

australian marxist review

**Theoretical journal of the
Socialist Party of Australia**

- ★ *Australian imperialism*
- ★ *Marxist science
and history*
- ★ *Women and Socialism*
- ★ *Class struggle defined*
- ★ *Existing socialism*
- ★ *Forces shaping world*
- ★ *Philosophy Course*

QUARTERLY. NEW SERIES No. 1 JUNE 1979 — PRICE 30c

Australian MARXIST Review

EDITOR: W.J.Brown
EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS
G.Curthoys
A. Miller
E.V.Elliott
J. Clarke

CONTENTS

Australian imperialism	A. Miller.....1
Marxist science and history	W.J. Brown.....5
Women and Socialism	Barbara Curthoys and Ina Heidtman.....12
The class struggle defined	J. Booth.....19
Existing Socialism and its international significance	B. Ponomarov.....23
Forces shaping the world	N. Vinh.....30
Philosophy Course	Education Committee....34

Australian imperialism

By Alan Miller

Ray Clarke's article "Lenin on imperialism" (AMR March 79) provides valuable material to show the correctness of the Socialist Party Program's statement that "Australia is herself a middle-sized imperialist power with considerable and growing overseas investment. It has a whole continent as its base."

According to Sydney stockbroker, William Tilley Hudson Evans and Co., Australian overseas investment will reach the \$1 billion mark towards the end of this year, and about 600 Australian companies have ventured abroad.

A recent study by a research team from the Macquarie University, entitled "Australian Enterprise Overseas," revealed that no less than 99 Australian public companies are multi-nationals.

Writing in the *Financial Review* of January 11, 1977, and using the Macquarie research as source material, Michael Southern revealed the recent growth of Australian overseas investment. In 1961 it was \$255 million, but by 1975 it was \$845 million. Of that figure, \$220 million was invested in New Zealand, \$232 million in Papua New Guinea and \$253 million in such countries as Indonesia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, South Africa, Fiji and Holland.

Southern, however, showed that the pattern of investment has changed, with a shift away from the traditional areas such as the UK, Papua New Guinea and New Zealand to the Pacific Basin countries and, in particular, Canada and the United States. He wrote:

"The annual growth rates for investment in the UK were 11 per cent a year between 1961-1975, but in the last three of those years, 1972-75, it was an average of eight per cent ... The United States and Canada, by comparison, took 21 per cent of Australian capital outflow in 1973-74, and in the 1972-75 period the annual growth rate was 35 per cent a year."

The Macquarie University research says that Australia is poised for more rapid growth overseas in the next two decades. In certain areas of technology, Australia has sprung to world leadership because of local conditions, the study claims.

These statements certainly bear out the estimation by the Socialist Party Program that "because of its advanced industry, food production and abundant natural power resources and the difficulties of its rivals, Australian imperialism holds the promise of becoming stronger."

The Macquarie document indicates that Australian concerns are particularly keen to keep absolute control over their foreign activities. It says:

"Australian companies have generally preferred, and still prefer, 100 per cent ownership of foreign operations.

"Almost exclusively, overseas operations have been tied to head office by rigid reporting systems and procedures. If anything, the trend is for this rigidity to become more widespread, with little indication of desire to change organisational structures to those obtained in modern multi-nationals."

BHP well illustrates the power of the Australian monopoly bourgeoisie. At the beginning of this year, BHP made Australian history when it became the first publicly listed company to be capitalised at more than \$2,000 million. BHP's last half yearly profit was \$160 million. (BHP uses a special system of accountancy which halves the actual profit). BHP and its direct subsidiaries have capital invested in New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Hong Kong, United States and Indonesia.

Soviet academic, I. Lebedev, in his article "Australian Imperialism Yesterday and Today," published at the end of the sixties, pointed out that Australian capitalism entered the imperialist stage when it was comparatively young. At the beginning of the century Australian already had (for those times) large monopolies, Lebedev said. Michael Southern, in his 1977 *Financial Review* article, wrote that "Australians are not new to the multi-national business" and referred to the "move into Fiji by CSR in 1882 to protect the Australian company's sugar from a competitive threat in the then British colony."

Lebedev, wrote that "between the two world wars Australia remained to a high degree, economically dependent on Great Britain The Second World War proved a turning point in the development of Australian imperialism According to some estimates Australia's industrial progress in the war years equalled 15 to 20 years of peacetime development."

To my mind, there is no doubt that the Australian monopoly capitalists — the Australian imperialists — constitute the real ruling class of this country. They, and their political representatives, the Fraser Government, act, above all, in their own economic and political interests. The whole state machinery is designed to serve the interests of the monopolists. Australia is, in fact, a good example of what Marxist-Leninist theory defines as state monopoly capitalism.

The growth of foreign capital economic penetration, accompanied by its consequent political and military influences, particularly by the US imperialists, could lead to the estimation that Australia was becoming merely a neo-colony and the monopoly class a mere puppet force for the US. The political conclusion could be made that the progressive forces in Australia should concentrate on the struggle against foreign capital and regard the fight against the Australian ruling class as secondary.

However, the increased foreign penetration, in my view, provides insufficient evidence to suggest that the Australian monopoly ruling class is, in any way, in danger of being dislodged from its position of economic, political and military power in this country or that it has ceased, to act primarily in its own interests.

Australian and foreign multi-nationals carry out joint exploitation in this country. This activity is typical of the capitalist world today. Australia and foreign imperialists join in political struggle against the Soviet Union and socialism generally and enter into joint military arrangements to further that political struggle. The latter is associated with the main antagonistic contradiction between the capitalist and socialist world systems.

At the same time, there are secondary but antagonistic contradictions between imperialism, each one acting in its own interests. The fact that one imperialist power is stronger than the other suggests a greater ability to dominate the capitalist world and to put pressure on the weaker imperialist power, but it doesn't overcome contradictions between the two.

Even a smaller imperialism acts in its own interests. I suggest that the 1975 bloodless coup which toppled the Whitlam government was essentially an act by the Australian monopolists to strengthen their position by having their own direct political representatives form the central government. At the same time, it was associated with world imperialist interests, particularly the US, and, indeed, the CIA

played a significant part in what took place. I also suggest that Australia's participation in the Vietnam war was not merely at the direction of the United States, but also because it served the interests of Australian imperialism in the area.

By its exploitation of Australia on behalf of its narrow class interests, the ruling class here acts against genuine national interests. In its links with foreign capital, Australian imperialism permits overseas imperialist interests to penetrate this country and this also is opposed to the real national interests of Australia. Thus one can see the close relationship between the working class struggle against the Australian ruling class and the struggle for national independence.

