

# N.Z. COMMUNIST REVIEW

3



**Congress of Unity and Victory** Page 2

**McAra's Line is Line of Class Collaboration** Page 8

**Imperialism and the "Population Explosion" Fraud**  
—Wibisono ("The Afro-Asian Journalist"). Page 10

# Congress of Unity & Victory

**W**HILE clouds of economic chaos and war darken the horizon in the capitalist world, more and more people turn to socialist People's China for a way out and an answer. Crowning 26 years of heroic struggle and effort, the successful Fourth National People's Congress, held recently in Peking, is an inspiration to all the oppressed peoples, those of the Third World countries and those of the Second World, such as New Zealand.

The Congress marks a new high tide of achievement in all fields shattering the dreams and wishful speculation of all imperialists, social-imperialists and their "running dogs" who predicted chaos and disaster during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

A weak but vital and growing force can become strong and a superficially strong but decadent force can become weak. Once China was a weak nation divided by warlordism and exploited by foreign imperialism which trampled on the people. Today, under the leadership of her heroic Communist Party, headed by Mao Tse-tung, and based on the dictatorship of the proletariat, she has developed into a mighty socialist state. Resolutely opposing super-power hegemonism and adhering firmly to a policy of equality, friendship and mutual benefit among nations, People's China is a beacon to all peoples in the struggle to build a new world. China does not dictate to the revolutionary forces of the world as the Soviet social-imperialist Brezhnev junta tries to do but leads by example and reliance on Marxist-Leninist principles.

Mao Tse-tung once stated that revolution is not like doing embroidery. Nor is building a vanguard, Marxist-Leninist party, a Communist Party, based on Marxist-Leninism, like doing embroidery. As the history of China has proved, such a party can only be built by arduous, protracted struggle, a struggle against opportunism, revisionism and splittism.

Hence the importance of fighting for a correct ideological-political line, which "decides everything," based on Marxism-Leninism and in this country, for the programme of the Communist Party of New Zealand which is to fight imperialism and revisionism, to fight opportunist betrayal of working class principles, develop revolutionary consciousness and organisation of the working class, to end capitalism, establish working class state power and build socialism.

**LONG LIVE THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA,  
HEADED BY ITS GLORIOUS COMMUNIST PARTY AND  
CHAIRMAN MAO TSETUNG!**

# McAra's Line is Line of Class Collaboration

Statement by the Political Committee, C.P.N.Z., February 26, 1975

**T**HE Political Committee Statement and extracts from its February 1971 Report published in the December "Communist Review", clearly expose McAra's attempts to distort the line of the CPNZ and to foist an opportunist line on the Party in its place.

The P.C. Report delivered by Comrade Wilcox made it clear that the N.Z. Revolution is a socialist revolution and that N.Z. is part of the imperialist camp.

McAra is pushing his own independent line that the N.Z. revolution is an anti-imperialist revolution and liberation struggle and that N.Z. is part of the world of oppressed colonial peoples. Moreover he is trying to palm it off on the unsuspecting as the line of the CPNZ.

**What is his purpose in all this? It is to pave the way for unity of the working class with the bourgeoisie — even the domestic monopolists!**

To assert that New Zealand is in the stage of an anti-imperialist liberation struggle means placing national tasks in the forefront. It means subordinating the class struggle against capital to the requirements of national unity against an oppressor. But what may be a correct line in conditions of a number of Third World countries is certainly not correct in New Zealand conditions. On the contrary, it becomes a line of class collaboration, of betrayal of the working class.

Internationally the revolutionary struggle of the Third World peoples is dealing hammer blows at world imperialism and domination by the superpowers. At the present time it is of the utmost importance to develop unity between the working class of the developed capitalist countries and the oppressed peoples of the Third World. By placing New Zealand in the latter grouping, McAra jumbles everything together, confusing the oppressor with the oppressed and therefore hindering the struggle and giving assistance to imperialism.

