

ories, in the people's organisations, among the farmers, every-
where, is the only way we see our role. May
1966

Our view is that such mass work can only be carried out by devoted Marxist-Leninists who have trained themselves in the process of practice, ideologically, as Marxist-Leninists. Ideology will ensure correct politics and organisation. If our members are fully trained then they are capable of the infinite flexibility and identity with the given sphere or stratum of people required of mass workers. Slowly, gradually, we are developing such people. There are those who say we are abstract. Of course that is true, or partially true. At the same time we are concrete. They are but two sides of the contradiction. Taken singly we are one-sided. Taken together we are not one-sided. Mass work — summing up (abstraction, if you like) — mass work again — and again summing up.

Our comrades have paid particular attention to Mao Tse-tung's "On Practice" and "On Contradiction" as an essential part of our development as a Party. These writings have opened many doors for us, in mass work and in understanding theory. They have enabled us to challenge many of the old ideas we had, to test them anew, to take what was good and discard what was bad.

Once more we must say that we are feeling our way. There are successes and failures. But our comrades are full of optimism because they are inspired by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

You comrades have had the great advantage of a leadership that was firm in Marxism-Leninism. Your course has not been exactly similar to ours. Your contribution has been much greater. In the past we have expressed to your leading comrades our profound admiration and respect for them and our profound gratitude for the assistance we have had from the example of your party. We should like now to avail ourselves of this opportunity of conveying those sentiments to the delegates to this Conference and through you to your whole Party and to wish you even greater successes in the struggle for Socialism and independence in New Zealand.

LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM!

**LONG LIVE THE SOLIDARITY OF THE C.P.N.Z.
AND THE C.P.A. (M.L.)!**

Why There Cannot Be Unity With The Modern Revisionists

The Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) frequently meets with statements by very good people that they agree with us but that we should unite with the Communist Party of Australia. Sometimes it is said that the Russians and the Chinese should unite. Obviously this is a question that troubles many workers and supporters of social revolution. It therefore requires a serious answer.

People who make this assertion undoubtedly have the cause of the working class and of socialism at heart. Yet to us it is quite clear there can never be reconciliation with those whom we call modern revisionists. Why is it that it is clear to us and yet not clear to these very good supporters? There are many reasons and it is not a matter that can be disposed of with one all embracing answer.

In the first place, human understanding unfolds in a complicated way — by experience, conclusions from experience, and putting those conclusions into practice. Experience showed people who ask this type of question that Khrushchov was wrong, but it took quite a time. They drew the conclusion from a series of experiences that his wrongness was not accidental: it was systematic and arose from his desertion from Marxism-Leninism. Therefore they say to us you were correct about Khrushchov and we agree with your stand on all other questions except one and that is your irreconcilable attitude to those whom you call revisionists.

And we must say to them "yes, we are irreconcilable in our attitude to the revisionists. There can and never will be reconciliation. And if you do not agree with us please let time show you that we are just as correct about the present position as we were about Khrushchov."

Stan J. King Collector

FROM AN ORIGINAL IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE ARCHIVES

This matter is a question of theory and of concrete practice. Khrushchov expounded ideas of peaceful co-existence, peaceful transition to socialism, reconciliation with social democracy. Within the Soviet Union he fought for the restoration of the profit motive. Internationally he came to terms with the U.S. imperialists but only on the terms of the U.S. imperialists. Within Australia the modern revisionists headed by L. Aarons slavishly followed Khrushchov. Specifically in Australia they urged unity with the A.L.P. and they abrogated all working class struggle. The A.L.P. fully supports Australia's alliance with the U.S. imperialists. We must say we think that that is treachery to the Australian workers and working people. Unity with the A.L.P. is necessarily the same treachery.

Now Khrushchov has been replaced in the Soviet Union. It is said that things have changed, that the new leaders are better and that within the capitalist countries the revisionists are better now that Khrushchov has gone; that there is the possibility of unity, reconciliation. But we must assert that the possibility is less. The situation has not improved; it has deteriorated. In its deterioration there is good because Khrushchov's exposure undermines his successors and the day is getting closer when this policy will be overthrown within the Soviet Union.

The fact is that Khrushchov and his colleagues (who are now his successors) represent the capitalist elements in the Soviet Union. There are in fact capitalist strata in the Soviet Union. The very highly paid live on the exploitation of the workers. That is their economic basis just as in capitalist society social democracy, reformism is based upon the highly paid sections of the workers. Everything the Soviet revisionists do flows from their class interests — capitalist class. So they are in class unity with the capitalists throughout the world. And as they exist in a powerful country they seek common ground with the capitalists of what to them is the other powerful capitalist country—U.S.A.