In the Australian context, the Socialist Party must concentrate on the monopoly capitalist ruling class, on Australian imperialism. In that concentrated effort, the party also tackles foreign capital because of its very relationship with the Australian ruling class, a relationship which, despite the conflict of interests, is also associated with sharing the spoils of exploitation as well as the political and military "responsibilities" of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism. Indeed, concentration on Australian imperialism is part of the struggle against world imperialism, part of the struggle for world peace and world socialism. I am, of course dealing here with our overall approach. I appreciate that there can be particular circumstances when there would be concentration on foreign capital. These circumstances could involve a particular threat from foreign capital which, from a working class viewpoint, would require the rallying of all available forces. Indeed, in the general political struggle, the party can well make use of contradictions which exist between Australian and foreign capital. However, extreme care needs to be taken against any drift to nationalism by presenting the whole Australian situation in terms of struggling mainly against foreign capital and seeking our own ruling class as "allies."

|

The Socialist Party Program is profoundly correct where it advances the concept of the working class struggle against monopoly capitalism in Australia, seeking allies even in non-monopoly capitalist circles, and going through the stage of anti-monopoly democracy to the socialist stage of the revolutionary transformation, beginning with working class power which uproots capitalism itself and builds the socialist economic system.

common against imperialism and international reaction, for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

Marxist science and history

By W. J. Brown

Australian history, like the history of all human society, needs to be approached on the basis of the scientific, materialist theory of history founded by Marx and Engels and elaborated by Lenin.

Before proceeding to any outline, analysis or study of history then it is essential to restate some of the basic principles of Marxist historical science.

The great German thinkers Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were the first to show that the analysis of history cannot be made on the basis of one nation in isolation but only by cognisance of the objective laws which govern the development of all human society.

They showed that human history is a law-governed process which, to date has progressed through five modes of production — primitive communal, slavery, feudalism, capitalism and socialism.

The great Russian theorist and revolutionary leader, Vladimir Lenin creatively developed and enriched the science of Marx and Engels. In addition to defending Marxism against ideological opponents of all varieties, Lenin developed the dialectical materialist science of Marxism on the basis of a philosophical summing up of the latest discoveries of natural sciences (see his work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*). Among other aspects, he further made a fundamental and creative contribution to development of Marxism in his analysis of the historical emergence of imperialism. Lenin's work "*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*," made a specially important extension to Marxist political economy.

Just as Marx had analysed and defined the objective economic laws which governed the historical development of the capitalist mode of production in general, so Lenin discovered the special feature of the economic system of monopoly capitalism and the emergence of imperialism, as the final stage of capitalism.

Marxist materialist understanding of history sets out the theory of socio-economic formations as the cornerstone of its theory.

The Marxist concept of socio-economic formations provides a fundamental basis on which to make any serious, scientific study of history.

What do we mean by socio-economic formations and why does it offer a basic, scientific answer to the understanding of historical development?

The core of understanding the Marxist theory socio-economic formations lies in analysis of the mode of production.

The mode of production refers to the instruments of production in a given society and the people operating them and to the relations of production that is the relations established between people in the course of producing goods. The latter is best determined by defining the relations of people to the instruments of production; that is, whether they own the instruments of production or are employed by others who privately own the instruments of production.

The Marxist theory of the socio economic formation is not confined to the economic basis of society; it also includes the superstructure, that is the legal system, ethics, ideology, art and culture, the media and the capitalist way of life in general.

It is essential to see that the superstructure is not passive within the socio economic formation. It is capable, to a certain degree, of having a "feed back" influence on the base on which it has arisen. For example, take the socio-economic formation of capitalism. Its mode of production is made up of capitalist productive forces and relations of production. This means that the capitalist owns the instruments of production and employs people to operate these instruments of production within capitalist relations of production which allow the capitalist, as the owner of the means of production to employ people in the process of production and to make profit from their labor.

As the owner, not only of the means of industrial production but the basic means of production in the media industry, the capitalist class holds decisive power in relation to the superstructure. The superstructure that has arisen on the capitalist mode of production reflects the ideology of capitalism and serves as an instrument to help the efforts of the capitalist class to retain this particular mode of production.

Take Australia's superstructure under capitalism. For example, Australia's legal system serves the capitalist class very well. The arbitration system, for instance, purports to be "impartial." In practice it is a very effective instrument for manipulating this particular arm of the judiciary to provide

class-oriented judgements favouring the interests of the capitalist class. In fact it serves as a valuable instrument in cushioning the capitalist system from the impact of class struggle against wage injustice, exploitation and the general and cyclical crisis of capitalism.

Capitalist ethics, ideology and way of life are all developed in a way that serve the interests of the capitalist system. Justification of ethics of a capitalist system based on exploitation of man by man for private profit is fundamental to the system. Religion, as part of capitalism's superstructure is obviously used by the capitalist state to preserve the capitalist status quo.

Similarly, the ideological aspect of the capitalist superstructure is to advance the concept that capitalism is the ultimate, the final form of socio-economic formation. The capitalist mode of production needs constant "justification" before the mass of the people. This is precisely what is done by the privately owned commercial and conservative dominated, government-run sections of the media in Australia.

Justification of capitalism as a system of exploitation is, in fact, the role of the capitalist superstructure in all aspects.

The Marxist approach to history lays bare the basic laws or regularities of historical process which note the transitory role of historical stages of human social development. It shows that the various socio-economic formations go through their transitory stage and that those formations based on class antagonisms are inevitably propelled into a higher stage of social development or confronted with the ruin of the contending classes.

Capitalism is not the acme of human development. In fact, in years to come with the advance of man to the higher level of socialist then communist forms of social life, capitalism will be looked back upon as a most primitive, even bestial, self — motivate pre-historic form of human existence. As Engels has noted true history of humanity will begin with the birth of socialism as a universal world system.

Capitalism fears the Marxist theory of history; it fears the concept of revolutionary transition from a lower stage to a higher stage in regard to various socio-economic formations. It tries to evade the historical reality of the five main types of relations of production known to history: (primitive communal, slave, feudal, capitalist and socialist). It tries to evade the unavoidable. Capitalism is the last of the socio-economic formations based on class antagonisms. It is a society which has created the class confrontation of a relatively small group of national and international capitalists with the vast mass force of the working class of each nation; steadily growing into

a powerful ever more united force based on the principles of international working class unity or proletarian internationalism.

Far from belittling the conscious element in historical development, Marxist historical science recognises the powerful role of the rising revolutionary awareness of people on both a national and international basis.

The import of this mass people's awareness is an obviously mounting factor in the modern world. This was clearly recognised by Marx and Engels even at a much earlier stage of capitalists development. Engels specifically noted the difference between natural historical process and social historical process.

He pointed out that in nature there are only "blind, unconscious agencies acting upon one another." He wrote: "the actors are all endowed with consciousness, are men acting with deliberation or passion, working towards definite goals; nothing happens without a conscious purpose, without an intended aim."

This does not mean, however, that Marxist historical science concedes that the decisions and actions of individual historical figures, no matter how outstanding, no matter how important their individual contribution may have been can be construed as the basic source, reason or cause in regard to the development of human society. The objective laws governing social development are the decisive factors which bring about significant changes in the overall history of social development.

Deep lying economic causes, affected in varying degree by time, place and circumstances, in the final analysis are the basic reasons for major changes in human social development.

The law of class struggle, arising from the antagonism between exploiter and exploited, is a historical regularity or law common to all antagonistic socio-economic formations. These objective laws arise on the basis of given social conditions. For all the attempts of the ideological defenders of bourgeois society in the universities, the media and elsewhere to deny it or conceal it, the law of class struggle is constantly at work in capitalist society in Australia as with the rest of the capitalist world. The big task facing the forces of Marxist-Leninist science is to give the inevitable conflict of labor and capital a conscious role; to give it a conscious goal that goes beyond the immediate objective of this or that wage gain, improved job conditions, or social reform and advances the essential need to change society from a capitalist

socio-economic formation to Socialism.