The line of the CPNZ that N.Z. is in the stage of a socialist revolution means placing in the forefront the necessity of raising the socialist consciousness of the working class and developing its ability to act as the leader of all the toilers and exploited in order to accomplish the socialist revolution. The more the workers are conscious of the necessity of fighting for socialism, the more capable they are of developing a powerful anti-imperialist united front and of providing strong leadership within it.

In New Zealand conditions this is a correct line of combining



national and international tasks which takes account of the specific features of N.Z.'s position as a developed capitalist country and part of the imperialist camp, yet one also subject to domination by the major imperialist powers. McAra's artificial concoction of an anti-imperialist revolution ignores or distorts basic features of New Zealand's development and is thereby anti-Marxist-Leninist, anti-revolutionary.

The question of the development of the N.Z. Revolution is to be determined not by a mechanical transfer to N.Z. of conditions existing in the Third World but by the nature of New Zealand's economic development since its settlement, the resulting class relations, and by the relationship of N.Z. to the main imperialist powers, particularly Britain, the U.S.A. and Japan.

### **ECONOMIC RELATIONS IN NEW ZEALAND**

It is indisputable that the relations of production in N.Z. are fully capitalist relations and have been so for most of N.Z.'s history apart from an early period when immigrant wage workers had the possibility to become independent producers in a similar colonial-type economy to that of the U.S.A. in the first half of the 19th century.

To say that New Zealand is fully capitalist means specifically that the dominant economic relations are those between capitalist employers and wage workers, and that there are no feudal or semi-feudal production relations such as exist widely in countries of the Third World and still have not disappeared from some parts of capitalist Europe.

The fact that the dominant production relations are those between capitalists and wage workers is readily apparent from official statistics. Over 85 per cent of the labour force of 1.16 million (October 1973) are wage workers, about 400,000 of these being industrial workers. The balance of 15 per cent are classified as working proprietors, executives and administrative and managerial workers, about 5 per cent of whom are listed as employers.

Even though in agriculture working proprietors outnumber wage workers by approximately two to one this does not alter the general picture, as the total farm work force amounts to only 11 per cent of the total work force.

Wage workers 85 per cent, capitalists 5 per cent! A clear enough example of fully capitalist economic relations, even allowing for a fairly large proportion of small-holders in agriculture. Yet in the face of these figures (which can be quite easily verified from Government statistical publications) McAra asserts in one of his documents that "The reality is that N.Z. has not fully developed capitalist relations of production. A study of political economy of N.Z. will prove this — that is by using Marxism-Leninism. Even the World Bank and Muldoon acknowledge N.Z. is not a fully developed capitalist country."

The expression "political economy of N.Z." is itself quite un-

Marxist. Political economy is a single science consisting of both general and particular laws applicable to conditions in a wide variety of countries. By contrast, McAra's expression implies that there is a separate political economy of every country, including New Zealand. If one can speak of a "political economy of New Zealand" (though who founded this peculiar science isn't mentioned) one can as well speak of a political economy of Australia, Brazil, France, or the Cook Islands — or any other country where some economic activity is carried on. Subjectivist views of this kind are bound to lead to subjectivist conclusions. But it is quite consistent with subjectivism to ignore the objective data provided by official statistics and prefer to rely on the opinion of bourgeois authorities.

But what is it that "the World Bank and Muldoon acknowledge"? "That N.Z. is not a fully developed capitalist country." A moment's thought will show that this is not at all the same question as N.Z.'s having fully-developed capitalist relations of production. What McAra has done is to substitute for the question of the dominant production relations in N.Z. the quite different question of all-round economic development or economic might, as though this were the same thing.

It is the abc of Marxism-Leninism that the existence of a capitalist social order is determined precisely by the dominant production relations being those of capitalist and wage worker. The question is not in the least affected by whether the particular capitalism is in its monopoly stage, or whether the country concerned is big or small. The Britain of Marx's time was still capitalist Britain, although in its pre-monopoly stage. N.Z. can be fully capitalist even though a small country and lacking big industry.

McAra's denial of the capitalist nature of N.Z. society is evidently a shabby sophistry aimed at justifying a "two-stage revolution." Either that or he is simply unable to understand the meaning of the concept "relations of production." In either case he ends up in an anti-Marxist-Leninist position.

