


CPNZ's Firm Stand Against the New Revisionism

 Full text of Report
of Communist
Party of N.Z.,
September 1978,
exposing modern
revisionism.

Price 30c

124
173

AGAINST THE NEW REVISIONISM!

Full Text of the Report
Adopted at an Extended
Plenum of the National
Committee, Communist
Party of N.Z., September
2nd and 3rd, 1978.

Published by the National Secretariat
Communist Party of New Zealand,
P.O. Box 1785, Auckland.

Foreword

On the weekend of September 2nd and 3rd, 1978, an Extended Plenum of the National Committee of the Communist Party of New Zealand, consisting of over 40 delegates from branches and Districts round the country, met in an atmosphere of great unity around the Party's basic line, and in militant solidarity with the Party leadership.

At each session of the Plenum the delegates were clearly adamant that their stand on the basic questions concerning the international Marxist-Leninist movement was based on their own experience and understanding of Marxism-Leninism.

The meeting, with great enthusiasm and absolute unanimity, adopted a Report from the Political Committee. This is published, with some explanatory footnotes, in the following pages.

As readers will see, the Communist Party of New Zealand declares, with good reason, that the leadership of the Communist Party of China has revised the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism on proletarian internationalism, on socialist revolution and on war and peace, and that it has placed China on the capitalist road.

This is the second time in the last twenty years that the Communist Party of New Zealand has refused to blindly follow a big Communist Party whose record of struggle had won it great prestige internationally.

The first time was in the nineteen-sixties, when the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union openly took the road of betraying socialism. At that time, important factors influencing the judgement of the New Zealand Party were the bullying tactics of the CPSU and the latter's complete ignoring of agreed principles which should govern relations between fraternal parties.

In a pamphlet entitled "New Zealand Party's Firm Stand", written by the then Secretary, V.G. Wilcox, this fact was mentioned on p5 in the following words: "It was things like this that started the leadership of the Communist Party of New Zealand questioning critically many of the methods of work of the leadership of the CPSU, and finally equally critically examining many of their 'new' theories and practices."

As will be seen in the following Report, the New Zealand Party has once again been led, by its own experience, to critically examine — and reject — the methods of work, and

the "new" theories and practices of a party for which it has previously had the highest regard, this time, the Communist Party of China.

Now, the leadership of the Communist Party of New Zealand considers that, in the interests of the working people of New Zealand and internationally, it must plainly state that the Communist Party of China has also become revisionist and betrayed socialism.

As will be seen in the following Report, Wilcox has also gone over to opportunism and revisionism since the 1960's. For this reason he was removed from all responsible Party posts in March 1977.

"Socialist parties are not debating clubs", wrote Lenin, "but organisations of the fighting proletariat; when a number of battalions have gone over to the enemy, they must be named and branded as traitors . . ." ("Collapse of the Second International")

This is sufficient explanation of the N.Z. Party's stand in 1978.

National Secretariat, CPNZ

Dear Comrades,

The present Extended Plenum of the National Committee is taking place in conditions of a high degree of unity around the basic line and policy of the Party. As a result of the recent inner-Party struggle against the Wilcox-Ross Ewen attempt to wreck the Party, we have emerged still stronger in our ideology and organisation at all levels.

At this meeting we are considering our Party's stand on basic questions concerning the international Marxist-Leninist movement. Inevitably, in this connection we have to consider the opportunist role played by the former General Secretary, V. G. Wilcox, who was removed from all positions of responsibility in the Party in March last year by decision of the National Committee.

For many years a struggle has been waged to overcome liberalism, opportunism and revisionism within the Party. Always there was a difficult obstacle to overcome, an obstacle not clearly recognised in its nature but which continually hampered the struggle — namely, the opportunism of the General Secretary, V. G. Wilcox.

It is now clear to all that for many years we had a revisionist at the head of the Party, and what is more, a person whose principal concern was not the development of the New Zealand revolution but his personal status as a big shot internationally and internally; a person who considered himself above the Party and its leading bodies, not subject to their discipline or required to adhere to their decisions; a person who was too lazy to do real Party work, mental or physical, and who only stooped to exert himself when it came to conniving in order to undermine or overturn collective decisions which did not suit him.

This was the basis of the National Committee's criticisms and the disciplinary action taken against Wilcox. From a Marxist-Leninist standpoint his actions were indefensible, yet both E. F. Hill, Chairman of the Communist Party of Australia (M-L), and the Communist Party of China are doing their utmost to defend the indefensible by using the theory of the three worlds to cover up his opportunism. Apparently if one gives lip service to this "theory" then all breaches of principle can be ignored.

A great deal of this has been made known to the whole Party over recent months.

While revisionism did not succeed in becoming uppermost within the Party, and did not exist without continued struggle against it, there is no doubt that revisionist tendencies existed and that Wilcox was himself the cornerstone of revisionism within the Party.

An International Faction

During the latter part of the inner-Party struggle the National leadership sought to make clear to all that the exposure and defeat of the Wilcox group was bound up with the struggle to defend our Party's line and unity against combined internal and external attacks. The role of E. F. Hill as a splitter, chauvinist and provocateur became clear. To a large extent he inspired and organised the factional attack by Wilcox, Ross and the Ewens etc. What could not be made clear at the time was the increasing evidence that Hill was acting with the backing of the Communist Party of China Central Committee. Just how much was manifested first in a public way by the republication in Peking Review of the original Vanguard article of March 2; * and then by the Central Committee's complete ignoring of our National Committee's cable in which we protested at the re-publication, drew attention to the People's Voice containing our Party's rebuttal of Vanguard and asked if the Central Committee had authorised the Peking Review article.

With the new revisionism now openly in power in China and going at a gallop to restore capitalism, we are not in any doubt that all along Hill and the Wilcox faction were in cahoots with the CPC in their planned actions against the CPNZ.

Why should this have been? As everyone knows, while we had not reached a conclusion on the theory of the three worlds, we had sought to maintain correct relations with the CPC, and had made no attacks of any sort upon it. The answer is now clear: as a Party of the working class our main task is to lead the struggle for the proletarian revolution in New Zealand. Thus we are concerned to ensure that we have a revolutionary basic ideological-political line and a revolutionary style of work in order to win the proletariat to socialist revolution. But such a line is in absolute opposition to all forms of revisionism as it places revolutionary class struggle in the forefront. The new revisionism is, by contrast, aimed at ensuring the great-

* Vanguard is the journal of the CPA (M-L) and the article referred to was obviously written by Hill himself. This article carried a scurrilous surprise attack on the CPNZ, accusing it of various crimes, including the suppression of Wilcox and carrying out a campaign of lies, slanders and innuendos in order to further revisionism. It constituted blatant interference in the internal affairs of the CPNZ and a gross breach of the principles governing relations between fraternal parties.

power dominance of China over other states and at turning Marxist-Leninist parties into agencies for furthering this purpose. Those parties which accept this role are given support; those which refuse are attacked.