This is why the study of the Marxist theory of history; the study of the various socio-economic formations that have so far emerged in human history is essential to all working people and progressive thinkers. This study is rendered even more urgent by the current cyclical economic crisis of capitalism, aggravated by the onset of the scientific and technological revolution.

The Marxist theory of history points to the basic revolutionary role played in social transformations by advance in technology. Marx in Volume 1 of Capital pointed out that the invention of machines to replace workers working with a single tool was "the starting point of the industrial revolution." To read this section of Marx's scientific analysis of capitalist history in itself holds deep significance for current understanding the social revolutionary forces at work within the computer and general scientific and technological revolution.

Marx points out that John Stuart Mill in his Principles of Political Economy voiced doubt on whether "all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any human being." Marx commented pointedly that Mill should have said: "of any human being not fed by other people's labor." He went on to show that machinery had "greatly increased the number of well-to-do idlers." Marx showed that greater surplus value; greater profit not lightening the toil of human beings was the aim of the capitalistic application of machinery. He went on to re-emphasise that revolution in the mode of production in modern industry "begins with the instruments of labor."

How much more true is this today? Today, the great capacity of the scientific and technological revolution to serve the needs of humanity obviously require social revolution. Social ownership of the means of production needs to replace private ownership. The relations of production, that is, the question of who owns the means of production must be brought into conformity with the revolutionised social character of the modern productive forces.

The fundamental solution to the problem of the capitalist world's current economic crisis and the problem of the human misery, suffering and wastage concomitant with mass displacement of labor by onset of new labor saving computer, automative and mechanisation techniques

lies in understanding the Marxist socio-economic formation question; in short understanding the cornerstone of Marxist materialist understanding of history and what must be done at this stage of history.

Before leaving any study of Marxist theory of class struggle as the motivating force that has brought humanity to this crucial point in history it is essential to note the qualification made by Engels.

Marxism points out that class struggle can lead to a progressive advance for a given class as it did in the victory of the bourgeois revolution with its establishment of capitalism, then a progressive step forward out of the dark ages of feudalism and as it subsequently did in the victory for the revolution of the working class and its allies first in the October Revolution of 1917 which established the Soviet Union and then in subsequent revolutionary changes in other countries. But Engels made the important point that class struggle can also end, not in the victory for the new, nascent class but in "ruin of the contending classes."

The qualification holds a vital warning for our nuclear times when the essential requirement for the future of all humanity is the ending of the arms race and consolidating peaceful coexistence as common to the foreign policies of all countries regardless of their political or economic system.

Here, the world-endangering course being followed by the present leaders of the People's Republic of China needs to be taken into account.

Capitalist politicians and scholars try to cite the position of China as a contradiction to the Marxist theory of history. It is not. The position adopted by the present Chinese leaders and, indeed, by one or two other leading circles in socialist countries is, among other things, a lapse into nationalism and a departure from certain basic tenets of the science of Marx and Lenin. Establishment of socialism does not automatically overcome nationalist tendencies or remove opportunist attitudes that could work against socialism and even lay the basis for destruction of a given socialist country and return it to capitalism. Idealistic or over optimistic belief that things would be otherwise have been replaced by reality.

Certainly, the Chinese leaders have created serious problems for the existing world socialist system by their departure from Marxist science. But the degeneration of political leaders in a given country and even the taking of that country back to capitalism eventually does not remove

the basic realities of the course of human history set out by Marx and Engels and elaborated by Lenin.

Indeed, the capitalist class would be extremely foolish in their own interests if they let reason be submerged in subjective hope that, with China's assistance, they can turn back history's clock, by resort to the mad adventure of nuclear war against the socialist countries. This will not deny the Marxist theory of history. It could but create the ruin of the contending classes

It needs to be seen that the nuclear age scientific and technological revolution has brought humanity to its most decisive moment. Enough nuclear weapons to wipe out the world 20 times over already exist.

The big task of all humanity is to ensure that there will never come any fatal instant of "letting slip the hounds of nuclear war."

The next stage of human history plainly lies inherent in the main characteristic of our times. That is, recognition of the fact that we live in the era of transition from capitalism to socialism.

Whether one accepts such a transition or not is not the point.

The point is that human advance is inevitable unless humanity is obliterated by nuclear calamity. Clearly, regardless of differences humanity must achieve agreement that peaceful co-existence and peaceful co-operation must be the path along which the destiny of capitalism and socialism is decided, not the insanity of nuclear confrontation and nuclear calamity itself.

★ ★ ★

The idealist view of history fostered by the very complexity of social development has been vigorously encouraged by the exploiting classes, who have an interest in concealing the true cause of economic and social inequality, the causes responsible for the wealth and power of some and the poverty and lack of rights of others. Thanks to the efforts of these classes, idealist views of society influence people to this day and are widespread in the capitalist countries. — from *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* p.117

Women and Socialism

An analysis of the International Conference held in Berlin from 23rd to 25th February, 1979 to commemorate 100 years since the publishing of August Bebel's book "Women and Socialism."

by **Barbara Curthoys and Ina Heidtman**

August Bebel was a friend of Marx, a co-founder of the Workingman's Association, who adopted the theory of scientific socialism. His book, "Women and Socialism" was published in Berlin, February, 1879, and as pointed out by Professor Kurt Hager in his opening address to the recent Conference of Communist and Workers Parties in Berlin, was regarded as the "first manual of the revolutionary class movement on the woman's question."

August Bebel's understanding of the women's movement for liberation was that although it had its specific features because of the double nature of women's oppression, at the same time, this movement had to become an integral part of the revolutionary movement against class exploitation and for socialism, if it was to succeed.

Only socialism can guarantee that equality of opportunity for men and women be maintained because the socialist economic base and socialist relations of production "end class exploitation of both men and women workers."

The central theme of "Women and Socialism" is that the liberation of women is a class question. Male chauvinism, a product of class society, needs to be persistently challenged but men are not the enemy, they are not the class that oppresses women, in fact, they too are oppressed by that class which oppresses both men and women.

In the course of mutual struggle to change society and to change the situation for women as part of that struggle, the relationships between men and women begin to change and this process will continue in the new society which is established.

This theme, the class nature of the struggle for women's liberation was dealt with in the reports of the delegates to the Conference.

At the Conference there were 186 international delegates, representing 84 parties and revolutionary organisations and 303 representatives of the

Socialist Unity Party of Germany. So great was the interest that the Conference was extended from 2 to 3 days and time was still insufficient to allow all delegates to speak.

Delegates came from socialist countries, capitalist countries, countries struggling for national independence and countries who have thrown off imperialist domination.

Socialists have long accepted the view that “the first condition for the liberation of women is to bring the whole female sex back into public industry” (Lenin) and that this process has begun under capitalism. The other necessary condition is to shift the “function of housekeeping from the individual to society.” The reports of delegates from the socialist countries was evidence that only socialism has succeeded in doing this on a large scale.