While New Zealand has a history of dependence on imperialism — particularly British imperialism — it also has certain features which differ from those of Britain's "white minority" colonies, as pointed out in an article in the "People's Voice" (issue 47, 1974):

"New Zealand capitalist society came into being first as a direct colony and then evolved as a dependency of British imperialism.

"The early outnumbering of the Maoris by British and European immigrants led to a different type of development from those of Britain's colonies in Asia and Africa, with a more privileged domestic capitalist class which was given some share in imperialist super-profits in return for services to British imperialism in its wars of colonial suppression and expansion, such as the Boer war, followed by World War 1 etc. As a result a quite substantial "labour aristocracy" grew up in New Zealand, providing the principal social

basis for the Labour Party and the dominance of opportunism in the working class.

"This 'labour aristocracy', relatively large and deeply entrenched, came into being and is sustained only on the basis of super-profits from colonial exploitation."

As a consequence of this type of development, N.Z. capitalism, while having features of a dependency of imperialism, is by no means identical with the countries of the "Third World", that is, those countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America where imperialist robbery has been most intense, where the mass of the population are still poor peasants, where industry is relatively undeveloped and agriculture is still feudal or semi-feudal in character, and where the native bourgeoisie has had little or no share in super profits, and there is consequently only a very small labour aristocracy if indeed one exists at all. In these countries — and they amount to a sizeable number — the revolution is still in its bourgeois-democratic stage and generally takes the form of a national liberation struggle against imperialism aimed at establishing a joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes in the country. Since October 1917, as Mao Tsetung makes clear in his work "On New Democracy", such bourgeois-democratic revolutions are no longer part of a world bourgeois-democratic revolution but are part of the proletarian socialist world revolution. In relation to China, Mao noted, **"The first step or stage in our revolution is definitely not, and cannot be, the establishment of a capitalist society under the dictatorship of the Chinese bourgeoisie, but will result in the establishment of a new-democratic society under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes of China headed by the Chinese proletariat. The revolution will then be carried forward to the second stage, in which a socialist society will be established in China."**

Despite the general decline of British imperialism, it is still able to squeeze out super-profits from the remnants of the Empire and from investments in former colonies, some part of this imperialist rake-off coming to the ruling class here. New Zealand capitalism also shares to some extent in the profits of United States imperialism for being a good stooge in Korea, Vietnam etc. The concessions allowed N.Z. by imperialism have assisted the ruling class in N.Z. to maintain a relative degree of prosperity for most of the period since World War II, with full employment being possible for most of the time. As a result of these conditions and of the influence of social-democracy and revisionism, there has been a relatively low level of class struggle and of class consciousness among the mass of the workers. Such conditions are generally not comparable to those in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the world.

In the same "People's Voice" article of December 11, 1974, already quoted, the nature of New Zealand's economy is further analysed. The article goes into the background of Fletcher's as

typical of a number of enterprises. A reasonably full quotation is given here because of the importance of the subject.

"The local capitalists of Fletchers are actively allied with overseas capitalists in mutual exploitation of the resources and labour of New Zealand, Australia, Fiji, Papua-Niugini and the New Hebrides. This is simultaneously foreign imperialism and local imperialism.

"But it is something else as well. Because of the active part played by state capital, it is a form of state monopoly capitalism.

"There are sufficient of these joint ventures in key sectors of the economy to make state monopoly capitalism a characteristic of the New Zealand economy.

"The New Zealand economy is not simply monopoly capitalism but is state monopoly capitalism. Despite its small size and lack of economic might as compared with the United States, Britain, Germany, France etc. New Zealand is nevertheless a good example of a country where the monopolies are closely interwoven with the state in a number of major enterprises (Tasman, Kapuni, Comalco, Fletchers etc.), and play a dominant role in key state bodies directing and controlling economic life, such as the Reserve Bank, the Wool Board, Meat Board, etc., etc.