The CPNZ has had clear experience of this. European and other parties have also found splinter groups secretly given assistance and assurances of recognition so as to encourage them to split off and set themselves up in opposition to existing Marxist-Leninist parties which did not alter their line to conform to the new revisionism. Objectively the Wilcox group have shown that their primary concern is that of turning the Party and the Marxist-Leninist movement away from the proletarian socialist revolution in N.Z. and into a puppet of China's great-power policy. In this respect the China Society has played a prominent part in their calculations and activities.

Another Revisionist "Road to Socialism"

In view of the fact that a high proportion of those supporting Wilcox were active in the China Society (and little else, be it noted) we must spend a few moments considering this organisation. The success of the Chinese Revolution and the establishment of the People's Republic of China was a great step forward for mankind and a powerful blow at world imperialism. Our Party was active in taking steps to rally support for new China among the New Zealand people and assisted in the formation of the China Friendship organisation, just as, in a previous era, it assisted in forming Soviet friendship organisations. A number of Party members belonged to the organisation and those who did not nevertheless were active publicising the successes of China as an example of what could be accomplished by people under a socialist system.

The Party's approach to the N.Z. China Society was that its main task should be the development of friendship between the people of New Zealand and the Chinese people. Up till lately, in general, our Party also supported the state policy of China because it was the policy of a socialist state which we considered was expressing the basic interests of the Chinese people and the world's peoples. With revisionism now in

command in China, that situation has changed.

Our Party still stands for friendship between the people of New Zealand and the people of China. We have the greatest respect and admiration for the heroic efforts of the people of China in overthrowing imperialism and striving to build a new socialist order. But just as real friendship for the Soviet people meant opposing the Communist Party of the Soviet Union leadership and the capitalist restoration they were carrying out, so today real friendship for the great and industrious Chinese people means opposing the revisionism of the CPC and the capitalist restoration **they** are carrying out, with similar consequences for the people as in the case of the USSR.

Over the recent past it became more and more evident that certain people in the China Society were intent on turning the Society into an openly political body, putting it in place of the Party. Particularly this was evident in the last year. Under the tutelage of the Ewens nearly the whole of the Mt Roskill Branch was involved in China Society affairs to the exclusion of almost all Party affairs. There was constant criticism of the leadership by the China Society fraction which refused to follow Party directions and went its own way.

As we now see, much of the responsibility for this situation lies with Jack Ewen, who was at the time a trusted cadre responsible for conveying the Party leadership's views on various questions to the comrades active in the Society. Periodically, Ewen would make reports to the Secretariat on problems, and would receive directions in line with our concepts of friendship work in such an organisation. Not long after he would return with the information that the fraction found these directives unacceptable. After further discussion the Secretariat would again explain our views on such work. So it went on. It was not until the factional struggle broke out in earnest that it became apparent that Ewen had all along not been properly conveying the leadership's line and decisions and struggling for their acceptance, as a genuine cadre should have done. Of course, if one puts forward views passively and doesn't fight for them, or if one treats them cursorily, they will not be acted on. The evidence shows that this was how Ewen performed in the Society.

As Wilcox came out in open opposition to the Party, so did the petty-bourgeois elements who had collected in the China Society (where they did not have to face the masses in struggle) proceed to organise among members of the Society to get support for the three worlds theory and rouse hostility towards the Party.

Recent practical experience has shown that the China Society is no longer a body for promoting friendship between the people of China and New Zealand but an agency for pushing China's great-power chauvinist policy centring on the theory of the three worlds.

The exposure of this role among people who have been unwittingly drawn into supporting it is one of the aspects of combating the new revisionism as an agency giving assistance to imperialism.

During the growth of Soviet revisionism it was made to seem possible that peoples in the capitalist world could arrive at socialism, not through pursuing revolutionary class struggle in their own countries, but simply by supporting the successes of the Soviet Union. This was done under the slogans of peaceful competition and peaceful transition etc. This line made an appeal to the weak, opportunist, class collaborationist elements in parties. In our own Party Jackson, Andersen and others took it to heart and ran for cover. Are we not once again witnessing the same sort of thing in relation to Wilcox, Ross & Co. and the new revisionism? Indeed we are. They too are taking refuge from the road of proletarian revolution through class struggle in the revisionist three worlds theory and two-stage "revolution" which is no more than bourgeois nationalism enabling them to unite with our local exploiting class, while pointing to support for China as the Party's principal task.

The concept is put quite clearly in a letter from Rewi Alley to one of Wilcox's supporters criticising our Party for becoming "a stooge of the forces which attack China on all sides", accusing our Party of "betrayal", and hoping "that the clear minded sturdy New Zealand folk who have worked for progress for so long, will group around Vic Wilcox, and then with the support of the China Friendship Society, carry on in the interests of both the people of New Zealand and those of China, the quest for stronger relations and better understanding between the peoples of our countries." This is one of two letters from Alley which Wilcox publishes, in neither of which is the shadow of understanding that the role of the Party in N.Z. is to make proletarian revolution in New Zealand, it is only a matter of supporting China.

Thus, without intending to, Rewi Alley helps to make perfectly clear the petty-bourgeois, anti-revolutionary character of the Wilcox group and their line.

Imperialism, the Crisis and Revisionism

On May 22 the National Committee issued a public statement reaffirming the basic line and policy of the Party. Internationally this statement was readily understood as one opposing all brands of revisionism; internally, it helped to unite the Party on a clear Marxist-Leninist line, not only on international matters but on the nature of the New Zealand revolution. Essentially, this statement was based on the following views:

The Present Epoch

We are living in the epoch of the final collapse of imperialism and the transition to socialism on a world scale. * The essence of the 1966 Party Conference was the fight against imperialism and against revisionism as the tool of imperialism. We are still facing a similar task, although there are certain changes in today's situation. One of these major changes has, of course, been the restoration of capitalism in the USSR and in a number of East European states. There is no doubt that this restoration has helped to extend the life of Western imperialism by providing it with new markets and new sources for the investment of surplus capital. The Soviet Union and other Comecon countries have borrowed enormous amounts — according to Western estimates about \$20 billion for the USSR and another \$20 billion for just 4 other Comecon states, and have as well received large long-term credits both from the US and from EEC countries for purchase of foodstuffs such as wheat and for plant and equipment. At the same time, the USSR has become an imperialist power while masquerading under the name of socialism. Its brand of social-imperialism is no different in essence from the old sort, but it still dupes some people by using the socialist label. As for the old-style imperialism of the U.S., Japan and the Western European states, it is still as Lenin characterised it, parasitic, moribund and reactionary all along the line. The imperialists certainly haven't changed their spots or laid down their butchers' knives, even though the armed liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples have forced them to yield many of their old positions of direct political rule and rely instead on neo-colonialist forms of dominance.