Lydia Lykova, (USSR) pointed out that 93% of all women work or study and that of each 1000 working women, 781 have secondary or tertiary study. She gave the following figures:

- ★ 60% of economists are women.
- ★ 50% of engineers in industry are women.
- ★ 40% of specialists in higher education are women.
- ★ 40% of all candidates in local government elections are women.
- ★ 33% of all deputies at Supreme Soviet level (i.e. 475 deputies) are women.
- ★ Communist Party of the Soviet Union has 4 million women members.

All other socialist countries showed similar advances and all delegates from these countries discussed the social measures carried out to make it possible for women to work and also to have their children well cared for.

Because the conference was held in the German Democratic Republic delegates were able to see at first hand in the days prior to the conference the facilities and opportunities provided by the socialist state to help women achieve equality in all aspects of life.

Ilse Lange, alternate member of the Politbureau and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany spoke of women's rights under socialism in her report.

Quoting Karl Marx, she said that “a right can never be greater than the economic system and the cultural development of society based on it allows,” and further that “legal relationships have their roots in material conditions of existence.”

Therefore, she pointed out the GDR “has always approached equality in a concrete manner as a social question” which is bound up with thorough-going political, economic, social, intellectual and cultural changes and not just achieved by “one-off” laws or any appeal to political consciousness.

Basic rights were achieved by 1960 in the German Democratic Republic. Since 1960 in order to raise the issues of equality for women to a higher level the Party set themselves the task “of progressively solving the problems which determine whether a women is able or not to make use of her equal rights to the fullest extent.” To do this it was necessary to build a highly developed material-technical base which would provide steady economic growth and a high rate of labour productivity and efficiency.

Some of the provisions now achieved in the GDR are:

- ★ 87% of all women of working age are employed, training or studying.
- ★ 1 in 3 production workers are women, and they work in all areas of the economy not just the traditional textile and clothing industry
- ★ 70% of all women working have completed vocational training. At the beginning of socialist construction this was only 5%.
- ★ 50% of workers with college education are women.
- ★ One third of those with university education are women.
- ★ 44% of those employed in agriculture are women and 82% of women farmers have completed some training.
- ★ Women have special protection against health-damaging influences at work.
- ★ Maternity leave with full pay is 26 weeks.
- ★ Maternity leave with partial pay is available for 12 months.
- ★ To help young couples there is a loan of 5,000 marks if they are not older than 26 and it is their first marriage. This loan is tax free. The repayment period is 8 years.
- ★ Every woman has the legal right to decide for herself whether to proceed with a pregnancy or to terminate it.

There has been considerable expenditure on materials, staff and financial support for creches and kindergartens and after school care so that:

- ★ 58% of all children under the age of 3 are in a creche.
- ★ more than 90% of all children attend kindergarten before entering school.
- ★ more than 75% of all pupils have after school supervision.
- ★ 77% of all pupils have a hot meal and a quarter of a litre of milk provided at school.
- ★ 40% of households in town and 25% in country districts send their laundry to be done in modern service enterprises.

After decades of strenuous work to make it possible women in the GDR are enjoying the advantages that socialism can supply.

Isle Lange also dealt with the question of changing male attitudes. She pointed out that people’s private lives are respected and therefore

they encourage married couples to deal with the question of male chauvinism themselves. At the same time literature, art, press, radio and television deal with such questions as the raising of each other's potential in marriage; aspects of equality in the home and the fact that housework not covered by conditions provided by the state still has to be done and should be shared.

The GDR's policy is one of positive discrimination for women and they do not accept attacks from the capitalist countries against this approach. There is no problem of "compatibility of paternity and gainful employment" but there is an acute problem of "compatibility of motherhood and gainful employment." Therefore special provisions and special rights for mothers must be provided.

If this is "positive discrimination" then the GDR supports it.

In her report Isle Lange did not deal with neo-feminism because it does not affect her country. But she made the point that they respect women within its ranks who fight for greater equality but are against that feminism which calls on women to struggle against men, as unity of all forces are required in struggle for socialism.

CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

It was interesting to compare the reports from the capitalist countries with the reports from socialist countries.

The feminist movement is strong in capitalist countries. Also the problems for women in these countries are similar and contrast greatly with the conditions for women under socialism.

Women are in the workforce in large numbers, but conditions necessary to make it easy for them to have a home and have their children well cared for are poor.

In the United States 51% of all women work. They do so without protection, job training, provisions for child-care, maternity leave and benefits, health and safety measures and all other necessary conditions of work provided by a socialist country.

Twice as many women are unemployed as men and women still earn about 60% of what men earn.

In Japan, one third of all women are employed. 60% of the working population in agriculture are women. Conditions for the care of children

are poor and employment is uncertain.

Monopoly capitalism employs many women 16.4% of the female workforce in a part time job basis and this places them in a low wage and unstable job situation.

Delegates from India and also from Sri Lanka made the point that in their countries, while equality of men and women is part of the Constitution, real guarantees for their implementation has not been provided.

The Canadian delegate said that on the average in 1978, women workers earned 55 to 60% of the wage of men workers and the labour power of Canadian women continues to be used as a reserve pool of low paid labour by governments and corporations.

In 1973 only 5.7% of pre-school children of working mothers were cared for in day care centres, whether public or private. Unemployment standards at 9.1% of the workforce but for women it stands at 18%.

The reports from France, Spain, Belgium and other capitalist countries showed similar conditions.

The report from Australia also indicated similar problems.

In many of these countries the tendency of large sections of the women's movement is to focus mainly on the issues of discrimination, inequality and sexism. However successful efforts are being made to involve women in general questions involving economic exploitation and against monopoly capital and also to draw large numbers of women of different persuasions into the peace movement.

Similarly in the countries fighting for their independence, nowhere could the fight for equality of women be separated from the general political struggle against class oppression. Goals varied according to the country's development, but the woman's question was firmly bound up with the general question.

Mavis Thwala, speaking for the African National Congress (South Africa) stated that "although the country has developed a system of capitalist production relations, apartheid politics hamper even these relations within the African home." Further she points out "white racism and apartheid coupled with economic exploitation have degraded the African woman more than male prejudices" drawing the conclusion that "the national liberation struggle is an integral part of their social emancipation."

The Delegate from Zimbabwe pointed out that “with the emergence of money economy and especially the coming of colonialism, the situation changed drastically. Apart from suffering discrimination because of their sex, our women are now faced with another type of discrimination, that of not being white. To a large extent this type of discrimination is worse both in form and context than that based on sex.” She also concluded that “national independence is a major condition required to solve most of the problems our country is facing today.”

In other countries in Africa such as Zambia which has won its independence and socialist Ethiopia, women were participating in national construction of their country while extending the rights of women.

The specific conditions of women in Arab countries render their struggle more complex.

The delegate from the Palestine Liberation Organisation explained that the situation for Palestinian women did not differ in essence from the situation of Arab women. Women’s dependence on men, especially economic dependence, within the context of a society governed by an accumulation of traditional social concepts has not been erased.

