

**COMMENTS ON
AN
INFANTILE
DISORDER
IN AUSTRALIA**

COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA

COMMENTS ON AN INFANTILE DISORDER IN AUSTRALIA

**Central Committee
Communist Party of Australia
November 2012**

“Left-Wing” Communism: An Infantile Disorder is a work by Lenin published in 1920. In this classic work, Lenin dealt with the two errors made in formulating strategy and tactics. There is an opportunist trend that wants to reform but not to abolish capitalism. The other trend is ultra-leftism or left sectarianism which advocates against compromises with the capitalist class, against working within conservative trade unions and generally boycotts elections.

Published by the Communist Party of Australia
74 Buckingham Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010.

Tel: (02) 9699 8844 Fax: (02) 9699 9833

www.cpa.org.au

The struggle against petty-bourgeois ideology

The widespread influence of petty-bourgeois ideas among the working class is inevitably reflected in the communist movement. Petty-bourgeois ideas have caused tremendous damage and are a main reason for the continuing difficulties in the Australian communist movement.

Some members of our Party have unfortunately become involved in a course of sustained and deliberate disruption. This has reached the extent of an open attack on Party policies which have been decided through the process of Party-wide discussion and Congress decisions over decades. This attack has been sent out widely, beyond the Party membership and even overseas. It has now become necessary to speak out to put the record straight.

The struggle against petty-bourgeois ideology, confusions and wavering is of fundamental importance. All communist parties have had to wage this struggle and the extent to which they have overcome petty-bourgeois influences is a measure of their ability to apply Marxism-Leninism and give sound leadership.

It is not the fact of being a critic which might bring one's position into question but the merit or otherwise of the criticisms – do they build or destroy, unify or disrupt, educate or befuddle?

Such inner-party struggles can, but need not be, destructive. The democratic centralist structures of the Party provide the means for raising differing views, arguing them and making decisions. As we argue the issues out, the way forward is being charted. Problems, backward ideas, errors will be discarded.

The current attack on Party policy and decision-making focuses around four main areas – building alliances and unity, the role of electoral work, how social change takes place, and democratic centralism.

The critics describe the policies they disagree with as new “*revisionist and liquidationist tendencies*” by the Party leadership. Yet most of them have appeared in Party documents, including the Party Program, since the mid-1970s without any such opposition from the members.

The views expressed by this minority would isolate our Party, turning it into a sect that is isolated and ineffectual. The people putting forward these ideas create theories divorced from the realities of life in Australia today. They avoid real campaigns with real people in favour of “pure” struggles. They have no understanding of the “battle of ideas” which is the central feature of our work.

These isolationists describe the Communist Party’s policies in this way:

Prior to leading the working class, we must first unite this mythical and nebulous beast “the left” to fight for socialism. There is no attempt to define who this “left” might be. Who exactly is this mythical creature labelled “the left” that we need to unite prior to uniting the working class?

In attempting to unite these differing groups ultimately we are forgetting the class we most of all need to attract, the working class.

Instead of attempting to lead the working class to victory this ideology suggests that we must unite these largely middle class groups first, as if they are the ones who will lead us to victory. Ultimately it will mean that we

will dissolve our movement into the Social Democratic movement and in the pursuit of reforms and parliamentary means to overthrow Capitalism.

Regarding the “urgent need” to break the “two party system” in Australia, this ideology is also incorrect. This policy of focus on breaking the “two party stranglehold” is a reformist, class collaborationist policy because the focus is on participation in the social democratic struggle within the Parliamentary system, instead of winning the leadership of the working class to overthrow it.

We should be standing in our Party name. Or at the very least we should be standing with other like-minded Marxist organisations. This idea of a coalition type government, of a mish mash of left groupings and social democrats, is indicative of the reformist view that somehow we can alter the basis of capitalism via means of participation in government.

These wild accusation from the members who are attacking our Party make a multitude of mistakes. They falsely claim that the Party policy is to build left and progressive unity before other forms of unity, that its main purpose is to win elections, that a united front is the same as a popular front. So let’s look at some of these matters.

Unity

The isolationists claim: *There is no attempt to define who this “left” might be. Are we talking about the Labor Party? The Anarchists? The Greens? The opportunists who are no longer members of our Party?*

They clearly do not bother to read CPA policy documents because these state clearly:

Left unity is unity between the left forces aimed at building and strengthening the position of the left. For this purpose we define the “left” as being those forces which recognise the class struggle, fight the class struggle in the interests of the working class, and recognise that capitalist society must be replaced with a socialist society.