**"Lenin, it will be remembered, called state monopoly capitalism 'a complete material preparation for socialism, the threshold of socialism, a rung in the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism there are no intermediate rungs.'"**

#### THE RULING CLASS

Within the domestic capitalist class there is a definite monopolist section — Fletchers, Cable-Price, Watties, Kerridge, Plimmer etc., having close connections with major foreign monopoly concerns and comprising the dominant section of the ruling class. This class exercises its powers by living in New Zealand — not abroad. It acts as the agent of foreign monopolies to secure their interests economically and politically.

It is erroneous to consider the ruling class as something outside New Zealand, even though many enterprises are owned or part-owned abroad. The point is that the execution of class economic and state policies rests with internal forces. It is these forces which have to be overthrown in the first instance in any successful revolution. Neglect of this aspect leads to an underestimation of the counter-revolutionary side of the national bourgeoisie and consequent danger of defeat for the revolutionary forces even where the national bourgeoisie — or a section of it — has carried on anti-imperialist struggles in the past, as, for example, in Indonesia. How much more does this apply in New Zealand, where no part of the bourgeoisie has taken an anti-imperialist stand!

Where feudalism had to be brought down, as in Europe in the 19th century or as in China, where it combined with foreign imperialism to stifle bourgeois-democratic development, there a



section of the national bourgeoisie gravitated towards revolution. By contrast the New Zealand bourgeoisie has not had to struggle against feudalism in order to develop as the ruling class but instead has profited by hanging on to the coat-tails of imperialism. In conditions of the decline of imperialism on a world scale and of sharpening internal class struggle arising from the growing economic crisis, the bourgeoisie's main concern will assuredly be to suppress the working class in order to ensure the preservation of capitalism. Not for nothing did Lenin write as far back as 1907: **"The 'radical bourgeois' cannot be courageous in the epoch of highly developed capitalism. In such an epoch the bourgeoisie, in the main, is already counter-revolutionary."** ("The Agrarian Programme of Social Democracy in the First Russian Revolution.")

Despite the fact that much of New Zealand's industry is relatively small-scale, the country is nevertheless **economically** ripe for socialism because of its fully-developed capitalist production relations. What is lacking is the subjective factor — the ideological-political preparation of the working class for revolution. But this is directly bound up with the strength of social-democracy and hence with New Zealand participation in imperialist super-profits.

The reality in New Zealand is that state monopoly capitalism exists, with a monopoly capitalist section playing a compradore role for foreign imperialism and heading a capitalist class no part of which is revolutionary. (The most likely ally of the workers is the petty bourgeoisie; but this is the middle class and not part of the capitalist class proper). On the basis of capitalist production relations there is a relatively large class of wage workers led by a sizeable (for New Zealand) industrial proletariat. These conditions require a struggle for socialism, with the dictatorship of the proletariat as an immediate task, and with special prominence given to the socialising of foreign and domestic monopolies.

This struggle for socialism requires an exposure of the capitalist relations of production in New Zealand, the way the local capitalist class allies itself with foreign imperialism, selling out local resources and labour for a share in the profits and the various types of opportunism that would have the working class collaborate with the local bourgeoisie. If the struggle against imperialism does not expose the local capitalist class and opportunists then that struggle is a sham and humbug that can only strengthen the local capitalist class and therefore its collaboration with imperialism. Such a one-sided struggle can also lead to dangerous illusions about social-democracy. For instance, the current Labour Government regulations limiting foreign ownership of shares and property look like a progressive step if there is a one-sided belief that we are engaged in a liberation struggle. In actual fact the Labour Government is merely regulating the amount of foreign investment on behalf of the local monopolists—providing some ground rules so that the local ruling class can collaborate with the foreign imperialists on a



more orderly basis. Far from showing that there is a liberation struggle going on, the Labour Government's moves show that the local bourgeoisie already have been liberated and are able to lay down some ground rules to protect their position while collaborating with foreign imperialism.

This is really an aspect of the contradiction between imperialists, between rival groups of capitalists who sometimes collude and sometimes scrap. McAra, by labelling it a liberation struggle (a contradiction between an oppressed people and a foreign imperialism) would have us supporting the local imperialists.