The Palestinian national liberation movement, though it did not put forward a program of social transformation achieved two main things:

1. Armed struggle gave women a higher level of participation and led to transformation in their relationship with men as comrades in struggle.
2. To confront the occupation of their country was a revolutionary demand which broke down class barriers and united people around this demand. Though conditions for women varied according to the economic system prevailing there was one common thread raised by most delegates, that the solution for women is bound up with the fight against exploitation and oppression and this struggle unites women across national barriers in countries all over the world.

Unity and solidarity were expressed at the conference in the overwhelming support for the delegates from Vietnam who spoke of China’s aggression and invasion of their country. Delegates spoke of actions being taken in their country in support of Vietnam and the Australian delegation was able to speak of actions and demonstrations in Australia.

Such expressions of solidarity emphasised the nature of the conference. It was an international conference brought together by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany to enable Communist and Workers Parties

and revolutionary movements all over the world discuss the involvement of women in revolutionary struggle.

The Conference was a fitting commemoration of August Bebel's book "Women and Socialism" written one hundred years ago. It was appropriate that the anniversary of its publication was held in the German Democratic Republic, thirty years after its establishment as a workers' and farmer's state which has realised so many of the concepts put forward by Bebel.



"IYC will be a time to place children, for one, at the top of the global agenda, to make the world aware of the situation of children as it is ... and to shock the world into action." — *Mrs Estefania Aldaba-Lim, Special Representative of the United Nations for the International Year of the Child.*

The class struggle defined

by Jack Booth

To be effective, class consciousness and class struggle must have a scientific approach. Without it, the workers can be led up the garden path by emotional oratory.

The term — class struggle is rarely heard in bourgeois circles although they feel the effects of it, The very term is abhorrent to them in some cases believing it doesn't exist as instance the new Govenor General trying to mend the damage done by his predecessor in the belief that Australians are all of the same persuasion!

Neither does the mass media ever mention the class struggle in spite of the fact that every day they are telling us of strikes, lockouts, black bans, green bans, international boycotts etc,.

From the bourgeois point of view this conspiracy of silence is essential to maintain the status quo. Every attempt by the working class to negotiate with them without the use or threatened use of the class struggle ends in procrastination.

This conspiracy of silence operates just as much in right-wing labor circles. Even if they acknowledge the class struggle it is channelled into a dead end

How can there be any advantage for the workers by labor party officials visiting the USA to study their (monopoly capitalist) political system? How can Australian Communist Party spokesman Jack Munday equate the rescue of socialism in Czechoslovakia 1968 with the USA invasion of Vietnam? Such lack of understanding of class struggle amounts to a mockery of the labor movement. This ignorance of class struggle is also apparent among those pseudo left forces who discuss Marxism at length yet oppose the Soviet Union. It also applies to the wide variety of armchair philosophers.

The class struggle is not something incidental to capitalist society. It is an integral part of it, formed within its productive forces. These are the basis of their history, the product of preceding generations. Every succeeding generation finds itself in possession of the productive forces aquired by the previous generation . Yet we still find academics and philosophers claiming to have the cure for the ills, i.e. Trotsky Garaudys, Maoists on the ultra left, Freidmans, Keynes and Douglas on

the right going back to Proudhon.

Class struggle reflects dissatisfaction with capitalism, objectively it expresses the need for socialism. If, as the reformist Labor Party platform states, in effect, they can achieve basic social objectives by parliamentary reforms why cannot they control prices and provide full employment and economic security, why can't they build houses for the many thousands of inadequately housed families on the government's long waiting list. When welcome reforms are secured let us not forget that it was the class struggle which brought the Labor Party into being in the first place. It was a struggle which drew the lesson of the need for a party of socialism.

Marxist-Leninist politics takes the realities of the class struggle and guides it to its scientific objective.

Before Marx, the class struggle went its haphazard way. It had no clear basic goal. Nobody could harness it. To this day the reformists and pseudo-communists rely only on the natural eruptions of the class struggle without knowing how to channel it to its logical conclusion. An example is the dead end, the NSW builders labourers found themselves in during 1976-77 arising from left-opportunist, unscientific tactics.

Such examples show class struggle devoid of Marxist-Leninist content.

Take the important conservation issue for example. Many sections of bourgeois society are genuinely concerned with ecology but if they follow their concern to the end in essential opposition to the planlessness of capitalism they must eventually find themselves members of the SPA

Capitalism with its greed and anarchy being what it is, such a society based on private profit motive is incapable of solving this problem.

It is no accident that the Duke of Edinburgh withdrew his patronage to the Conservation Foundation. Imagine the Duke being caught up in the class struggle!

The preservation of whales, seals, and uranium protests have their value but the conservationists are contributing practically nothing to the anti-imperialist war movements and what could be of greater importance to conservation of nature — not to mention humanity itself than the prevention of nuclear war? How can the conservationists stand by knowing the US Pentagon is piling up nuclear weapons with an already stated overkill capacity capable of wiping out the world as we know it 20 times over.

As the Soviet Union also has an overkill capacity what is the point in the

US negotiating from a position of strength when both sides can only pulverize the debris. (Except of course the shortsighted idiocy of making profits from weapons for world destruction).

Or take racism. Of all the hundreds of books and papers written about Aborigines over the last 200 years it was left for a Socialist Party of Australia comrade to integrate the Aboriginal solution to the class struggle. **“And now we want the land back”** by H. Middleton.

Throughout the world history shows other examples of native people facing extinction or demoralisation under imperialist attack or exploitation.

It is easy to follow the line of the least resistance, it entails no struggle, it stultifies the most important asset the human being can have the brain.

Turning to the socialist world, can any socialist organisation claim to understand the class struggle and at the same time oppose the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. More, can the Soviet Union be singled out for attack? No.

If Ivan Denisovich made a thousand roubles in share dealings on the Moscow Stock Exchange then there would be some justification in saying that something has gone wrong with socialism.

For any anti-Soviet organization to claim an understanding of or support for the class struggle is ludicrous.

One would naturally think that if a country has rid itself of poverty provided education to the highest level, free hospital care, no unemployment or inflation and most important, established unity between their numerous nationalities, such a country should merit full support.

The whole world can now see what has happened to China since their leadership abandoned the class struggle and adopted what they call the “Three Worlds Theory”, which in short means that the world is divided into the United States and the Soviet Union as the first world, Japan, Britain, France, and advanced industrialised countries as the second world which would also include nearly all the European Socialist countries. And the third world countries are Africa Asia and Latin America.

According to this, Socialist and non Socialist countries are in the same category.

Could anything be more absurd? Yet by their very conduct this absurdity is proving itself in practice by their lining up with fascist and imperialist elements to satisfy their paranoid obsession of anti-Sovietism. Their invasion

of Vietnam must surely place them among the old feudal Chinese war lords.

A few weeks before he died in 1968 J. B. Miles, past General Secretary of the Communist Party of Australia told his audience — “when ever you come up against a political problem that determines policy, always ask yourself “Which Class Does It Serve”.

This is the yardstick which all workers should use in their class relations with capitalism.



A Great Beginning: “Classes are large groups of people which differ from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions and mode of acquiring the share of social wealth of which they dispose. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.” — *A Great Beginning, V.I. Lenin*

INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL CONFERENCE

Under the subject heading: "The Construction of Socialism and Communism and World Development" an international theoretical conference took place in Sofia, Bulgaria from December 12 to 15, 1978.