People’s Unity unites forces across broader sections of society than the working class alone, drawing together the broadest array of forces exploited by capitalism. In fighting together for programs in the interests of the working class and other social groups, a cohesive democratic unity can come into existence directed against the most reactionary big business circles.

Working class unity brings together the working class which consists of the majority of people. The united front of the working class means the establishment of unity in action by all sections of the working class in support of their economic and political interests. Building the united front of the workers means advancing policies, demands and slogans which workers will actively support and which will strengthen the struggle and organisations of the working class.

We use the term “left” in a precise way, to describe those who see the domination of our society by large corporations as being responsible for the economic, political and social crisis society faces.

The political left recognises the importance of the class struggle and takes it up on the side of the working class in fighting for a socialist solution to society’s problems.

Some left political parties clearly fall into this category, despite the differing views of how socialism should be won and what it will be like.

There are left-wing trade unionists, peace activists, environmentalists and many others, but it would be wrong for us to describe as “left” all activists who fight oppression and injustice.

There are many “pro-people” organisations and individuals who support political reforms and progress and work for social justice, equality, democracy and a better society, yet don’t see the prime importance of the class struggle, the need for a socialist form of society, or understand the role the giant corporations play in society. Such organisations and individuals can be described as “progressive”.

Just as it is wrong to describe all activists as just “progressives”, it is equally wrong to describe them all as “left”.

The isolationists allege that the CPA wants to create left unity *prior to uniting the working class*.

You can search CPA documents for a month of Sundays but you will not find a single reference to any order in which these different forms of unity should be built.

What you can find are references to the dialectical relationship between the forms of unity and recognition that different demands and forms of activity will be required depending on the prevailing conditions, the form of unity and the participants in any particular activity or campaign. You will also find references to the importance of the leading role of the working class and the leading role of the Communist Party.

Alliances

Many sections of capitalist society are suffering under the growing power of the transnational corporations: the working class (including the unemployed), small business, small farmers, Aboriginal people, professional, self-employed, and academic strata.

There is a large range of social and political issues facing all those mentioned above that remain unresolved. They include workers' rights, environmental protection, the battle against privatisation, defence of the public sector (health, education, transport, housing), progressive tax reform (including taxing mining and other super-profits), decentralisation to assist rural and regional communities, ending the Intervention in Northern Territory Aboriginal communities, and the humane treatment of asylum seekers. Ending Australia's involvement in aggressive US wars is also a priority.

If we are to effectively fight back against this onslaught, the Communist Party believes a central issue is to build **unity** among the left and progressive forces, in order to mobilise the working class and its allies to substantially change the direction of politics in Australia.

The many progressive individuals and groups are part of the political scene and won't go away. It is true some have taken anti-working class positions on some issues, but nonetheless, **if the CPA doesn't work with them and help them develop a class outlook in a battle of ideas, who will?**

The CPA some time ago adopted a strategy of building left and progressive unity to contribute to the creation of an alternative political force, with the working class at its core, strong enough to substantially change the direction of politics in Australia.

This is a strategic approach to change which is shared by many Communist parties around the world.

The political alternative is the name given to the complex of political forces who are prepared to change direction, to build struggles and fight for policies for the people, against the interests of the transnational corporations, against the pro-big business policies being foisted on us by governments of all shades.

The forces that form the political alternative can be seen in embryo now in some campaigns like Your Rights at Work in opposition to the Howard Government. The wide array of social forces and political groupings in that campaign shows that co-operation around issues is not only possible but effective. When people with different political, religious, ethnic and occupational backgrounds join hands to achieve an objective that all agree on it is a powerful force to be reckoned with.

The working class must be at the core of this mass movement. We must win support for the idea that more fundamental, more lasting change in the people's interest can be brought about if co-operation and united struggle are taken to a higher level.

Marx's observations in 1847 are interesting in this context:

“Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers. The domination of capital has created for this mass a common situation, common interests. This mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have pointed out only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself. The interests it defends become class interests. But the struggle of class against class is a political struggle.”

(Karl Marx *The Poverty of Philosophy* 1874)

We have called for all our Party Branches to become centres of political activity. This means a branch must be active with the people, it must be involved with the people in their struggles, it must be seen by the people as giving help and leadership to struggles that people are involved in and concerned about.

Working at community or local level will necessarily mean working with people with whom we have ideological differences. Working in this way allows us to be more effective in winning reforms for the people and also gives us opportunities to speak to a wider audience, an opportunity to argue our position and raise politics to a higher level.