* Lenin characterised imperialism as "the highest stage of capitalism" and "the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat". This is still true of our era.

The imperialists, old and new, are still ruthlessly exploiting their own working classes and the peoples of weaker nations, and still therefore acquiring masses of capital which overflows its bounds, as it were, which far exceeds the possibility of profitable investment at home and must therefore seek investments at high profits abroad. Hence there is still the urge for imperialist expansion in all the big (and even some of the "small") capitalist powers; it is not merely characteristic of the superpowers alone, even though they are the prime examples. Hence we find in continents like Africa not only contention between the superpowers, but countries like France and Belgium playing the gendarme, and, with Britain, seeking to get back some at least of their old colonialist role.

In this epoch we have seen the development of the multinational corporations on a massive scale, along with interstate consortiums of various kinds, all indicating an extension of monopoly capitalism to a higher level of cartelisation and hence a strengthening of the hold of the financial oligarchy on all the capitalist countries. This development represents a further sharpening of the contradiction between the private character of ownership and the social character of production which is the basic contradiction of capitalist society.

The sharpening of this contradiction inevitably reflects itself in the sharpening of all the other contradictions within the system, and hence in the deepening of the present economic crisis shaking the capitalist world and of course embracing New Zealand capitalism as well. The effect of the crisis throughout the world is to bring a new intensity to the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples.

Fascism and Revisionism — Two Weapons of the Bourgeoisie

Within New Zealand the crisis is having sharp effects in the form of cutbacks in production and a general economic stagnation, resulting in widespread unemployment and growing hardship among the masses. The disappearance of the old relative prosperity and "full employment" is sharpening the internal class struggle and starting to undermine the hold

of social democracy within the working class as the ruling class becomes less able to bribe the labour aristocracy with concessions. As far as the spokesmen for the international bourgeoisie are concerned the times are rather reminiscent of the thirties; here and elsewhere the theme of their forecasts and pronouncements is, the worst is over and we are just about turning the corner. Not long back Muldoon declared that unemployment had reached its peak. Yet in N.Z. as in nearly all the developed capitalist countries unemployment is increasing rapidly. At the same time world trade is stagnating, the US dollar is falling spectacularly, and protectionism is growing apace. Thus the objective situation in the capitalist world shows that the bourgeoisie is simply putting on a front of false optimism, whistling in the dark in fact. The reality is that the crisis is still deepening. True to its inner nature, imperialism is calling to its aid all the forces of repression at its command plus its disguised servants in the form of revisionists and reformists of all shades. The latter's role is, of course, to damp down struggle, to prevent the working class and the masses from taking the revolutionary road. Where they do not succeed, then reaction's answer is fascist repression. In all the Western world we can see the growth of fascist tendencies in which racism and anti-communism are intermingled. However, the international working-class struggle is still on the rise and it cannot be stopped. Herein lies the particular danger of the new wave of revisionism.

In recent times, the new revisionists have been attempting to split the established Marxist-Leninist parties and turn them into parties of class collaboration. This is of great material assistance to the imperialist bourgeoisie. In countries such as Britain, the Federal German Republic, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Italy — to mention a few, the Marxist-Leninist parties have been achieving growing mass support among the working class on the basis of leading the workers in class struggle. In all these countries the new revisionists have set up opposition splinter groups propounding the three worlds theory and class collaboration, aiming to throw new confusion into the working class movement. In France, what was developing as quite a good Marxist-Leninist party is now on the road of revisionism. There are similar developments in Latin America.

All this means that supporters of the three worlds theory are giving practical support to imperialism, most particularly U.S. imperialism.

Revisionist Betrayals May Postpone, But Cannot Prevent, Decay of Imperialism

Just as usurpation of power by revisionists in the Soviet Union helped imperialism to survive and recover some strength in the period of the sixties up to now, so the accession of China to revisionism and capitalism — towards which it is marching at full speed — is bound to give a further respite to imperialism. Still, the fact remains that imperialism is a moribund, a dying system, and the fact that it can get a temporary injection to keep it alive cannot alter the fundamental character of the epoch. Just as the intensifying class struggle round the world has been exposing and disintegrating the old-line revisionists and bringing the best and healthiest elements of the working class towards Marxism-Leninism, so will this process in turn discredit and expose the new revisionists. While it is of course a set-back, nevertheless the working class and the genuine Marxist-Leninists internationally will learn from it and strengthen their unity in struggle, strengthen their armour against opportunism and revisionism and guard against further betrayals.

It was the unwavering standpoint of Lenin and Stalin that the success of the revolution in one country was not an end in itself but simply a step forward in the world proletarian revolution, enabling that country to build socialism and thereby give support to the working class and the oppressed peoples of other countries in **their** struggles to overthrow capitalism and imperialism. Such a stand was absolutely foreign to chauvinism, to placing the interests of one's "own" nation above the interests of the world proletarian revolution. Mao Tsetung also upheld the same stand during the great struggle against Soviet revisionism in the 1960's. That position has now been reversed. Instead of utilising the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country or in several countries to support the revolution in other countries, the CPC leaders and their followers are trying to turn the revolutionary movement in other countries into puppets of China. Needless to say, a country, a class or a party that does this is no longer Marxist-Leninist or even socialist.

Three Worlds, Two-Stage "Revolution" — A Package Deal

Since E. F. Hill began his open interference in the internal affairs of the Communist Party of New Zealand we have pointed out that he was also attempting to impose an opportunist line of two-stage revolution on our Party. What we did not say publicly till now was that this attempt was bound up with the three worlds theory and China's new revisionism.

Firstly, let us restate our own Party's stand, repeated many times in our publications over the years, that New Zealand is a developed capitalist country with a system of state monopoly capitalism, and that it grew up as a bourgeois democracy having no feudal economic relations to get rid of. Thus, the basic contradiction in New Zealand as a developed capitalist country is that between the working class and the capitalist class, headed by the monopoly capitalist section. Consequently, the working class faces a directly socialist revolution. This also conforms to world development, in an epoch where the world system of capitalism in its imperialist stage is ripe for revolution.

The contradiction between the working class and the capitalist class, as all Marxist-Leninists know, is resolved by socialist revolution. Except in extraordinary circumstances such as occupation by a foreign imperialist army, there is not the slightest need in advanced capitalist countries for any phoney intermediate stage such as an artificially-concocted "revolution" for national independence. The insertion of such a stage is nothing but a justification for collaboration with one's own capitalist class.

This, in fact, is just what the three worlds theory leads to. It requires that all class forces in every country, and internationally, have to be united; in words, against both superpowers, but in practice, only against the Soviet Union.

Thus, parties such as the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), declaring for the three worlds theory, regard it as their "patriotic" duty to unite with their own "patriotic" capitalist class, and try to deceive the workers with the idiotic fable that their class enemy, the capitalists, will support the workers in a "revolution" for "national independence". Thus, they propagate chauvinism and class collaboration instead of class consciousness.