This important conference was attended by delegations from 73 Communist and Workers' parties and revolutionary democratic organisations. It was organised by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party in collaboration with World Marxist Review.

Australian Marxist Review, due to unavailability of contributions, was not able to cover the conference in its first issue of 1979. February and March issues of the World Marxist Review contain reports of many contributions. AMR presents the following two contributions. Readers are advised to get all World Marxist Review issues covering the conference and to subscribe to this basically important journal of Marxist-Leninist science.

Existing socialism

and its international significance

by B. Ponomaryov

Alternate member of the Political Bureau
and Secretary CPSU Central Committee

The correct approach to major international and social problems, let alone to their interconnections, is possible only if existing socialism's objective place in the world is properly and fully taken into account.

The central issue of contemporary world affairs is the issue of war and peace. Lenin warned that world wars, the danger of which comes from imperialism, may destroy the very conditions for the existence of human society. In the nuclear-missile age this danger looms as a stark reality. But by this time a force has appeared and grown strong in the international arena that is called upon, and is able, to save human civilization. Socialism assumed this historic mission. Strength in imperialist hands is a source of the war danger. In socialist hands strength has become an instrument for ensuring peace and lessening the war danger. This was so in the past and is also true today.

The strength of the Soviet state is firmly linked with the strength of

the other socialist countries. The joint might of these countries is conjugated with the peace struggle of the communist and working-class movement, and also the national-liberation movement, and that of all progressives. This basic fact implies that it is possible to exclude world war from the life of mankind even before capitalism disappears.

The approach to the Warsaw Treaty and NATO as organisations of similar character and content does not stand up to any criticism from the one and only correct, Marxist standpoint. One only need compare the latest NATO session in Washington and the recent conference in Moscow of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee to see the utter fallacy of this approach.

As regards the 'superpowers' theory invented by the anti-communists, the class criterion is absent in the assessment of their policies. But when echoes of this theory resound in the concepts being spread in the working-class movement, it is proper to ask: What has happened to the class evaluation of the foreign policy of any state that is obligatory for communists? This, after all, is the ABC of Marxism.

The socialist community and the communist movement, those chief defenders of peace, always bear in mind that imperialism is continuing its material preparations for war at a rapid pace. The arms race has reached a truly unheard-of scale. Following the NATO session in Washington the 'Chinese card' is being played for all it is worth. And this no longer on the plane of mere political demagogy and blackmail against the USSR and other socialist countries. The military-industrial complexes have joined in the game. In this way the imperialist countries are helping to create an exceedingly dangerous seat for starting a world war. And if this is not going to be opposed, the consequences for mankind may be unprecedentedly tragic.

It is obvious that in these circumstances socialist countries cannot be idle. They are forced to take appropriate measures to strengthen their defense capability. But they do nothing in excess of what is absolutely necessary to make their defenses secure, and are prepared on a reciprocal basis to reduce the level of any armaments.

Love of peace is organic to the socialist social system and the political course consonant with its nature. It is essential that this should be known and deeply understood by the millions of people in the non-socialist part of the world. Conversely, obscuring the truth about socialism may weaken one of the most convincing arguments of the communists in support of the need to fight for socialism.

The sharp intensification of the attacks of ideologues and advocates of capitalism on socialist democracy in recent years has brought the question of the relationship of democracy and socialism to the forefront of the international ideological struggle.

The ideologues of imperialism attempt to portray bourgeois democracy as the model of democracy for all mankind. Yet, there has never been and cannot be any supra-class democracy. In the modern world there are two democracies — the bourgeois and the socialist.

If the Soviet man did not know what freedom is, did not feel himself really free, how would he have managed to display such self-sacrifice and heroism on a mass scale in the battles for his socialist Motherland? Would there have been such labor enthusiasm and complete dedication in labor for the sake of rehabilitating the war-ruined economy? And is not our own pulsating turbulent, creative life the best possible proof of the profoundly democratic nature of Soviet society? The real democracy in fraternal socialist countries is the power of the people, it is what the people need, it accords with the interests of millions upon millions of working people.

We are far from asserting that what has already been achieved in the field of democracy, rights and freedoms is the limit. The CPSU and other fraternal parties in the socialist countries regard the continuous improvement of democracy as the main direction in the development of socialist statehood.

An important part of existing socialism's role in the world is its influence on the national-liberation movement.

The national-liberation movement has produced many socialist revolutions. The rest of it has also entered a new historical stage. To strengthen national independence against imperialism, to achieve economic independence, to surmount age-old backwardness, and to ensure that the people benefit from the real fruits of national freedom — such is the main content of the national-liberation movement of our time.

The key to surmounting backwardness is radical social change, the advance along the road of social progress, and the utilization of the extensive experience of the countries of the socialist community. This truth is confirmed by the development of the socialism-oriented states. They are a new, active and growing factor in the world revolutionary process.

Socialism-oriented states are in their way a historic vanguard of the peoples of the former colonies. Imperialism regards them as a serious threat to itself in the world of newly-free countries and makes them the targets of its policy of pressure, blackmail, subversion and even military intervention. Taking this into account we consider it our duty to offer our solidarity and support to these countries. The recently signed Soviet-Ethiopian and Soviet-Afghan treaties of friendship and cooperation are a vivid expression of this policy.

What are the main directions of the influence of existing socialism on the rest of the world?

As was already pointed out, it is attributable above all to its role as the chief factor of peace.

Through its foreign policy existing socialism exercised and is exercising a growing influence on the democratization of international relations. It has called into being interstate relations of a new type by proving that it is possible in principle to put an end to domination and the use of force, enmity, and distrust among nations and countries. The policy of the leadership of the Communist Party of China toward the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, the incitement of Kampuchea against Vietnam, and so forth, are not the products of socialism, but a result of the repudiation of the principles of socialism.

The rapid and stable economic growth of the socialist countries, the steady improvement in the well-being of the people, the attainment of ever new heights in the economic, scientific and technical competition with the capitalist world multiply the appeal of socialist ideas and strengthen the positions of the left forces in the class struggle.

The socialist countries, having secured vital socio-economic rights and freedoms for their peoples and steadily deepening real democracy, provide a stimulus to and criteria for the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries for similar rights and freedoms, and raise their possibilities, as it were, in the struggle against the domination of capital.

Unfortunately, imperialism's slander campaigns over socialist democracy, over human rights have also misled some of our friends in the West. Not all were able to discern that these subversive acts were directed not only against us but against them, too. But they cannot fail to be interested in seeing a joint principled rebuff being delivered to

the imperialist initiators of anti-Soviet, anti-socialist acts.

The existence of the socialist world system seriously limits the possibilities of imperialism to resort to open export of counter-revolution. This enables the working class and its allies to orient themselves also on peaceful ways of winning power, on averting civil war, on using the existing forms of bourgeois democracy, parliament in particular.

The foregoing is extremely important for a correct understanding of the great role of internationalist solidarity. It is, and always has been a major factor of world social progress. Its key element is, as before, cooperation between the revolutionary forces in the non-socialist part of the world and existing socialism.