Our job is to make an alliance of left and progressive forces **work**. We have no other choice.

To restate some of these points, the Communist Party of Australia **Program** says:

The CPA sees the task of uniting the left/progressive organisations and individuals as a major objective in the present period. With this in mind we see the main aim of the Party in the present situation as working to develop left unity and working class unity. The development of a united front of the working class will greatly assist building the broader people's front unity that is required for the progressive forces to successfully achieve the anti-monopoly anti-imperialist democratic government that we identify as the first stage of revolutionary change.

While it is possible for the various forms of unity to be developed simultaneously a people's front will not succeed as a contribution to the revolutionary development of society without being based upon the unity in action of the working people which must be at the centre of the broader form of people's unity.

While never ceasing to place the main emphasis on the development of working class unity, it is necessary to build a left oriented, politically progressive people's front, strong enough to challenge and break the two party monopoly. This alternative must be the aim of and arise out of the demands and mass actions of the working people and other classes and social groups that oppose monopoly domination.

The isolationists ask: "What did the Party intend to achieve in this alliance with the Left Sectarians", citing the recent Sydney municipal council election campaign in which a CPA member stood with members of the Socialist Alliance and independents on a Housing Action ticket. They claim that left sectarians "alienate the workers by silly, adventurist and sometimes even criminal activities."

Let's think for a moment about why Lenin admitted Trotsky and his whole group into the Bolshevik organisation. Lenin was certainly not naïve; he had raised criticisms of Trotsky before. In fact he was committed to maintaining the strength of the movement while simultaneously recognizing that ideological struggle would continue. Working together means changing together. The key question is change in what direction? That depends on who is best equipped to win the battle of ideas.

We are confident that the CPA can and will win. Perhaps the isolationists do not have the same confidence when they try to run away from the battle of ideas by repeating the dogma of working class, working class and no one else.

But let's be clear. We are talking about the battle of ideas **within alliances**. Of course that is not the only arena in which we need to win the battle of ideas. We need to do it in all areas of our work – the trade unions, peace work, environmental campaigns, within community organisations, etc. However, since the isolationists

seem intent on spreading disinformation about CPA policy, we must stress that we are not raising the possibility of amalgamation of the CPA with groups such as the Socialist Alliance or the Socialist Alternative.

Elections

It would be a mistake to interpret the concept of the political alternative as just an electoral alliance. Our efforts to build a political alternative have been expressed in different campaigns, including at election times. This has led some people to falsely accuse the CPA of thinking that real socio-economic change can be achieved by parliamentary means. This is nonsense and has never been CPA policy.

The Communist Party **Program** says explicitly that parliamentary work is important provided that it is combined with struggle by the people outside parliament.

This is not some revisionist or liquidationist “error” or “tendency” that slipped through at a recent Congress. This policy has been in the **Party Program** for more than 35 years. The Socialist Program of the Socialist Party of Australia (adopted at the June 1975 Congress and slightly amended at the September-October Congress in 1978) states under the cross-head “Parliamentary Struggle”:

The Socialist Party regards parliament and parliamentary election campaigns as having an important place in the whole arena of struggle to curb monopoly and bring forward the interests of the people, provided parliamentary activity is combined with vigorous struggle of the people OUTSIDE parliament... The Socialist Party stands candidates and seeks their election to parliament. Our candidates would fight vigorously inside parliament for the fulfilment of our

progressive policies while at the same time assisting and encouraging maximum development of united action outside parliament as the only guarantee that the demands of the people will be satisfied.

Building the mass movements into a strong, united, militant force is fundamental for real change.

Without a mass movement, achievements in parliament by left and progressive members would be very limited. It's a bit like a union fighting a battle in an industrial tribunal without mobilising its members outside. Work among the working class and in the mass movement is the primary focus of the Party's activity and elections can be an important form of class struggle, an opportunity to build unity, and take the policies of the Party to a broader audience.

How should we approach electoral co-operation with others? If we stand for election in broad coalitions, will we lose our independence as a party, be limited in what we can do, and not be able to express our Party policy?

Certainly not. There may be some limits but there are also benefits, if we make our work in alliances successful.

If we say we want to co-operate to build a new alliance for change, we have to show we are genuine and prepared to do some selfless work. We are not in it to see what we can get out of it for ourselves. Building trust among the working class is extremely important in building support for our Party. Our aim is to win leadership of the working class, to see that the working class "constitutes itself as a class for itself". (Karl Marx *The Poverty of Philosophy* 1874)

The Communist Party

There will be no strong left and progressive political alternative without a strong Communist Party.