To test all this there are outstanding examples. Khrushchov assisted the Indian reactionaries to wage war on China. Kosygin took the part of India in its war on Pakistan, then imposed the so-called Tashkent agreement with the aim of strengthening India. Kosygin proposes joint socialist action in support of Vietnam. Superficially that is attractive and there are those who say it should be tested out so that the Soviet leaders can expose themselves. Therefore there should be unity and agreement with this proposition. Our opinion is that that is profoundly mistaken. The Soviet leaders have already exposed themselves. Khrushchov pursued the policy of disengagement in Vietnam, i.e., get

right out of it and leave the U.S. to it. Kosygin pursues the policy of disengagement in Vietnam in order to achieve the same objective, i.e., Soviet-U.S. control of the situation. The Soviet leaders want to end the Vietnamese struggle by negotiations, i.e., leaving U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. They have not been able to impose their will on Vietnam. The problem for them is how to impose their will. If they occupy key military positions or supply key military material in Vietnam then they can use it to control the situation just as they used their rockets in Cuba. It is said well why not test it? But do you go into a critical battle with a person whom you know for certain is a traitor in order to test his treachery? Certainly not. His treachery can lead to your defeat. The situation is too serious for such an exercise. We know from a multitude of facts of the Soviet leaders treachery, of their real alliance with the U.S. imperialists. There is the "spirit of Camp David," of "Tashkent," of open collaboration with the Indian reactionaries, of seeking agreement with the Japanese imperialists, of co-ordination and agreement with U.S. imperialism. The U.S. imperialists can withdraw troops from Europe critical to them in Vietnam only because of the actual (not imagined) conduct of the Soviet leaders. The Soviet leaders interfere in the internal affairs of the Communist Parties in Japan, Indonesia, New Zealand and indeed of all others, including those in Asia and Europe in order to try to impose their line of peaceful transition, peaceful co-existence, negotiations on them. That line is peace at any price, agreement with U.S. imperialism at any price. We say to you examine all the facts and ask yourselves is it possible for there to be reconciliation with all this?

For the Chinese or us even to think of unity or reconciliation or even to raise the question would be treachery. It would suggest there was something good in these people. It would help them in their treachery. It would be betrayal of the working people of the world. There is nothing good in the Soviet revisionists or local revisionists except their badness and their badness is good because it leads to their exposure.

Then it is said the Communists in China, Albania, New Zealand and Japan did not go to the 23rd Congress of the C.P.S.U. That, it is said, is bad. It creates confusion particularly when others went. Once more we must say that to go to a conference initiated by traitors is to provide the traitors with cover. It is to assist their treachery. We know full well from a host of facts they are traitors. How then can Marxist-Leninists go on the basis that this is the Congress of a fraternal party? The Soviet leaders would then say, "Look, the Chinese, the Albanians, the

New Zealanders, the Japanese attended; we can't be as bad as they say." Marxist-Leninists are responsible for the destiny of the people of the world. Anything they do that jeopardises that destiny is bad. In particular the Chinese Party is seen and seen correctly as the focal party, leading party of Marxism-Leninism. If the Chinese Party had attended would it, for example, have assisted the Marxist-Leninists in the Soviet Union? On the contrary. Would it assist the Marxist-Leninists in Australia? On the contrary. So it goes for the world.

When a man is actually scabbing on a big workers' struggle and calls a conference, do the struggling workers accept an invitation to go along and discuss the scabbery, even though the discussion might be wrapped up in pleasant words? Of course they don't, because to go along as though the person were not a scab would be to help him, give him standing, take the heat off him. The present day struggle is even more serious.

Those who refrained from attending have assisted the struggle against the scabs and renegades. They have made the scabs and renegades stand out more clearly for all the world to see.

Look at it another way. Everyone knows that the Soviet leaders have spared no effort in abusing the Chinese Communists and the Albanians, the Indonesians, the New Zealanders and the Japanese. Yet they invited them to the 23rd Congress. Why? It could not be for love of a fraternal party for in the case of Albania, they even broke off diplomatic relations. It could not be for the furtherance of Marxism-Leninism because they assert that these parties are not Marxist-Leninist. (The Chinese are even "Trotskyist," "adventurist," "pseudo-revolutionaries," and the Albanians "have sold themselves to the imperialists for 30 pieces of silver"). Why then invite them? Simply to cover their own revisionist treachery and to provide the means for pursuing their treachery.

Within Australia the Aarons revisionist group follows this whole line. It is even a little clearer in Australia. It has changed the Tribune from its previous position as a workers' paper, a Communist paper into Australia's national progressive weekly and its Communist Review into Left Review. It has acquired a very expensive headquarters and printery. It seeks unity, identity, reconciliation with the A.L.P. Should we then seek unity with it? Do we want unity with the A.L.P. — a party of capitalism that supports the U.S. alliance and thus the war in Vietnam? Do we want to repudiate Communism into a Left Review or Australia's national progressive weekly? We may say we do not

object to changes in a name. There is no necessary magic in a name. But when the change is made in the present circumstances, it is a reflection of desertion of Marxism-Leninism. No more eloquent expression of desertion of Marxism-Leninism could be found than that by Mortimer, member of Aaron's revisionist clique on the Four Corners Television Programme on the A.B.C. on April 2.