At the present stage the solidarity of the world revolutionary forces with existing socialism is expressed above all in disseminating the truth about the socialist foreign policy of peace which meets the vital interests of all peoples, about the experience in remaking society on socialist principles, and about how the ideals of socialism are translated into life. Solidarity with the socialist world implies rebuffing the slander campaigns against it. To be neutral in this respect, let alone subscribing to anti-socialist actions, can cause nothing but harm to the working class and revolutionary movement in every country. An unobjective, fault-finding attitude to existing socialism is, in fact, tantamount, as Lenin put it, to alienation of workers from socialism.

It should be noted that the CPSU has always been and continues to be attentive to objective, friendly views and suggestions of the representatives of the fraternal parties.

In connection with the above I should like to take up another, very topical issue of fundamental importance, namely, what it means to maintain a correct, internationalist attitude to the experience of victorious socialism. In spite of what is sometimes said, it is not a question of copying or imitating 'models,' 'samples,' etc.

Such an approach is alien to the spirit of creative Marxism-Leninism. Back in 1956, the 20th Congress of the CPSU recorded in its resolution: 'Naturally enough, the forms of the transition of countries to socialism will be more diverse in future.' The thesis about the specifics of the transition to socialism in each given country is confirmed by our party today, too. As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said: 'Each country that took the socialist road has distinctively, each somewhat in its own way, dealt with the problems of socialist state-

hood, development of socialist industry, peasant cooperation, and ideological re-education of the masses. Undoubtedly, the transition to socialism of other peoples and countries with different levels of development and national traditions will introduce a still greater diversity of concrete forms of socialist construction. This is quite natural.'

Yet, the search for one's own way does not at all need to be counterposed to existing socialism, and much less to be used as a pretext for defaming it.

We are certain that each fraternal party, each nation taking the socialist road will inevitably come up against some problems in solving which socialism has acquired invaluable experience.

The CPSU does not close its eyes to shortcomings in the practice of socialist construction. At its congresses and in its documents, and daily activity it exposes their causes, and charts concrete ways and means of rectifying them. One of those causes, by the way, is the fact that there was no practical experience which the party could draw upon. Such experience simply did not exist.

Some years in the history of our country were beclouded by violations of socialist democracy and of the norms of party life and government activity. The CPSU formulated its stand on this question in the resolution of the CC CPSU of June 30, 1956. In a report on the draft Constitution of the USSR at a plenary meeting of the CC CPSU,

Buy and read your WMR regularly...

Subscribe to...

World Marxist Review

...the most authoritative journal of the world Communist movement. WMR is a monthly publication containing articles by communist leaders and theoreticians from all over the globe. It is published in handy paperback, pocket size. Cost \$1 (Postage 25c Extra).

Comrade L.I. Brezhnev pointed out: 'The party has resolutely condemned such practice, and it must never be repeated.' And, indeed, for a quarter of a century there have been no violations of socialist legality in the USSR. Therefore it is strange and harmful when someone claiming to speak in the name of socialism relishes and harps on these violations of the long gone days of the personality cult.

The attempts to cast a shadow on Leninism, counterpose it to Marxism, and reduce it only to a so-called 'Russian' teaching are extremely harmful. Pretending to champion the development of the science of socialism, the advocates of this 'abolishing' of Leninism, whatever their intentions, play into the hands of those who declare Marxism-Leninism 'out-dated' in general and would like to ideologically disarm the working class movement.

We hold that to approach the experience of socialism correctly means to see, above all, its great, epoch-making achievements. A solicitous attitude to what has been gained, and the ability to analyze, draw upon, use, and develop it is a task without which the struggle for socialism cannot be successful.



It is important to emphasise that the achievements of the Soviet Union as a whole are also achievements of each republic. I shall cite just one fact. The industrial output of Kazakhstan is now five times greater than that of the whole of prerevolutionary Russia. Only the combined efforts of the working people of that republic and of the working people of the whole Soviet Union made it possible to raise Kazakhstan to such heights. The same may be said about any other republic. Such is the result of the Leninist nationalities policy and of the friendship and brotherhood of the Soviet peoples. — L. Brezhnev

Forces shaping the world

by N. Vinh

CC Member, Communist Party of Vietnam

The three revolutionary streams determining the main content, trend, and character of the course of history and speeding mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism are making rapid headway.

There is, first, the process of building socialism and communism in the countries of the socialist community. As well as being vastly important to these countries, it influences the national-liberation movement and the struggle of the working class in capitalist countries. The socialist system is a creation of the international working class. A revolutionary force opposing the capitalist world, it ensures the working class a leading position and is a dependable bulwark of the peoples fighting for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

There is, furthermore, the national-liberation movement, which is advancing steadily and scoring remarkable gains under the increasing impact of the socialist system. This impact is multiple. Indeed, the socialist system is something more than a dependable stronghold of all oppressed peoples, whom it gives disinterested support in their struggle for national independence and socialism. It also shows them by its example and its well-founded, Leninist policy that in our time the proletarian revolution is the only way to save the country and free the nation, and that none but socialism and communism can deliver the oppressed workers and peoples of the world from slavery. The national-liberation movement tends therefore to look increasingly to socialism — witness the revolutionary path of the peoples of Angola, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, South Yemen, and Afghanistan. This trend confirms an important truth of our time, namely, that national independence is inseparable from socialism. It fully applies to the Vietnamese as well as the Laotian revolution, both of which have won major victories.

The struggle of the working class of capitalist countries is gaining in scope and becoming more organised. Using its huge revolutionary potentialities the working class leads the struggle of the masses

against monopoly oppression, for a better life, democracy, and social progress, in defense of state sovereignty. This struggle, aimed at gradually weakening the positions of monopoly capital and bringing about the victory of socialism, requires creative quests. We are certain that under the leadership of communist parties guided by the teachings of Marx and Lenin and by proletarian internationalism, the working class of these countries will defeat reaction and ultimately fulfil its historic mission by destroying capitalism and banishing it from the life of society for all time. An important factor in this protracted and perserving struggle is its connection with the cause of building socialism and communism.

Life shows that the community of socialist countries plays a decisive role in the world revolutionary process. It is safe to say that today every revolutionary current and every important political event is influenced by the socialist world system.

This influence is a result not only of the convincing example and gains in building the new society but also of the active all-round support and assistance which the socialist countries render to the people's struggle for national liberation and social emancipation in accordance with great Lenin's precept. 'There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism,' Lenin wrote, 'and that is — 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) *this struggle*, this, *and only this*, line, in *every* country without exception' (*Coll. Works*, Vol 24, p.75). The socialist countries' foreign policy is inspired by awareness of the responsibility of the working class and the peoples, who have won power, for the destiny of the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy, and socialism, which the peoples of other countries are carrying on.

Taken as a whole, the world forces of revolution are greater than those of imperialism and international reaction. But the imperialists and their lackeys refuse to surrender their positions; they try hard to weaken the revolutionary movement from without and within. A very dangerous force has appeared on the world scene in recent years. It is the reactionaries among the ruling circles of Peking, who have far-reaching designs. Behind the facade of talk about 'socialism' and 'anti-hegemonism,' they hatch a plan whose substance is great-power expansionism and hegemonism and which they would like to implement on a world scale, with Southeast Asia as their first target.