A political alternative will not be built if we try to play down the Party, or hide its face. Successful work requires our influence to be much greater so our ideas gain acceptance by wider numbers of people.

That will not happen if we do not work with and engage in the battle of ideas with other social forces.

We need a strong Party presence in the mass movement because an advanced perspective of left and progressive unity combined with good policies will be a strong unifying force, enabling a more long-lasting change of direction of politics in Australia.

The working class and the people

The working class has the leading role to play in building an alternative political force for real change because of its central social position, its strength, organisational capacity and experience in struggle.

The CPA seeks to involve and give leadership to the working class in struggle for its demands. We also seek to promote the struggles of progressive and community organisations. This is not a dilemma. We do not have to choose. The two processes are not contradictory; they should be complementary.

Recognition of the primary role of the working class is sometimes elevated into the idea that Communists should only work with the workers on working class issues. This is a mistake the isolationists are making.

The CPA's recognition of and representation of social forces other than the working class does not mean that the Party loses its class orientation and therefore the reason for its existence.

These mistaken views misrepresent the manner in which our Party has tackled the issues of health, education, environment, peace and war. We have consistently said, for example, that Star Wars is the military arm of globalisation, a very dangerous addition to the arsenal of imperialism. Is this not a class approach? We did not restrict our campaigning against Star Wars to the working class. We sought to build the broadest possible movement and alliances to defeat Star Wars.

Climate change is a vital issue for the working class but again we do not restrict our struggle to within the confines of the working class movement. We have also joined forces with a range of social forces, all with the common aim of taking action to reduce emissions and develop sustainable, renewable energy sources.

Health, education, housing, social welfare etc are massive issues for the working class. They embrace issues of government budget allocation, privatisation, user-pays, exploitation, the reserve army of labour, and the role and responsibilities of governments.

Such issues are issues for the working class; they are issues for the people; they are issues for the Communist Party. There is no contradiction involved. Those who present them as contradictory will only cause division between the working class and the people. Can the problems of these areas be solved outside of the arena of working-class struggle? Does anyone seriously suggest this?

The isolationists suggest that the focus must be on those issues which directly concern the working class, with emphasis given to issues associated with labour exploitation. The division of

issues into “working class” and “people’s” issues is born of metaphysical thinking, cuts the working class off from major political battles and leads to economism.

Economism

Lenin was critical of what he called “economism”, the idea that only issues related to the economic struggle of the working class, i.e. their immediate workplace issues, should be taken up.

Lenin was convinced the economists were wrong. He branded their view, that the economic struggle was the best way to involve the masses in the political movement, as “erroneous and reactionary”.

It’s not that Lenin thought a wages struggle or a “factory exposure” to be wrong in principle, but when prosecuted as purely economic struggles, all the workers learned was to sell their labour on better terms and to fight the purchasers over a purely commercial deal.

Lenin thought it necessary to organise the political education of the working class on the basis of the exposure of *all* aspects of the existing system. Communist propaganda should expose police oppression and “autocratic outrages” in all spheres of life, be they industrial, civic, scientific etc. Lenin wanted every conscious worker to react to the “tyranny of landlords, corporal punishment of peasants, bribery among officials, harassment by the police, the regimentation of soldiers, and the persecution of students.” Workers must develop a responsibility towards *all* oppressed strata.

According to Lenin, the ideal Communist should not be the trade union secretary but “*the tribune of the people*, who is able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression,

no matter where it appears, no matter what stratum or class of the people it affects; who is able to generalise all these manifestations and produce a single picture of police violence and capitalist exploitation; who is able to take advantage of every event, however small, in order to set forth before all his socialist convictions and his democratic demands, in order to clarify for all and everyone the world-historic significance of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat.”

Such an extensive understanding and practice of “political education” benefited not only the workers, but also the broad masses, highlighting a most important aspect of communist work – what we today call “building alliances” with non-working class sections of the population.

The historical experience of the working class movement and the many successful struggles for socialism illustrate this point. The Russian Revolution itself was built on the demands of “Peace, Bread and Land”. They were issues for all the oppressed people struggling against the Kerensky Government and the capitalist class it represented and the remnants of the autocracy. The Socialist Revolution was led by but not won by the working class on its own.