We set out in full what he said:

"Mr. Mortimer, you've been called an exponent of the Italian Communist line. Could you briefly explain what the Italian line is.

"Well, first of all I don't like to be called an exponent of the Italian line because I like to be called an exponent of an Australian line, but I think what people mean when they say this is that the Italian party is the party that has most successfully adapted itself to the new conditions in the western world if you like. They have developed a set of theses about how it is possible to mobilise a popular movement for socialism utilising the democratic process that exists in Italy. Now this seems to me to be somewhat relevant to our conditions in Australia. Therefore I think the Italian experience is very worthwhile studying but I don't think that you can automatically apply what the Italians do or say to Australia any more than you can what the Russians do or say but I think the Italian line is more relevant to Australia because the social conditions are more similar.

"Would you call it a more liberal line perhaps than those who follow either the Moscow or Peking lines fairly rigidly?

"Well if you ignore the connotations that liberalism has — yes, in the sense that I think it is a more relaxed and creative approach to socialism.

"Would you say that means working more within our normal constitutional processes in Australia?

"Yes, but it doesn't mean relying solely upon parliamentary means. We believe that essentially socialism in Australia can only come by the mobilisation of the democratic resources of the people as a whole, different classes of people, different strata of people and they have to take a direct part in the active process of social change in order to achieve socialism in Australia. So that it works within the democratic process by giving more weight to popular movements outside the purely parliamentary machine."

These statements of Mortimer are completely at one with the A.L.P. position. From a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist viewpoint they completely avoid the key position of the working class struggling for its own state power and establishing that state power by its own armed force and smashing the state machine of the capitalists. Lenin in "The State and Revolution" pointed out that this was the very question that marked off the opportunists (social democrats, revisionists or whatever term you use) from the Marxists.

Aarons himself appeared on the same programme and expressed more carefully similar sentiments. He was rewarded by the praise of the violent anti-Communist Knopfmacher. There is no need to comment.

Were we to make even the slightest suggestion of reconciliation with these people would it help the Australian workers? Would it not on the contrary, contribute to illusions about them? Would it not give them cover? Would they not be able to say, look the Marxist-Leninists think we are not so bad?

Actually the position is simple enough. The imperialists are at their last gasp. They are calling up their very last reserves. For example they are striving to unify the churches and "revive" religion. Gromyko seeks out the Pope. Religion is a weapon of the reaction. According to Christianity God forbade killing. Yet the U.S. imperialists kill indiscriminately and at the same time they seek to unify the churches and revive religion. Christianity serves their ends because from another standpoint it justifies killing in the interests of the ruling class — do not resist, it teaches. Gromyko sees the Pope and thereby enhances the authority of the ultra reactionary papacy. Similarly the imperialists promote revisionism — diversion within the ranks of the workers. There is no doubt (and you who question us do not deny) that the revisionists have placed on one side the question of revolution. They have abandoned it. If they have abandoned revolution necessarily they support capitalism because capitalism can only be ended by revolution. There are all the other things of which we have spoken and about many of which you agree with us. Thus these people are the capitalists or capitalist influence within the working class. The very struggle of the workers is to overthrow capitalism and capitalist influence within the working class. How then can there be reconciliation or unity with them? Reconciliation or unity with them means reconciliation or unity with capitalism. For us to give that any comfort

or aid at all would be desertion of Marxism-Leninism. It would itself be treachery. Lenin was pressed with the need for unity. He agreed that there must be unity but on Marxist-Leninist principle. Lenin at the head of the smaller half (if one can use the expression) of one party within the then international revolutionary movement upheld revolution. All the other parties including the larger half of the Russian social democrats, split away, repudiated revolution, supported their own bourgeoisie (just as Aarons supports the reactionary A.L.P. policy). Lenin steadfastly and firmly rejected unity and reconciliation with such people. There were honest people who pressed him. Their motives were good. He did not waver. Time proved him correct. To some he appeared arbitrary "not to understand." But had Lenin compromised, sought unity and reconciliation, there would have been no October revolution. And though the Khrushchovites have betrayed the October Revolution, they can not destroy it or its significance. It was precisely Lenin's firm adherence to principle and refusal of such "unity" and "reconciliation" that initiated the world socialist system. Today the plea for unity and reconciliation, at just as important a period of history, can only disarm the working class just as certainly as we can now see clearly it would have in Lenin's day.

Thus we say to you in all sincerity: There will be no unity and no reconciliation with the revisionists. The toiling people of the world are repudiating the revisionists. That can be seen internationally. It can be seen in Australia. We will do nothing to assist the revisionists to maintain their hold. On the contrary the gap between us is increasing day by day and we will struggle to the end to defeat revisionism. It is an essential part of the struggle to defeat capitalism and imperialism.

We appreciate your sincerity. We are certain that when you think it over, investigate and examine experience, you will agree with us. We cannot give you the one-blow answer. It is a question of the development of your experience and knowledge. Join with us in the struggle.