So the struggle to build an anti-imperialist united front particularly against US imperialism must embrace the struggle against the local imperialists and their agents otherwise it is leaving the rear open while concentrating on only part of the enemy forces. It is as dangerous as ignoring foreign imperialism while attacking only local capitalism. The contradiction between the N.Z. proletariat and the N.Z. capitalist class cannot be separated from the contradiction between the people and imperialism and must not be confused with the contradiction between rival imperialists. This is what the CPNZ line (of fighting imperialism and revisionism and of developing revolutionary consciousness and organisation) involves.

It also requires the organisation of increased struggle against the domination of foreign monopolies in N.Z. along with the exposure of the compradore role played by the domestic monopoly capitalists. This struggle is an integral part of the building of an anti-imperialist united front, particularly against U.S. imperialism. This line is and has been the line of the CPNZ irrespective of the attempts of McAra and Co. to distort it and thereby render a service to the bourgeoisie.

There is no need to be daunted by the fact that the socialist consciousness of the working class is at a low level. In large measure this situation arises from the objective factors pointed out earlier — a long period of relative prosperity and a large labour aristocracy based on imperialist super profits. In the epoch of the decay of imperialism these conditions will certainly not continue indefinitely. The new conditions which are now developing will undoubtedly make more fruitful the work of raising the socialist consciousness of the working class and hence the preparation of forces capable of achieving the socialist revolution.

How long this process may take cannot be foreseen. The bourgeoisie will undoubtedly throw up all sorts of obstacles and attempt to block it by all possible means. At the present time the bourgeois line of W. McAra is such. By means of a specious division of the socialist revolution into stages McAra seeks to dress up a line of class collaboration and unity with the bourgeoisie as Marxism-Leninism. The exposure and defeat of this is a necessary part of clearing the road forward for the working class in their struggle for socialism.

# Imperialism and the 'Population Explosion' Fraud

—Wibisono ("The Afro-Asian Journalist")

**I**MPERIALISM is sliding down deeper and deeper into a general economic, financial and political crisis of its own making, in severity and scale unprecedented since the end of World War II. It is now feeling the rumbling of social and political earthquakes, at home and abroad simultaneously.

Though recognising these facts but unwilling to see the basic cause of the upheaval and, consequently, unable to find the correct solution, the imperialist bosses are making frantic attempts to shift their plight onto others. They are making strenuous efforts to induce the people into believing that they, the people themselves, and in particular those of the Third World are responsible for and therefore have to bear the worst impact of the present serious problems of "population explosion", "energy and food crises and inflation" and all the consequences thereof, such as a further increase of unemployment, poverty, starvation, disease and all the consequences of any eventual social and political conflicts resulting therefrom.

These problems are real and acute, but the imperialists' presentation of them is a fraud, and so is the "solution" they propose.

## THE "POPULATION EXPLOSION" FRAUD

There are two contradictory viewpoints on the question of population growth. One is reflected by a revolutionary American journalist, here quoted just as one of the various examples, who says:

**"Too many babies? No — just too many capitalists." "Poor countries weren't poor in the beginning, and large population isn't the cause of their poverty. They are poor because imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism plunder and exploit them. What about industrial countries? There population grows slowly, yet millions are unemployed and tens of millions struggle on the starvation line. The ruling circles don't care, they ruthlessly oppress and exploit them anyway."**

The opposite is expressed by various imperialist defenders.

A signed article carried in an American weekly, a mouthpiece of monopoly capitalism and imperialism, commenting on the result of the first UN World Population Conference held in Bucharest August 1974 (1) stresses the following viewpoints: " 'population explosion' has already propelled mankind headlong toward catastrophe and the only hope is that radical action will minimise expected losses."

What radical action?

It says: "... limit population growth beyond that point and ... pursue development programmes."

How?

It doesn't elaborate, but says that "ultimately, much of the burden will fall on the developed world." Here lies the key point of the article.