The process of change

It is universally understood that the transformation of the economic base of society from private monopoly control over the means of production to social forms of ownership – including state, municipal, co-operative and other forms – cannot be accomplished overnight. In fact, the term “by degrees” comes directly from the *Communist Manifesto* itself. But by how many degrees and of what duration between each step or phase of transformation?

The CPA is of the view that society will change from its present capitalist mode of production toward socialism through a series of stages. Society will progress through an anti-monopoly anti-imperialist democratic stage prior to the working class winning power and creating a socialist state.

Initially – and in Australia today we are the very beginning of this process – the working class and other progressive social forces would begin to take control of political life and the economy and introduce measures to alleviate some of the worst features of the capitalist system.

These changes will take a considerable time to bring about. As more and more of them are introduced and consolidated, the present dictatorship of capital will gradually be eroded and the power of the working people will begin to expand and develop.

The first stage in the process of transition to socialism, as outlined in the Party Program and other Congress documents, would weaken the power of monopoly and extend the democratic rights and participation of the people.

But it cannot end there. Social change is a continuous process and the need to construct a socialist society will inevitably arise.

The socialist stage requires the replacement of capitalist class power with working class power and further steps to break the control and ownership of the economy by capitalism.

When we talk about the “first stage”, what we are describing is actually a lengthy **process within** capitalism. We are describing points along a continuum that will develop and change over time in a complicated, uneven process of change towards the ultimate achievement of socialism in Australia.

The ruling class will resist any change, any challenge to its power, using all the means at its disposal. This could result in set-backs or rapid progression in the process of change.

Some people have attacked this analysis, condemning it as reformist and calling it “stagism”.

But the concept of stages in the transition from capitalism to socialism does not mean that the CPA believes there is a distinct socio-economic formation between capitalism and socialism, an intermediate stage that is a different form of society.

Over time, capitalism has taken various forms but has remained capitalism in its essence. In his book *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism* Lenin was describing a particular historical form or stage of capitalism. Would the isolationists call Lenin’s analysis “stagism” too?

Their rejection of the CPA analysis is in fact a rejection of dialectics, of Marxist-Leninist science. They are denying the dialectical process of quantitative changes leading to a qualitative change. In relation to human society they are denying the need for reforms to accumulate before a revolutionary transformation can take place.

This is reinforced by a statement from the isolationists that “Our goal is to overthrow the Capitalist system not to work within it.” This reveals their metaphysical approach and their inability to distinguish between the gradual reforms that must be won and the achievement of a revolutionary transformation.

The concept of the two-stage transition is not some recent “revisionist tendency” by the leadership. The Socialist Party of Australia Program (adopted at the Second Congress of the SPA in June 1975 and slightly amended at the Third Congress

in 1978) outlines the two-stage process which has remained in Party documents to this date.

Talking about a new kind of government in the first stage it says it would:

... extend democratic rights to the working people, nationalise key industries and build up the State sector, end control by overseas capital, break with policies of imperialism and raise the living standards of the working people.

Fulfilment of these policies will weaken the political and economic grip of monopoly capitalism and open the way for further democratic advance, and the socialist transformation of Australian society.

The second stage covers the replacement of capitalist class power by working class rule, the ending of the private ownership of the means of production for private profit and the establishment of public ownership by the people of Australia's natural resources, means of communication, transport and information, and the large landed estates controlled by monopolies and big land owners ...

Democratic centralism

The principles of democratic centralism are the organisational principles of all communist parties and they arise out of the revolutionary tasks of the party. Their abandonment would turn a communist party into, at best, a liberal democratic or reformist party incapable of waging any revolutionary struggle against capitalism.

Dialectics is the disclosing of the contradiction of a single whole. Unity of opposites refers to the internal contradictions within

a single, unified and indivisible whole. It does not refer to the drawing together or combination of two separate elements.

Democratic centralism is not two separate and separated processes. It is a single integrated whole and the proper observance of the party's democratic centralist practices will and is intended to strengthen the Party at all levels.

Main principles of democratic centralism are set out in our Party's **Constitution** as follows:

- a. The election of the Central, State and District Committees and Branch Executives by secret ballot.
- b. All Party organisations must set out to study and learn from the experiences and views of other party organisations to practice criticism and self-criticism.
- c. Leading party organisations must submit reports at regular intervals to the party organisations which elect them. Lower party organisations must report to the higher party organisations and be proffered guidance and assistance on problems arising from their work.
- d. Collective leadership is the principle of leadership of the party. All important questions are decided collectively, while individual responsibility is fixed for carrying out decisions.
- e. Party decisions, properly made in accordance with this constitution, must be carried out. Lower party organisations must carry out decisions of the higher organisations; decisions of the Party Congress and the Central Committee are binding upon the whole Party.
- f. Party organisations shall ensure a regular and efficient check on decisions.

