists with the same aims, the same basic class standpoint and ideological outlook. They can then be discussed and resolved by concrete analysis and investigation, in which all learn; if there are some issues which cannot be settled immediately, experience in practice will resolve them.

How to Restore Unity

The first necessity for unity today is abandonment of the hostile stand of the Communist Party of China, which treats the differences as being between themselves — "100% Marxist-Leninists" — and the majority of Communist Parties — "enemies of Marxism-Leninism" and "traitors to the working class."

A further necessity for unity is for the Communist Party of China to end its open or covert support for factional groups and splitters in other Parties.

It is also necessary to place emphasis on what unites rather than on what divides.

While it may take some time, we are confident that Marxism-Leninism will prevail; and unity in the fight against imperialism, for peace and for socialism will be achieved.

Despite the differences, the socialist countries are achieving great successes and the Communist parties in the capitalist countries are making advances in their leadership of the people's struggles.

Restoration of unity in the world movement will enable the advance to become still faster, and hasten the day, which is clearly coming, when Communism will triumph the world over.

Build the Communist Party

The Communist Party is the most resolute opponent of monopoly capitalism, a vanguard fighter for peace, the party of the working class which works tirelessly for a Socialist Australia.

A strong Communist Party is a great asset for the whole labour movement, the best guarantee of working class unity. Strengthening the Communist Party is not a narrow question only of concern to members of the Communist Party; it is an urgent need for the whole class.

We set out to convince all believers in socialism, all militant workers and peace-lovers that the Communist Party's programme, policy and activity is the way forward for Australia and that they should join our Party to help in the great fight to realise the socialist objective of the labour movement.

The great strength of the Communist Party lies in its scientific theory, in its consistent work to build unity in defence of the economic and political interests of the working people, and in its discipline and organisation. These are the great contributions the Communist Party has to make to the labour movement.

The Communist Party works to build a mass Communist Party which will enlist tens of thousands of industrial and white collar workers, working farmers and intellectuals in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism. This will make it possible to progress towards the aim of a single, united workers' party guided by scientific socialist theory, Marxism-Leninism.

The monopolists and their agents are implacably hostile to the Communist Party and use all weapons to prevent its growth and destroy its influence. They fight its ideas, try to split its ranks and isolate it

so they can smash the Party. However, all such efforts end in failure.

The Communist Party of Australia appeals to all workers and the progressive people who support its aims and policy to strengthen the Party by supporting and joining the only Party which can lead the people's struggle against monopoly and war to its final goal—SOCIALIST AUSTRALIA.