Various parties and splinter groups in the advanced capitalist countries of Europe and elsewhere have also been declaring for the three worlds theory and two-stage revolution, seeking to influence their countries' working masses to take the road of class collaboration and revisionism.

Because of this trend, our Party publicly reaffirmed its basic line of class struggle and proletarian socialist revolution in the May 22nd issue of the People's Voice, although at that time we did not openly criticise the three worlds theory or any Party other than the CPA (ML) which was both openly and secretly attacking us. In our May 22nd statement we said:

"Any attempt to try to insert an intermediate stage between capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat is opportunism and revisionism. The adoption of a line of an intermediate stage of national democratic, people's democratic, or anti-imperialist revolution, however correct for many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, is nothing but class collaboration in regard to developed New Zealand. It means collaborating with ones 'own' capitalist class, uniting with this class — who are thoroughly pro-imperialist — and sowing illusions among the working class and the masses that their exploiters and class enemy are really their friend and ally, willing to fight under the leadership of the working class and its party for liberation from imperialism!" And further: "The Communist Party of New Zealand follows a consistent line of revolutionary class struggle in New Zealand for the aim of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Internationally it unites with the working class of the developed capitalist countries in the revolutionary struggle for socialism and against imperialism and capitalism, particularly against the two imperialist superpowers, the biggest world exploiters, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. It fights both in theory and practice to unite the working class of New Zealand with the struggle of the oppressed peoples for liberation from imperialism and their internal reactionaries. It fights also for the widest unity between all peoples against superpower domination and drive to world war.

"The Communist Party of New Zealand develops its line in conformity with proletarian internationalism and its own practice in revolutionary class struggle. It wages consistent struggle for strict adherence to the basic principles of Marxism and the correct relations between fraternal parties, which includes non-interference in the internal affairs of other parties."

As we have already seen, and shall further demonstrate, it is not we who have thrown overboard "the basic principles of

Marxism and the correct relations between fraternal parties" but the Hill group of revisionists in Australia and, standing behind them, the revisionist clique at the head of the CPC who have usurped power in China. Using the bourgeois weapons of intrigue and conspiracy they have attacked and tried to destroy our Party because it would not toe the revisionist line.

We said in our May 22nd statement: "In the present developing crisis of capitalism in New Zealand and abroad, the imperialist bourgeoisie are seeking to smash the Communist Party of New Zealand because it is in the forefront of the struggle in defence of the basic interests of the working class and the mass of the people. The imperialists are being aided by a small gang of petty-bourgeois elements within the Party." And we might well have added, directed by a gang of petty-bourgeois elements from outside, in Australia and China!

The Proletarian Revolution and the Theory of the Three Worlds

In view of the present revisionism manifested in the policies of the Chinese Party leadership it is necessary to restate briefly the Marxist-Leninist view that the overthrow of capitalism on a world scale is the task of the proletarian socialist revolution, and that this revolution can only be led by the proletarian revolutionary parties. In the present epoch the revolution of the oppressed peoples forms a part of the world proletarian revolution by undermining the strength of imperialism and clearing the way, where the national bourgeoisie is brought to power, for the proletariat in those countries to overthrow them in their turn. The unity of the working class of developed capitalist countries with the oppressed peoples is obligatory. So is support for all genuinely anti-imperialist movements, even when led by a section of the national bourgeoisie (as in the Algerian liberation war, for example), always keeping in mind, however, the independent class interests of the proletariat — however small — in such countries. These must inevitably bring them into conflict with their own bourgeoisie for the purpose of overthrowing it. Failure to keep those interests in mind, or sacrificing them to great-power interests as is now happening under the influence of the three worlds theory is a betrayal of the revolution.

The Main World Contradictions

1. The Contradiction Between Capital and Labour

In analysing the world situation and the alignment of class forces internationally, the basic approach of the great Marxist-Leninists was to examine the four main contradictions in the world in their present state, their interconnection and their development. These contradictions are: the contradiction between capital and labour; the contradiction between the imperialist powers, or blocs; the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed peoples; and the contradiction between the socialist and the capitalist sectors of the world.

Our analysis shows today that the three worlds theory for all practical purposes ignores and glosses over the contradiction between capital and labour in the developed capitalist countries, which are only considered from the aspect of being dominated by the superpowers.

The reality of this theory is that, far from inspiring, organising and mobilising the working class forces in the advanced countries to utilise the conditions created by the developing crisis to sharpen the struggle against their own bourgeoisie and to hold high the banner of proletarian revolution, it tells them to collaborate with their own bourgeoisie, to regard them as "patriotic", to support their imperialist war preparations as part of the US imperialist camp, in fact to make common cause with US imperialism because there is only one enemy, Soviet social-imperialism.

China's support for the EEC as a bloc is a case in point.

During the first World War Lenin warned against support for the slogan of a United States of Europe. He wrote:

"Of course, temporary agreements between capitalists and between the powers are possible. In this sense the United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the European capitalists . . . but what for? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty **against** Japan and America, which feel badly treated by the present division of colonies . . ." And further, "The United States of Europe would mean the organisation of reaction to retard the more rapid development of

America." ("The United States of Europe Slogan").

Have the Western Europe imperialists changed their spots? Of course not. The EEC bloc is not a "United States of Europe", but it is an economic alliance with the same basic purposes. It is an organisation of reaction to suppress socialism in Europe and to protect Western Europe's neo-colonial booty against Japan and America, etc. And this is what the theory of the three worlds calls on West European Marxist-Leninists to support!

2. The Contradiction Between the Imperialist Powers

As for the contradiction between the imperialist powers themselves, or between imperialist blocs, this has been transformed solely into a contradiction between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. The imperialist character of Britain, France and other West European states is totally left out of account, as is that of Japan. The question of **their** part in the fierce competition between the imperialists for the plunder and domination of weak nations is not simply obscured, but conjured out of existence. Yet all of them have substantial investments in the "undeveloped" countries, and all of them have armed forces ready if need be to go into action to protect their investments. All of them also have aggressive alliances with US imperialism, which now receive China's blessing! In all of this the interests of the working class and the peoples of those states, and those of the countries these states exploit, are treated as of no concern. All that counts is that these alliances **might** be used against the Soviet Union.

ANZUS and U.S. Imperialist Alliances Are Not in the People's Interests

Our Party's hostility to U.S. military alliances such as Anzus and Seato is well-known and dates back to their origin. These military pacts were put together and maintained by US imperialism as instruments of US domination of Asia and the Pacific. They have been potent weapons of US imperialism in its attempts to suppress national liberation struggles, to "roll back" and "contain" communism, and for the US imperialist exploitation of vast areas.

For over two decades the CPC also condemned such pacts.