This position is pictured in the following figures presented by the author showing the tremendous gap between the rich and the poor, implicitly suggesting that the poor tend to become poorer, mainly due to the fact that the population growth in their countries is the greatest and the rich become richer because of their far lower growth rate. Whereas the total population of North America, West Europe and Japan is only 18.13 per cent of the world figure (North America 6.21 per cent), the gross national product (GNP) of those areas constitutes 66.72 per cent of the world total (North America 34.49 per cent). Asia (excluding Japan), Africa (excluding South Africa) and Latin America have a population comprising 70.74 per cent of the world total, while their total GNP is only 16.35 per cent. The poor, thus, are portrayed as being mainly dependent on the rich for their advancement and not on what the historical fact has shown, that is, that the rich have become rich merely because of centuries of plundering the poor (2).

These contradictory viewpoints were, as is known, also reflected in the Bucharest World Population Conference.

The defenders of imperialism usually project the population problem through the "ancient" glasses of the British bourgeois economist Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834) who maintained that population tended to increase at a faster rate than its means of subsistence and "unless it is checked by moral restraint or by disease, famine, war or other disaster widespread poverty and degradation inevitably result."

It is this kind of inferior mentality, based on deception, that the imperialist propagandists have always been frantically trying to imprint in the mind of the people.

The people of the Third World are not opposed to the planning of population growth rate in conformity with the needs of their respective countries. But, they reject the premise that babies are the basic cause of impoverishment.

The people are convinced that in human society they themselves are the most precious things. They produce everything they need for living. The Malthusian theory on population, created at the time when world population was only about one-fourth of the present total, has long since been proved to be a farce.

**What has been proved to be true by the history of mankind is the fact that the pace of development of production, science and technology always surpasses by far the rate of population growth. It is the imperialist policies of colonial plunder which have artifi-**

cially withheld the Third World nations from advancing. The two superpowers, the biggest international exploiters today, are the chief culprits responsible for poverty in the world. The people are conscious of this fact and are fighting.

### FORD'S WARNING

In his speeches in the UN General Assembly and in Detroit last September, US President Gerald Ford "warned" the Third World, especially the Arab oil-producing countries that food and other commodities could be used as a political and economic weapon against rising oil prices.

### INFLATION — DISEASE OF CAPITALISM

Various oil-producing countries have pointed out that inflation did not begin with the increase of oil prices and that it was because of inflation that oil prices had to be adjusted. In essence, inflation is an inherent disease in the capitalist and imperialist system and tends to be the outcome of the increasing aggravation of diverse contradictions inherent in that system. Concretely, the present runaway inflation has been mainly caused by the tremendous spending US imperialism has been making to conduct its war of aggression against the Indochinese people, the arming and financing of various puppet regimes, the armament race between the two superpowers, the export of capital for seizing super-profits and various other factors.

As a matter of fact, oil prices did not start to increase until 1973.

Inflation started much earlier. Ironically, it was the American First National City Bank which said, a couple of days only after President Ford launched his "warning" in the UN, that "the current wave of inflation around the globe is a consequence of the explosion of money-stock growth that occurred in the years 1969-72." In the US, this "money-stock explosion" was caused by its average increase of about 5 per cent annually to a level of about 13 per cent, which also caused severe inflation in those countries whose currencies are tied to the dollar.

**It is, for sure, not merely a coincidence that the flaring up of inflation accelerated in the years 1969-72, at the height of US imperialist war of aggression against the people of Viet Nam and of Indochina as a whole.**

This war cost the US treasury every year from 30 to 40 billion dollars. Until now, nearly two years after the signing of the agreement on ending the war in Viet Nam, the US continues to recognise the Saigon puppet regime as the only "legal" one in south Viet Nam and provides it with military and "economic" aid. According to US sources, in 1973, the US financial contribution to the Saigon regime's budget ran to 86.3 per cent. Likewise, the US continues to provide military and economic aid to the Lon Nol regime of Phnom



Penh, the Pak Jung Hi rgime of South Korea, the Zionist regime of Israel and others as well.

