

E. F. Hill Warns Against "Co-Operating" With Bourgeois Press

INTERVIEW WITH VANGUARD

E.F. Hill, Chairman of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), in an interview with Vanguard this week, spoke of his attitude to "co-operating" with the daily press by giving interviews to it or in any other way.

Hill said the capitalist press was the property of the capitalist class. "Everything it does serves that class. It stands directly opposed to the working class."

"The capitalist press strives very hard to dress itself up as an impartial press, a press that 'stands above classes'. For this reason it continually tries to ensnare working class leaders into its schemes. By publishing comments and news about working class matters it hopes to build the illusion that it is a 'fair' press and has no class allegiance. Its efforts in this regard should not be assisted in any way."

WILD ATTACK

Hill said that a violent anti-working class leaflet, wildly attacking himself and others, had been issued. The leaflet claimed that the other people attacked were connected with him. In factual content it was hopelessly inaccurate. One of the "victims" of the leaflet was worried. On being told of this Hill said: "When these scoundrels begin to praise you then is the time to be worried."

Vanguard has learned that a capitalist newspaper has been making inquiries about the republication of the book, "The Petrov Conspiracy Unmasked". A reporter from the paper was told that he had better see Hill. To this he replied: "It isn't any use trying to see Hill. He hasn't given an interview to the press for more than 20 years."

Vanguard asked Hill to comment on this.

Hill said: "Well, it is not quite true. I frequently talk to the working class press and write articles for it. Generally speaking I have refused to talk to the capitalist press, to the radio or appear on television. There have been exceptions."

HONORED BY ATTACKS

He went on: "It is true that I have said that when the diehards and their press and their D.L.P. and such elements begin to praise me then indeed I will get worried. I am honored by their continuing attacks on me and the Party of which I am Chairman. I think Mao Tsetung was right when he said: 'I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work.'"

Hill said that he had recently declined to appear on the ABC Four

Corners program when asked to put "Peking's point of view" and in company with Aarons and Clancy. "Of course I agree with the Chinese Communist Party but it would be utter presumption on my part to put their point of view."

Hill recalled that Mr. Sorrel, when employed by the Melbourne Herald to write the "On The Spot" column used to ring him up consistently requesting an "interview". When Hill told Sorrel that he had already refused him, Sorrel would say — "but you may have changed your mind."

Hill revealed that a newspaper had offered him a lot of money to write his "memoirs" for publication.

NO "NICE" PHOTOS

"I declined," he said. "I got a good deal of satisfaction out of News Weekly (organ of Santamaria's NCC) when, not so long ago, it referred to my 'ill-health' and in a roundabout and very polite way, wished me dead."

Hill said that no "nice" portraits of him appeared in the press.

"No capitalist newspaper has ever, with my consent, taken a photograph of me, so a nice posed portrait or photograph of me can never appear in the capitalist press assuming they want to publish one. Instead they publish the most sinister photograph they can get hold of. I may say I don't pretend to be an oil painting. But my friends ask me why I don't give them a decent photograph. I would sooner be presented as a villain by people like Denis Warner, Richard Hughes, etc., than as a 'respectable' man. Warner, Hughes and company are die-hard reactionaries. I am very happy that I conjure up nightmares for them. May they have many more."

Hill said it was part of the technique of deception of the capitalist press to praise working class "leaders". He went on: "So there are pretty portrait pictures of Aarons, Clancy, Munday, Carmichael and a few others. These pictures appear in the press. All these gentlemen are portrayed as 'reasonable' or something of that kind."

TUNE IS CHANGED

"Commonly such people commence by being attacked and 'intimidated'. Then the tune is changed and they become not so bad. Then stories begin to appear about them as good family men, or clean living or sincere and nice pictures appear. One such case is the notorious J.J. Brown. There are others. These gentlemen 'co-operate' with the press. They end up co-operating with the capitalist class.

Behind Cover Of So-Called Detente Soviet Social Imperialists Arm To The Teeth

Soviet's \$10 billion military build-up in central Europe

By DREW MIDDLETON
military editor "The New York Times"

SPENDING by the Soviet Union on its military forces in central Europe has risen by \$10 billion in recent years, one of Britain's leading authorities on the Soviet military reports in the first specific public assessment of over-all Soviet reinforcements in the area.

The increase in Soviet tank strength has been "spectacular," according to Prof John Erickson of Edinburgh University. Also, at least five airborne divisions had been added and tactical air power in central Europe had been increased 50 per cent, he said.

In the last year Western intelligence sources have published general estimates of Soviet reinforcement in various services, but the British authority is the first to offer exact figures on the increase in money and in the numbers of airborne divisions, tanks and tactical aircraft.

The build-up has come as American public opinion has swung toward cutting United States forces in Europe, the Gallup poll reported. The poll said that two-thirds of those questioned in its latest national survey had heard about congressional proposals to reduce the number of troops with nearly six out of 10 of those favouring the return home of some troops.

The cost of maintaining American troops abroad and a conviction that a third world war would not be fought by conventional forces are key factors behind the public support for the pullback, the poll said.

Interviews by "The New York Times" around the country paralleled the Gallup findings.

"If you've got troops somewhere, you're going to have a war. If we ever have a war with Russia, we'll annihilate each other anyway, so what's the difference," said Lora Bernstein of Los Angeles supporting a troop pullback.

"We spend a lot of money (on troops abroad) and those countries where they're stationed are economically well developed and can take care of themselves," said Michael Harris, a medical student at Tulane University in New Orleans.

The Nixon Administration, attempting to block congressional proposals for a unilateral US pullback, argues that it would weaken the effort to negotiate with the Soviets "mutual and balanced force reductions" in central Europe.