However, a marked change began to emerge in the last few years. Noticeable symptoms of it appeared during the visit of Mr Muldoon, the reactionary Prime Minister of New Zealand,

who visited China in April 1976 at the invitation of the Chinese Government. While he was there, spokesmen for China praised the Anzus Pact and N.Z. adherence to the U.S. alliance as a good thing to counter Soviet expansion in the Pacific. This was done without any consultation or concern for the standpoint of the CPNZ or anyone else.

This switch in China's basic stand, like many others, is justified as "correct" by the three worlds theory. But the real character and aims of the Anzus Pact remain unchanged. U.S. imperialism has not changed its colour. China has!

Despite China's about-face, our Party did not "obey the baton" and praise Anzus and Muldoon. Many of us indeed looked askance at the sort of welcome given by China to Muldoon. Naturally the CPNZ recognises and always has recognised the need for socialist countries to have state relations with bourgeois countries and their reactionary politicians. But the welcome for Muldoon in Peking far exceeded an ordinary state welcome — it was the sort given to leaders of the working class and anti-imperialist struggles, with thousands of flag-waving school children lining the streets. It was awarding a medal to imperialism while slapping the N.Z. working people in the face. This sort of welcome, also given to Nixon, has become commonplace for all the arch-reactionaries who visit Peking, from Mobutu to the King and Queen of Spain and the Shah of Iran. Reactionary Prime Minister of Australia Fraser also got a similar welcome to Muldoon's at about the same time, with the same sort of Chinese comments about the value of the Australia-US alliance. Like the good stooge he is, E. F. Hill immediately began to praise Fraser for "defending" Australia against the danger from Soviet social-imperialism.

Since then, under the magical influence of the three worlds theory, Fraser has now become a "friend" of the "third world" countries according to articles in Vanguard. How convenient for Hill and Co. to ignore the role and participation of Fraser and the reactionary Liberal Government in the plunder and exploitation of this very self-same "third world" by the imperialist great powers headed by the US, and including Australia as a lesser hanger-on. Such lauding of the Fraser Government is nothing but the opportunist reconciling of the exploited to the exploiters; socialism in words, imperialism in deeds!

A De Facto Alliance

Judging by its top-level military and political discussions and the high degree of agreement that now exists between the Chinese and the US governments on world issues there is in

reality a de facto alliance between them.

The three worlds theory talks of uniting the second and third world countries against both the superpowers. But in practice, all of its supporters do not simply present the Soviet Union as the main danger, they present it as the **only** danger. Somehow or other it is made to appear as if US imperialism has lost not only its teeth but its ambitions. For example, Wilcox quotes Rewi Alley saying "... US imperialism is on a downhill course, with its dollar less than half what it was a while ago, unable to fight wars abroad as it did". When they were in the Party our own revisionists such as Ross attacked the slogan in the pamphlet "The New Slump": "No Alignment with Either Superpower", even though this had been a Party slogan for a number of years, asserting that it did not present the Soviet Union as the main danger. But if that slogan is wrong, then it is not just a question of the Soviet Union being more aggressive, or more adventurist, but one of aligning N.Z. with **one** of the superpowers, i.e. the good one, the good old U.S.A. So that all the "three worlds" talk about the need to unite all other countries against **both** superpowers can be seen to be sheer eyewash.

One has only to look at recent issues of the CPA (ML) "Vanguard" to see that three-quarters of the paper concerns opposing Soviet social-imperialism while only here and there in minor articles does one find criticism of US imperialism.

3. The Contradiction Between Imperialism and the Oppressed Peoples

The contradiction between the oppressed peoples and imperialism has been deliberately confused and distorted by the advocates of the three worlds theory. Particularly the differences between the revolutionary peoples and their rulers — often extreme reactionaries in league with imperialism — has been completely obscured.

The concept of the "third world" includes fascist states like South Africa, South Korea, Indonesia, Thailand and Chile, whose peoples are held down by ferocious fascist terror. Instead of encouraging these people to organise to throw off their fascist masters (mostly backed by US imperialism) the three worlds theory tells them that their states are part of the main force in the world fighting imperialism! And even in those undeveloped countries where an anti-imperialist section of the national bourgeoisie rules, acceptance of the three worlds theory by workers' and peasants' representatives

simply means, on the one hand, making Soviet social-imperialism the enemy — irrespective of the actual imperialism which dominates or threatens them, and on the other hand subordinating their independent class interests to those of the bourgeoisie and putting socialism off till the millenium. For the peoples of such countries, when the three worlds theory comes in at the door, revolution goes out of the window.

4. The Contradiction Between the Socialist and the Capitalist Sectors

It is also necessary to note that the three worlds theory abolishes the fourth major world contradiction, that between the socialist sector and the capitalist sector. By placing itself in the so-called "third world", China evidently seeks to obtain the hegemony over a large group of countries outside the main advanced capitalist states.

However, in the process it has suppressed what was its most notable feature, its existence as a socialist state. As for socialist Albania, which does not regard itself as belonging to any of the "three worlds" but as a socialist country differing from all capitalist states of every kind, there is simply no place for it to go. But unfortunately for imperialism, social-imperialism and revisionism, it won't disappear. It continues to fulfil the role envisaged for a socialist state by Lenin and honourably carried out by the USSR while it was the only socialist country in the world, namely, that of attracting to itself the oppressed classes of the world, raising revolts among them against the capitalists and actively demonstrating the superiority of the socialist to the capitalist system. Thus, the three worlds theory notwithstanding, the contradiction between the socialist and capitalist sectors remains.

A Theory Which is the Main Weapon of World Counter-Revolution

On the basis of our own Party's experience, and of the foregoing analysis, it is our unshakeable view that the theory of the three worlds is a counter-revolutionary theory which is being used unscrupulously to suppress revolution, to suppress socialism, to split the world Marxist-Leninist movement, to turn revolutionary parties into puppets of China's great power policies, to build support for US imperialism round the world, to prop up fascist gangs wherever they are in power, to prop up

collaboration in every country with the national and imperialist bourgeoisie at the expense of the basic interests of the working class and the oppressed peoples; in a word, to totally betray the world proletarian revolution. At the present time it is the main ideological weapon of imperialism and counter-revolution in the international arena.

China on the Capitalist Road

When the Soviet revisionists embarked on their course of restoring capitalism in the USSR they first proceeded to enunciate policies and decisions which they then tried to impose on the Communist parties of all countries. At the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956, they took a major step to revisionism when they proclaimed, in opposition to all Marx's and Lenin's teachings, the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in capitalist countries by means of the parliamentary road. At the same time they carried on a campaign of denigration of Stalin, giving immense support to world imperialism.

Apart from their internal policies for dismantling socialism, carried on under the phoney concepts of "The State of the Whole People" and "The Party of the Whole People", in the international field they pursued the policies of "Peaceful Transition", "Peaceful Co-Existence", and "Peaceful Competition". In the great polemic of the sixties against the Soviet revisionists and their followers, the Communist Party of China referred to these policies as "The three peacefuls and the two entires", and it was under cover of these so-called theories that Khrushchov and Co. were spreading revisionism and counter-revolution throughout the world. Are we not seeing a similar situation today in respect to the three worlds theory?