### **ARMS EXPANSION**

If one adds to all these the tremendous amounts of dollars the US has been spending in the context of its fierce contention on a global scale for world hegemony with the other superpower, the Soviet Union, each frantically expanding its war potentials, one cannot but draw the conclusion that these are the main causes of inflation which have forced the US to twice devalue the dollar, suspend its convertibility, reach the short-lived Smithsonian currency agreement with the other developed countries of the West, which ultimately ended up with the present floating of currencies aggravating the financial-monetary crisis in the capitalist world that the IMF "Committee of 20" has not yet been able to solve, and not so much the increase of oil prices.

The raising of oil prices is absolutely justified, firstly, because before 1973, oil, and for that matter also all the other raw materials produced by the Third World countries, was purchased year after year, by the Western countries as well as by the Soviet Union, at prices which were never in proportion to or in equilibrium with the prices of the manufactured goods which those countries require for their development; secondly, it is in conformity with the "Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order" adopted by the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Raw Materials and Development last May; and thirdly, it serves as a positive step leading to the implementation of their decision to defend their national resources against imperialist plunder and exploitation.

#### **On the utilisation of one commodity for political purposes:**

The people of the Third World should be grateful to the US President for stating this if only for reminding them of the fact that it has always been the imperialists who have not only applied the weapon of embargo and blockade for political purposes, but also sabotage to achieve their objectives. The supply withholding and destruction of commodities, including food, in international relations are actions often taken by imperialism, especially by the two superpowers for political purposes, not only in war but also in peacetime.

### **DESTRUCTION IN VIETNAM**

That US imperialism does not hesitate to destroy means of subsistence of the people whenever it considers it necessary for achieving its political purposes has been revealed — here just as one example — by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. After having made an investigatory study, this association issued a report around the end of 1970, which said, according to American reports, "The US has systematically sprayed chemical

herbicides over large areas of south Viet Nam since 1962. About five million acres, one eighth of the country, have been sprayed. According to Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, we (the US) have used six pounds of the plant-killing chemicals for every man, woman and child in South Viet Nam."

"The chemical killing of forests has cost South Viet Nam nearly \$500 million worth of prime hardwood. It has destroyed a fifth of the country's 1.2 million acres of mangrove forests. Alarmingly, vegetation is not returning to the dead mangrove areas. Moreover, the killing of inland forests has made the areas subject to disastrous erosion by rain that carries off the soil nutrients."

"Both crops and forests have been poisoned. The defoliation programme has deprived about 600,000 people of their normal supplies of rice and other food."

One may say, that what happened to South Viet Nam (and for that matter also to various other countries) was an act conducted by US imperialism in war. But there are various instances which can be cited showing that imperialism does not usually refrain from taking similar destructive acts short of war in countries of the Third World whose regimes it does not like and wants to topple. The creation of economic, social and political chaos, including the creation of artificial shortages and the application of bribery and deception are its chief means (3).

For that matter, various historical facts can likewise be cited showing the ugly performances of Soviet social-imperialism using military and economic aids as instrument for infiltration and expansion, for the control and exploitation of the recipient countries. Here, commodities are also used for achieving political purposes to facilitate the Soviet social-imperialist ambitions to lord it over the whole world, including the Third World countries.

With regard to the Middle East question, it is also a well-known fact that it is the two superpowers' contention and collusion which have, so far, prevented the Arab nations, including the Palestinians, from recovering their Israeli-occupied land. The utilisation of oil by the Arab countries as a political weapon, is therefore, absolutely just. But it is particularly the oil-producing Arab countries who are portrayed as overlords and blusterers. This is entirely to confuse right and wrong.

The Western press has suggested still harsher measures to be taken by the developed Western countries toward the Arab oil-producing countries, short of war, such as highly increasing the prices of all goods and services sold to the oil producers, exerting an economic boycott against them, refusing to accept short-term deposits from the oil-rich states in order to force them to make long-term investments, founding of an oil-consumers cartel among the developed countries, etc, which all tend to further aggravate the international confusion which will inevitably lead to the deepening of the general crisis.