The people attacking our Party present democratic centralism as a “balance” between democracy on the one hand and centralism on the other. A balance inevitably implies two poles, two weights to be measured against one another. Hence, democratic centralism approached in this way divides what is a dialectical unity.

Having divided democratic centralism into two components, the next step is to pose one against the other. Then it becomes possible to “award” democracy to the rank and file and centralism to the leadership and to set the membership against the leadership.

They allege that there “has been a long standing tradition that any member of the CPA has the right to approach any member of the Central Committee regarding their concerns in relation to the Party, or in order to have something tabled at a Central Committee meeting.”

This is dangerous nonsense. These critics are trying to replace the right to “address any proposal, statement, criticism or appeal to any Party **organisation**” with the right to lobby individual members of Party committees, to bypass and undermine the democratic centralist structures of our Party. And they try to do this by reference to a “tradition” that only individualists like themselves have tried to inflict on our Party.

The critics also allege that “branches/members are rarely consulted; decisions are made without consultation”, and most recently the claim that “kept secret are current moves to sell Party assets”.

The dishonesty of these allegations is breathtaking. The Central Committee sends out a letter to every single Party member after each of its meetings, informing comrades of decisions and seeking their opinions on a range of matters.

Far from keeping matters secret, the CC letter in September 2012 informed the membership about the sale of Party assets and sought their opinions. The letter said:

After detailed examination of Party finances and assets, the CC decided to take immediate action to secure and strengthen the Party's finances into the future.

This will entail the purchase of a new building and the consolidation of the Party's properties to ensure adequate returns and ongoing financial security for the Party into the future.

The CC discussed the need for a new headquarters that is more appropriate for the Party's needs and that can become a real centre of political activity.

The aim is to restructure our assets so the Party remains financially viable into the future, protecting our political legacy with financial certainty.

This, together with increased party activity and new members, will see the work of the party continue and grow for generations to come.

The plans will ensure that the Party's income is increased and is more regular so we can meet the costs of our political work and plan more effectively.

The CC would appreciate comments from Party organisations on what they believe are the Party's main requirements for a new headquarters.

We also look forward to hearing your ideas around fund raising options into the future.

None of the critics took up the opportunity to send their opinions on these questions to the Central Committee. Instead they

repeat their criticisms and slanders, knowing that they are creating concerns and distractions among our genuine members and weakening support for the Communist Party.

If these critics were genuine, if they had come to the view that aspects of the Party's long standing policies and strategy for revolutionary change in Australia were not longer valid, then why have they gone far and wide attacking the Party, its press and leadership? All policies should be regularly reviewed and tested against historical developments and experience. Why haven't they raised their views through correct democratic centralist channels? They also have an opportunity to propose amendments to the Party's Program, with which they appear to have fundamental differences, and the Political Resolution when the draft is sent out to members next year in the lead-up to the 12th Congress in October 2013. They have chosen another path which is not in the interests of the Party or its unity.

Conclusion

George Dimitrov, the Secretary of the Communist International in 1935, referred to people who put forward simplified methods of solving the most complex problems of the working class movement as those for whom "mountains are mere stepping stones".

This approach was also condemned by Lenin when he spoke of the "revolutionary phrase which leads to the death of the revolution".

Sectarians often refuse to work in alliances with non-revolutionary groups, claiming that alliances with reformists or sections of the middle class in particular circumstances and for particular limited objectives are "betrayals" of the revolution. This reflects a refusal to accept the struggle for partial demands or to work

in alliances except with those who share similar, sectarian attitudes. It is a denial of the fact that change takes place by both “evolution” and “revolution”.

The views of the members attacking our Party from leftist and isolationist positions display a capitulation to the difficulties confronting every revolutionary party in a non-revolutionary situation and a defeatist response to problems in the international communist movement.

However, the Communist Party will not be diverted from its work or from its confidence in the future, despite all the difficulties our movement faces.

We repeat and reaffirm the following statement from our 10th Congress:

“We declare that the 21st Century will be the century of socialism. That is the objective of our work and activity. But whether this is achieved cannot be taken for granted. It will depend on the successful outcome of the struggle against capitalism and imperialism. This, in turn, depends on the organisational, political and ideological maturity of the Communist Parties that must lead it.”