It is not our intention to comment on the rights and wrongs of the so-called "Gang of Four". However, what is notable is that under cover of the denunciation of this group, all of the verdicts of the Cultural Revolution aimed at preventing China from taking the capitalist road have been reversed. * Further, while the CPC vigorously protested at the CPSU's use of

* Recently a whole series of measures have been passed aimed at re-establishing the conditions for the production of a new bourgeoisie consisting of a military-bureaucratic-technical elite. Bonuses and other material incentives are being pushed to the fore, elitist forms of education (special schools for gifted children etc) are being restored, the technical intelligentsia is again being raised to a privileged position, and the state organs are controlled by the military in alliance with the technocrats. Opposition elements have been suppressed.

coercion and other forms of pressure to compel other parties to endorse the theories and decisions of the CPSU 20th Congress, now the CPC is using just such coercion, blackmail, interference and other forms of pressure to try to compel acceptance of the three worlds theory by other parties, though it was never adopted by a Chinese Party Congress or, on all the evidence, discussed beforehand with any other Party.

Pressurising the CPNZ

Our own Party has experienced such pressure and interference in our internal affairs from the Communist Party of China and its agents such as E. F. Hill. Indeed, the use of such methods, which are utterly opposed to proletarian internationalism, more and more reflected that a bourgeois outlook was in command in the CPC, just as similar methods in use by the CPSU reflected their complete departure from a proletarian outlook.

1. Big-Party Interference Becomes Evident

Our first intimation that the CPC was departing from a proper standard of fraternal relations between parties was in connection with a visit by a Party delegation in 1976 made up of middle cadres. The nature of the delegation was actually based on the wishes of the Chinese Party, which said that it wished to get an understanding of the level of our middle cadres. After they had several times postponed the arrival date of the delegation for reasons which were never explained, the delegation duly arrived. Part way through their visit, the delegates were separated and closely cross-questioned about the N.Z. Party's internal affairs, to such an extent that one comrade became very suspicious, clammed up and complained to the delegation leader. He took the matter up officially and called on the CPC to make their enquiries in the proper form, that is, to the Party leadership either directly or through him. This was an example of big-Party domination and interference by the CPC, which grew more and more blatant as time went on.

For several years our leadership had noted that no articles were reprinted from the People's Voice or Communist Review in Hsinhua News or Peking Review unless they had appeared under Wilcox's name originally. In any such article, even when they were statements by the Political or National Committees, they only appeared as statements by Wilcox. Infrequent as these were, this meant the virtual ignoring of our Party and its

leading bodies. More will be said on this question further on, and it will be seen that this was no accident but a conscious policy.

Matters began to move more rapidly, and evidence of wrong methods and interference began to accumulate during 1977.

2. An Unprincipled Breach of Confidence by the Central Committee, CPC

Then came a more direct political question, a direct and unprincipled breach of confidence by the Central Committee.

Over the years, having developed close and comradely relations with the CPC in the common struggle against imperialism and revisionism, we had been in the habit of keeping the CC, CPC informed of important developments in our Party life. Consequently when the National Committee removed Wilcox from all positions of responsibility within the Party, in March 1977, a copy of the Report to that Committee concerning Wilcox's opportunism and the need for his removal was sent to the CC, CPC. * This was also necessary because all Party-to-Party communications were made through Wilcox.

The Political Committee was critical of this and had been trying to change the situation. In fact, in that same Report sent to the CPC, the criticism of this situation was conveyed to the Chinese Party in the following extract from the Report:

"As matters stood, the whole question of relations between our Party and the Embassy and the Communist Party of China revolved around Wilcox.

* The Report detailed Wilcox's record of opportunist actions and the main features of his political degeneration over a period of years. It specifically exposed his consistent line of compromise towards the various opportunist groups which had been expelled: the Manson-Bailey group, the McAra clique and the Hieatt clique; his consistent evasion of Party duties under all sorts of phoney pretexts; the practice of heavy drinking which underlay his use of the excuse of ill-health to obtain long periods of leave from all Party duties; and two other particular matters for which he was still under sharp criticism. The first of these concerned the use of his position as General Secretary to secretly tamper with letters from the Party's Political Committee to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, a piece of trickery which actually reversed Political Committee decisions and in which he was caught out. The second concerned his blatant denial of a Political Committee decision under circumstances which assisted the opportunist S. Hieatt to split off a group of members from the Party. All these grounds were the basis for Wilcox's removal from Party positions.

They followed the practice of contacting him on all matters. It meant non-recognition of our leading bodies. He had not only been instrumental in making this arrangement; he also helped to keep it in being.

Wilcox would inform the National Secretariat, he had received a message to go to Wellington. This might be before he went or when he came back. In any case only Wilcox could go. He had informed us on many occasions that the Embassy did not want anyone else. Despite Political Committee objections we could not get this situation changed.

Under these conditions, important matters were taken out of the control of the collective of our Party and placed in the hands of one individual, in this case Wilcox.

There seems no doubt that it is situations such as these that are breaking down the relations between our Party and the Chinese Party".

Towards the latter part of 1977 we received word from the Wellington Branch that the Manson-Bailey group were spreading a rumour that Wilcox had been removed from his post as General Secretary. Coming from that group, the original source of this rumour was difficult for us to verify. However, not long after, we were informed by a comrade that he had been visited by a non-Party person who had been a member of a China Society delegation to China and asked if it were true that Wilcox had been replaced as General Secretary. The comrade was told that two of the delegation — the other also being non-Party, had been taken aside by interpreters who told them of Wilcox's removal and questioned them as to our Party's attitude towards the new leadership in China. Later, we got back the story from the other delegation member indirectly, (through a then Party member) and that story was the same. Both these non-Party people were told that the CPC had known where Wilcox stood, but they did not know what the position of the N.Z. leadership was.

This action by the CPC was something unheard of! Here we had provided them with confidential information which we had not then released to the Party for the reason, fully explained in our later circulars to members, that we hoped to solve the contradiction with Wilcox in a non-antagonistic way. Instead of seeking information from the Party leadership, or requesting discussions, the Central Committee informed its interpreters of our confidences and evidently instructed them to question non-Party people in a China Society delegation about our affairs, while revealing matters told to them in strict confidence!

The net result of this was that soon after this delegation returned, the matter was being discussed by other Society members. Some of those Party members who had heard of it were bringing the matter up in their branches in a consciously disruptive way, attacking the leadership for "keeping the rank and file in the dark". Joyce Ewen added fuel to the flames by using her position of trust as the person who had helped to type the National Committee Report on Wilcox's removal to give authenticity to the rumours and add a few more innuendos of her own.