Western intelligence sources surmised that the Soviet buildup was an effort to improve their position in the bargaining.

But Erickson, in "Strategic Review," published by the United States Strategic Institute in Washington, wrote that "rather the opposite is the case," that the Soviet military priorities "come first and it is those which must be fitted into an MBFR context. In terms of external performance, the Soviet-Warsaw Treaty Organisation forces have been provided with greater offensive

capabilities with the emphasis on mobility, fire power and the shock effect of this combination."

He noted that Soviet tank forces were built up and modernised with "more than 1,000 T-62 tanks (moved) into forward positions," with older T-54 and T-55 models kept in depots.

The 10 armour and 10 mechanised infantry divisions the Soviet kept in East Germany received additional weapons and material for an additional company per regiment.

"The net result has been to give the Soviet first echelon 8,700 tanks in 16 tank and motor-rifle (mechanised) divisions in central and eastern Europe," Erickson wrote.

In addition, he said, the nuclear weapons available in the area have increased. Soviet ground forces have acquired a newer long-range missile system, the guns per division have been almost doubled and ammunition and infantry vehicle stocks have been built up.

Airborne forces have been sharply increased to 12 or 13 divisions, a five-division increase with nine divisions west of the Urals.

Soviet, Polish, East German and Czechoslovak tactical air strength was put at 4,180 planes, while Erickson estimated a force of 2,550 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

"Whatever way the figures are read — whether in terms of money, men or machines — the Soviet investment in its European theatre forces has increased steadily over the years, not only after 1968 with the physical intrusion of Soviet troops into

Czechoslovakia and the creation of a new group of forces (the central group) but also during recent months."

He noted that only one-quarter of the Soviet's 160 available divisions are in the Far East, with "well over one half assigned to the confrontation with NATO."

While the manpower level of the Soviet forces in Europe is leveling off, the "building-up in armaments has continued apace," Erickson stated.

The US keeps about 500,000 troops abroad, 300,000 in Europe, including the 190,000-man Seventh Army in West Germany. Air Force units in Britain, Spain, Germany and Turkey and the sixth fleet in the Mediterranean make up the remainder.

"The Times' interviews, however, indicate that many American's don't know how many troops are overseas, with the estimates ranging up to two million."

NATO military men believe any American pullback would have to be made up for by increases in the West German Army, but a recent poll in West Germany showed that even Germans "doubt that their country could be defended by an army."

In any case, there doesn't seem much doubt that many, perhaps a majority of Americans, are tired of the burden.

"If we pull out they'll be happier and I think our image abroad would improve," said Marjorie Cunningham, an administrative assistant at New York University.

The above cutting reproduced from the October 19 issue of the Financial Review shows how the Soviet Union and the U.S. imperialists continue to arm themselves to the teeth despite their talk about a "detente".

"It is sometimes said to me 'but you can reach people you otherwise wouldn't reach if you talk to the press or appear on television.' Of course it is true that their coverage is great. But under such circumstances it is not I then speaking; it is the capitalist class using me.

When Hill declined to appear on Four Corners a person who pretends to be a Marxist wrote a 'protest' to Vanguard against his refusal and inspired a "workers' group" to write another. Hill said: "I can understand people not comprehending the attitude we take. But when a person writes in terms of Marxism, but in reality uses every revisionist argument and terminology such as the Aarons' slander 'the Hill group', then it is a different matter. Such people have sold their souls to the reaction and they want us to do the same.

"Then they said 'how ridiculous for Hill to suggest the ABC allow itself to be given to the workers for 24 hours!' Of course I used the illustration simply to show the ABC would never, under capitalism, serve the working class. These institutions strain every nerve to get working class leaders into the capitalist net. They never cease trying. It goes on every day. The capitalists never lose

The figures come from capitalist sources. But as we have said, when the imperialist countries fall out they tend to tell the truth about each other.

their vigilance in the task of trying to adapt the workers and their leaders to capitalism."

Hill said it was true that he had never co-operated with the press, the radio or television — "so I have never been 'popularised' by them. Notwithstanding that they have done a very good job in making me and, more importantly, Communism, known throughout Australia. They have done this through hostile material. I borrow from the great Lenin in saying we should bow down and thank you, gentlemen."

Hill stressed that he did not, in any sense, regard all this as a personal matter nor did he include working journalists in his general assessment and role of the press. He said: "What we are dealing with is a matter of very great political importance, a class question. Australian workers and working people should be vigilant about 'leaders' who co-operate with these enemies of the people. These enemies are not out to help the people.

"I also recognise that one cannot be inflexible in these matters. Circumstances vary and different leaders are in different positions; but the underlying principles remain."

The reality that the Soviet Union and the U.S. are two heavily armed superpowers cannot be denied. The formidable arms build-up of the Soviet Union has the European capitalist countries worried. They can see that the armed forces under command of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe exceed by far what could be considered necessary for defence. The Soviet social-imperialists, with the U.S. imperialists seek to dominate the world. The two superpowers also contend with one another. It is this seeking after world domination that is the major factor in causing world instability. The feverish arming by the superpowers shows that there can never be peace while imperialism exists.

FROM PAGE 1

After analyzing the situation between the enemy and ourselves, it notes: "Fighting on two fronts has always been a nightmare for the enemy. Therefore, his plans have always been worked out on the basis of a blitzkrieg, finishing off with one front and then turning to the other. In no case should we allow this to happen.

The article stresses: "To deplete enemy forces in concentrated and large numbers is actually the strategic principle worked out and being effectively carried out by the General Command of the (Egyptian) armed forces." "Annihilation of enemy troops must be the basic objective of all forms of operations."