In foreign policy the Peking partisans of great-power expansionism

follow a reactionary global strategy prompted by their concept of 'three worlds.' Their aim is to enter into alliance with imperialism, rally all reactionary forces around them, and mislead the developing countries so as to fight jointly with U.S. imperialism against the socialist countries and the revolutionary forces of the world. On the basis of a reactionary analysis of world development totally alien to Marxism-Leninism, they deny the existence of the socialist system and its decisive role in contemporary history. By assailing the socialist system and trying to disunite the countries and peoples it comprises and to reduce its influence on the revolutionary movement in other countries, especially on the national-liberation movement, the Peking leaders merely play into imperialism's hands.

The reactionaries among the Peking rulers claim that world war is inevitable. They have become the most dangerous advocates of war abetting imperialist warmongers. They set various countries against each other in order to establish their hegemony while 'watching a fight between two tigers from a mountain top.'

Those who earlier made a show of taking a stand against imperialism by uttering 'fiery revolutionary' phrases have treacherously entered into collusion with the worst reactionaries in the imperialist camp to fight revolutionary movements.

The partisans of great-power expansionism regard the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, which is pursuing an independent Marxist-Leninist policy, as the greatest obstacle to the establishment of their hegemony in Southeast Asia. To frustrate our people's revolutionary cause, they have made a deal with the United States and other imperialist powers, and they do not shrink from the grossest and most infamous acts.

In spite of the insidious plots of imperialism and reaction, the socialist countries and the revolutionary forces of the world are continuing their victorious advance which no one can stop.

The Vietnamese people have always attached great importance to friendship, solidarity, and cooperation with fraternal socialist countries. We think highly of the sympathy and support of the communists and peoples of the world. Not long ago the SRV and the Soviet Union signed a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. The growing friendship and cooperation between the two countries is a reflection of the ever closer unity of the socialist countries on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This process is of vital importance to the countries of the socialist community fighting in

'The Vietnamese people have encountered new difficulties,' Le Duan, General Secretary of the CC CPV, has said, 'but nothing can check their advance or prevent them from achieving victory. This is because we owe our strength to solid unity and a tradition of staunchness as a nation, and know that 'nothing is more precious than freedom and independence'; because we are fighting for a just cause in harmony with the course of history; because we have the sympathy and support of the Soviet Union, all fraternal socialist countries, and the governments and peoples of countries fighting for peace and justice; and because we are backed by the whole of progressive mankind.'

The Communist Party of Vietnam, which enjoys tremendous international support and is carrying high the banner of Marxism-Leninism, is leading the Vietnamese people to the complete victory of the cause of socialism and in the defense of their socialist country. It contributes its share to the effort to strengthen the socialist world system and step up the peoples' revolutionary struggle.

★ ★ ★

"Kampuchea is the only place in the whole world and a unique example in modern history where the madness of a doctrine has brought about almost total annihilation of a country and its people. No war destruction even approaches what the Pol Pot — Ieng Sary murderers have done to their own nation. After what I have seen in Kampuchea, I may definitely say that Maoism is not just one of the many political theories of the XXth century. It is not a proposal. It is not a revelation, as some young people thought a decade ago. It is nothing but an ideology of genocide — premeditated, comprehensive, ruthless genocide. All the rest is either naive platitudes or sophisticated word-gimmickry, to which many of us were attracted because of our yearnings for things pure and unequivocal."

— *W. Gornicki, Polish journalist at Helsinki Conference in Solidarity with Vietnam.*

New study feature

The Education sub committee of the SPA CC has developed the following curriculum on Marxist philosophy with proposed reading.

As part of the interrelated work of the Education Committee and the AMR editorial board, the curriculum is produced below in full. SPA members or readers interested in arranging study classes or informal study and discussion groups are urged to retain their copies of AMR for a guideline in conducting such projects.

Further curricula on Marxist Historical Materialism will be published in the next issue of AMR.

Philosophy course

Reading is given for each part of the philosophy course set out below. However, students should study the basic texts, read the pages recommended again for each class and then continue to use the texts for private study after the course is over.

Basic texts

Fundamental of Marxist-Leninist philosophy (Progress)
ABC of Dialectical and Historical Materialism (Progress)
F. Engels: Socialism, Utopian and Scientific
M. Cornforth: Materialism and the Dialectical Method
M. Cornforth: Historical Materialism
F. Cunningham: Understanding Marxism
V.I. Lenin: Marx-Engels-Marxism

(All books available from New Era Bookshop 531 George Street, Sydney).

COURSE OUTLINE

1. Philosophy

Science as knowledge of part of reality and philosophy dealing with general questions of reality as a whole. Partisan nature of all philosophy. Relationship between partisanship and objectivity.

Marxist philosophy (dialectical and historical materialism), the science of the most general laws of development of nature and society and of methods

of learning about the world and its revolutionary transformation.

Dialectical and historical materialism as world outlook of Party and revolutionary class. "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

Reading

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy pp. 15-29, 31-44

ABC of Dialectical and Historical Materialism pp. 37-46

Cornforth Materialism and the Dialectical Method pp. 7-16

Lenin: Marx-Engels-Marxism pp. 66-69

2. Materialism

Matter as philosophical concept and as natural-scientific picture of the world.

Matter and its forms. Motion, space and time, consciousness, Matter primary and thought (consciousness) secondary.

Reading

ABC of Dialectical and Historical Materialism pp. 65-126

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy pp. 71-124

Lenin: Marx-Engels-Marxism pp. 11-14, 51-56

3. Materialism

Historical conflict between idealism and materialism. Contemporary forms of idealism.

Reading

Burns: An Introduction to Marxism pp. 90-101

Cunningham: Understanding Marxism pp. 121-133

Burns: An Introduction to Marxism pp. 90-101

Cornforth: Materialism and the Dialectical Method pp. 17-48

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy pp. 600-604

(Aslo pp. 604-635 on contemporary forms of idealism if interested)

4. Dialectical Materialism

Dialectics as science of change and development. The interconnectionness of all phenomena. Theory and practice — truth is concrete.

Reading

Cunningham: Understanding Marxism pp. 135-142

*Cornforth: Materialism and the Dialectical Method pp. 40-48, 53-54,
71-80, 120-126*

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy pp. 193-219

Lenin: Marx-Engels-Marxism pp. 14-16

Engels: Socialism, Utopian and Scientific Part II

5. Dialectical Materialism

Laws of dialectics (transformation from quantity to quality, unity and struggle of opposites, negation of negation. Contradictions. Categories of dialectics.

Reading

ABC of Dialectical and Historical Materialism pp. 127-174

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy pp. 125-192

Cornforth: Materialism and the Dialectical Method pp. 81-119

Cunningham: Understanding Marxism pp. 142-147

6. Dialectical Materialism

Dialectics and metaphysics.

Reading

*Cornforth: Materialism and the Dialectical Method pp. 49-53, 57-65,
68-70*

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy pp. 29-31

ABC of Dialectical and Historical Materialism pp. 52-56

Engels: Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classic German Philosophy

Written questions, letters, queries or opinions welcomed Addressed to:
Education Sub-Committee
392 Sussex Street,
Sydney NSW 2000