Looking back in retrospect, it is evident that this campaign was designed to prevent the National leadership from solving the question of Wilcox in a non-antagonistic way in order that Wilcox could be used as a front man for propagating the three worlds theory and if need be forming a new Party on the ruins of the CPNZ, with Wilcox as nominal leader.

3. An Outright Public Attack by China's Australian Stooge, E. F. Hill, as part of an International Faction

It became evident that some such plan was definitely afoot when the next step was taken, namely the publication of the Vanguard article of March 2nd 1978. Everyone except those opportunist elements who rallied around Wilcox as the "defender of the three worlds" (some of whom had already been formed into a faction) immediately recognised this as an open attack on the Party. It may not be of great moment as to where Hill got his information from about Wilcox, but it is worth some consideration. It may be, of course, that Wilcox himself provided the information direct to Hill. However, as Wilcox earlier on displayed no particular concern to push matters to a conclusion, and indeed, being a lazy person would be unlikely to involve himself in strife which might involve work, it seems unlikely that the initiative came from him. However, as Hill is China's errand boy and general factotum in the South Pacific, and is in China almost every other month, what more likely than that he should be fully informed as to the New Zealand Party's position and the tactics of dealing with it discussed with him? After all, if such things could be discussed by interpreters with non-Party visitors to China, there were evidently no holds barred in betraying confidences.

This would explain not only the blatant breach of principle in the publication of the Vanguard article. It would also explain the immediate circulation of it to Party members in N.Z., the rapid formation of an openly anti-Party group — many of whom were in leading positions in the China Society — and then the re-publication of the article in Peking Review, all happening within a month or so.

4. An Open Attack on the CPNZ through Peking Review

The Peking Review republication of Hill's article was clear evidence that Hill was not acting on his own. It was designed to show that Hill's attacks on our Party had the full backing of the Communist Party of China. Naturally, with the prestige of the CPC still great from its earlier Marxist-Leninist days, this article greatly strengthened the anti-Party elements in New Zealand.

As was earlier notified to the Party, the National Committee decided to cable the Central Committee, CPC concerning the Peking Review article. Here is the text of that cablegram:

13th April, 1978

Communist Party of New Zealand in Peoples Voice of April 3 has condemned Vanguard article quote Unite All Marxist Leninists in Oceania end quote as blatant interference in New Zealand Party internal affairs and breach of principle stop National Committee of Communist Party of New Zealand seriously protests at reprinting of Vanguard article in Peking Review number 14 and requests you to inform us whether this reprinting authorised by Central Committee Communist Party of China stop Please reply urgently stop Communist Party of New Zealand deeply concerned over matter, in view of correct practice of New Zealand Party in upholding Mao's principles of correct fraternal relations stop National Committee Communist Party of New Zealand

As can be seen, the cable lodges a protest, draws attention to the rebuttal of Vanguard in the People's Voice and asks if the CC had authorised republication of the article. There is no mention here of any demand for self-criticism by the CC. It is interesting to note, however, that Wilcox, in a recent document (noted mainly for the puerility of its content) claims that a self-criticism was demanded of the CPC by the "Wolf leadership".

As one can now see is their normal practice, this cable was ignored by the CPC and we have never received a reply.

Our Party had tried to maintain correct friendly relations with the CPC, sent messages of greetings to the CPC on their anniversaries and generally acted in accordance with accepted principles concerning relations between fraternal parties. We were perfectly justified in sending such a cable to the CPC. And had the CC, CPC been capable of taking a correct Marxist-Leninist stand it would certainly not have hesitated to make a self-criticism for its blatant, unprincipled interference in our Party's affairs. The fact that Wilcox can speak as though a demand for self-criticism by the CPC would have been some sort of supreme impertinence shows just how little he really understands the nature of a genuinely Marxist-Leninist Party. But this, perhaps, is hardly surprising in view of his ingrained opportunism. The fact that not only no self-criticism, but no reply at all was received from the CPC, is an indication to us how far the CPC has travelled from Marxism-Leninism and the principles governing relations between fraternal parties.

5. Pressure by China through Cancelling Orders for CPNZ Publications

The next action taken by the CPC leaders was to cancel orders for our publications, the People's Voice and Communist Review.

When we announced this action to our Party we pointed out that it had been done in two stages. In the first notice of cancellation they cut part of their People's Voice order, while cancelling all Communist Reviews. Two weeks later they cancelled the balance, this time by cable.

Evidently the first cut was a form of pressure, to show what would happen if we did not come out for the three worlds and revisionism.

Here again there was evidence of collusion between Wilcox and Co. and the Chinese Party leadership. The day after the first cancellation letter was received at the People's Voice, a comrade was told by a close relative of one of Wilcox's group that the Chinese had cancelled their order for the People's Voice. This comrade denied that that had happened, and got the answer, "you'll find out".

At that stage only three or four people knew of the letter of cancellation, and they were keeping the matter in strict confidence. Only a day or two later, another relative of another of the group told a different comrade the same story. Again, the comrade, having no knowledge of the matter, denied it.

It became abundantly clear that the leaders of the CPC were keeping the Wilcox group informed as to their measures against our Party. Plainly they were carrying on a despicable campaign to smash us or deal us blows by various means, economic and political, yet without openly declaring their enmity. While they preached being open and above-board, they were secretly conniving in all sorts of underhand ways against our Party, conniving with Hill, with Wilcox, and with the Manson-Bailey group as well, for how otherwise did that group obtain the information on Wilcox which it was the first to circulate?

As we have pointed out to our Party, the orders for our publications earlier placed by China were not just one-way assistance. During the 1960's our Parties rendered mutual support to each other in the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism. Because we were the only party in the Western world to hold fast to revolutionary Marxism-Leninism at that time, the People's Voice was of particular value to the CPC in being the only English language paper of the 81 parties existing before the split which could be readily circulated in China and used both for political purposes and language training on a wide scale. Thus the circulation of the People's Voice in China was helpful to the CPC. The original CPC orders were placed after mutual consultation, but they were cancelled unilaterally without consultation or explanation as a deliberate blow at the economics of the People's Voice and hence at our Party.

CPC now Practises Revisionism

It seems astonishing, at first sight, that a powerful Party of 33 million, a ruling Party with great resources, should stoop to such mean, unprincipled activities against a small Party, a long-time friend, and one which, moreover, had sought to maintain that friendship and behaved in a principled and above-board manner. But it is not difficult to see why it has happened.

In the first place, the leadership of the CPC are not practising Marxism, but revisionism. Just as in the case of the Soviet revisionists, this has led the CPC leadership to a position of great-power chauvinism and the use of the methods of chauvinism against those who do not bow to the big stick.