## STRUGGLE AGAINST NEO-COLONIALISM

In essence, at this stage of development the struggle of the people of the Third World who have achieved political independence, is a struggle against neo-colonialism, a struggle to protect their national sovereignty and territorial integrity, to protect their national resources in order to achieve economic, social and cultural emancipation and they are willing to co-operate with others on the basis of the principle of sovereign equality.

It goes without saying that this co-operation should not resemble the kind of co-operation existing between the imperialists, and particularly the two superpowers, and their victims. Their "co-operation" is, in fact, exploitation and aggravates the imbalance between nations.

During the period of 25 years after liberation, the Chinese people have gained great achievements in all fields. In conclusion, it is relevant to quote what Chairman Mao Tsetung said some years before and on the eve of liberation about the task of a politically emancipated people. He said: **"We stand for self-reliance. We hope for foreign aid but cannot be dependent on it; we depend on our own efforts, . . ."** **"To win country-wide victory is only the first step in a long march of ten thousand li . . . The Chinese revolution is great, but the road after the revolution will be longer, the work greater and more arduous."** **"While the prospects are bright, the road has twists and turns. There are still many difficulties ahead which we must not overlook. By uniting with the entire people in a common effort, we can certainly overcome all difficulties and win victory."** (Abridged, Ed., "CR")

### Notes:—

(1) The twelve-day UN World Population Conference was held in Bucharest, Rumania, attended by delegations from 130 countries and regions and closed on August 30, 1974.

(2) Some economists find that GNP, applied as measurement to show the annual total value of a country's output of goods and services, often obscures rather than reflects the real economic development of that country. There are various reasons on which they base their position, the most important of which are as follows: GNP includes the output of waste, i.e. the output of goods and services which are useless for or even detrimental to society; the same unit of currency considered as income through its transfer from any one to another is counted twice; it does not so much reflect the distribution of wealth; the US dollar is used as international standard for counting while the real value of its equivalent in local currency is not the same; in the neo-colonialist countries in particular, the GNP tends to obscure the broadening gap between the annual incomes of the handful of newly rich and the broad masses of the people as well as the ratio between the incomes of those countries' citizens and those syphoned by the transnational corporations operating there.

(3) To be more concrete, here in regard to artificial food shortages: A

new leakage, similar to the one which later took the form of "the Pentagon Papers" (telling the "secret" history of US war of aggression against Viet Nam) was published in the American press in October, this year. The US Agriculture Economic Research Service has made a report on its policies entitled "The World Food Situation" which was to have been released in time for the World Food Conference to be held in Rome in November 1974. The report, which was supposed to become "political dynamite" if published (in the context of the sharpening contradictions between the ruling circles in the US) and was therefore withheld but, nonetheless, leaked out, says that agricultural policies of rich nations "have kept poorer countries from becoming self-sufficient and could cause massive starvation by 1985" and that hunger abroad has been and is being caused "by artificial price structures, subsidies, mismanagement, political decisions and cheap food policies". It is a well-known fact that the acceleration, or temporary restriction or even stoppage, of the production and distribution of a given kind of food in the capitalist countries is not based on the consideration of the actual need of the people for that kind of food but on the consuming power of society, i.e. the ability of the consumers to pay for it on a profitable basis for the producers and salesmen and even on political considerations. Another striking example: Food surpluses are becoming a major worry for the EEC. A London report recently referred to "alarming increases" in stock of butter, poultry, eggs, beef, fish and fruits. There were talks of subsidising the slaughter of a million laying hens in order to raise prices. In some European countries, thousands of litres of milk were poured into the gutter and tons of beef thrown on the street due to capitalist over-production which does not at all mean that there are no people in Europe who are not dearly in need of these commodities but because the expansion of the market cannot keep pace with the expansion of production for profit.

Published 5/3/75

Registered at the G.P.O., Wellington, as a Magazine.

Published by the In Print Publishing Co. Ltd., 139 Albert St., Auckland;  
and printed by Wilson Printery Ltd., 139 Albert St., Auckland.