In the second place, the fact that the CPNZ was the only Western Communist Party which took the Marxist-Leninist road and rejected the Soviet revisionist line in the 1960's gives our Party a certain stature in the international revolutionary movement. However, the CPC leadership are (as they have been for a long time) trying to present Wilcox as the "great man" who was solely responsible for our stand in the 1960's and the one who is still a Marxist-Leninist. That is why they had to do everything to rescue him or at least rehabilitate him, and why they had to secretly attack our National Committee when it did not jump to the great-power baton. For Wilcox was "their man in New Zealand", a pliant tool who they knew would jump when told to jump, while to many people in other parts of the world he still had his reputation as the leader of the only Western Party to stay on the Marxist-Leninist road when all the rest went revisionist.

But Wilcox is a hollow reed, no Marxist but a philistine, no revolutionary but a collaborator with capitalism. For a time his masters may be able to prop up the waxwork figure for public view, but it won't fool people for very long. The class struggle will expose it as a sham, as it will also expose the new Khrushchovs in the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

Phoney Claims by Wilcox

It is worth quoting Wilcox's document previously mentioned to see how easily facts can be stood on their head by revisionists. Speaking of our National leadership, he says:

"They break off relations with great speed and no discussions; as far as the Australian Communist Party (ML) was concerned, Comrade Hill became a villain over night and when the 'Peking Review' republished the 'Vanguard' appeal for unity of Marxism-Leninism in all Oceania, the Wolf leadership demanded a self-critical statement from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China which the Central Committee Communist Party of China could only refuse to make. This led the Communist Party of China to make an investigation into the political line of the leadership of the CPNZ, resulting in a decision to have no further contact with what they consider a force alien to Marxism-Leninism."

Truly did Wilcox say earlier in the same document: "We have a long way to go before we even get a glimpse of reality." The reality of E. F. Hill's actions, of the CC, CPC's actions and our own position are, as we have seen, quite the opposite of Wilcox's claims.

We will not go further into Hill's connivance with Wilcox and the CC, CPC, or into the invention about our "demand" to the Central Committee. However, three things have to be noted. The first of these is that Wilcox's document has been out for some weeks, available in bookshops, sent to various individuals. It is beyond doubt that it has been received by the Chinese Party and by the local Embassy. They have said no word to our Party denying Wilcox's assertions, though it would need only a note or a phone call from Wellington to do so. We have already seen that the CPC have close, back-door relations with the Wilcox group, providing them with up-to-date information on their decisions. We have also seen that the CPC has ignored us, not just since our cable was sent but well before that. All told, then, it seems that Wilcox has had official information from the CPC as he reports it. They have decided to have no further contact with us. All we can say is, we are in good company! We are in company with the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Party of Labour of Albania, and the genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionary forces of Europe, Asia, Africa and North and South America and all other major regions.

Practice has already shown, and is daily confirming, that it is the CPC leadership and their lickspittle followers of the Hill-Wilcox brand who are the force "alien to Marxism-Leninism". Our Party holds high the banner of Marxism-Leninism, of class struggle, and of socialist revolution, and will continue to do so.

An Attempt to Coerce Socialist Albania

Of all the recent actions of the revisionists now at the head of the Chinese Party and state, none have more exposed their real nature than the cutting off of aid to the People's Socialist Republic of Albania.

This was an act of a power only too clearly following in the footsteps of Soviet social-imperialism. Just as the Khrushchov revisionist clique signified the full transformation of the Soviet Union into an imperialist state by their brutal and arbitrary cutting off of aid to China and Albania in 1960, so does the

Hua-Teng revisionist clique in China signify the same for present-day China by their equally brutal and arbitrary action against Albania. There can be no condoning of this blatant attempt at coercion.

In 1960 Khrushchov arbitrarily tore up all the state economic agreements the USSR had with China. He withdrew all Soviet specialists from China, stopped immediately all supply of materials and even spare parts for existing equipment. This abrupt withdrawal left many joint enterprises under construction in China in only a part-finished state. Furthermore, all blueprints were withdrawn as well. When this took place it was clear to everyone that the Soviet leaders had used their economic power as a bludgeon, aiming to throw China into economic crisis by causing the maximum possible damage to its economy. The Soviet aim was to either force China to turn to the West for "aid", which it claimed China would immediately seek and get, thereby "proving" it to be pro-imperialist, or if the West refused, to force China to go crawling to the Soviet Union begging forgiveness. Khrushchov and Co. treated Albania in exactly the same way. But the Soviet leaders badly miscalculated. Both China and Albania stood firmly on their own feet and exposed Soviet perfidy to the world.

In the Soviet note to China announcing its cancellation of all economic agreements, the Soviet Union cited in detail how much, in former years, it had given China in aid, boasted of the Soviet Union's generosity, accused China of ingratitude, and made a song and dance about how the Chinese users of Soviet equipment were completely ignoring the standards of operational efficiency laid down by the Soviet experts.

China's Ruling Clique Copies Khrushchov

Now, almost word for word and accusation for accusation, the new revisionist Hua-Teng clique in China have copied Khrushchov in their note to Albania breaking their economic agreements. Undoubtedly they have the same aim, to force Albania to its knees — if they can — and to make it bow before the imperialist master. But they will fail as certainly as Khrushchov failed.

Just as China, replying to the Soviet Union, pointed out that much of the aid "given" by the USSR had been paid for by China, that China had also given political aid and support to

the USSR in its struggles such as could not be reckoned in money terms, and that in any case it is the duty of all socialist states to render fraternal aid where they can to others on the basis of proletarian internationalism, so socialist Albania has answered China's blackmail tactics and revisionist slanders in similar terms. Evidently the present rulers of China think that no one remembers how Khrushchov and his clique covered themselves with disgrace by their crude bludgeoning tactics towards China and Albania. But Marxist-Leninists round the world remember only too well and judge accordingly.

The practice of great-power chauvinism, of coercion by a big state or nation towards a small state or nation is typical of imperialism and has always been condemned by Marxist-Leninists. Yet China is using precisely such coercion towards socialist Albania. Lenin wrote: "A proletariat that tolerates the slightest coercion of other nations by its 'own' nation cannot be a socialist proletariat" (Socialism and War, Coll. Wks. vol 21 p 317). But the CPC leadership's actions are certain to rebound on themselves in the long run, exposing them to the world's peoples as no different in character from the Soviet social-imperialists or the U.S. imperialists.

Albania a Bastion of Socialism

Despite the capture by revisionism of the Soviet Union and its followers and now of People's China, the great flag of Marxism-Leninism and socialist revolution still flies high above the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, led by its rock-like Party of Labour and headed by that outstanding Marxist-Leninist, Enver Hoxha. For the international working class and the national liberation movement everywhere, Albania is now the socialist fatherland. Its defence against the encirclement by hostile forces of imperialism and social-imperialism is the common task of revolutionaries the world over.

The Party of Labour under Comrade Hoxha has rendered inestimable services to the proletarian revolution. Firmly adhering to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism through thick and thin, the PLA has achieved tremendous successes in leading the armed struggle of the people to firmly establish and defend Albania's independence; it has led the workers and peasants to transform the most backward corner of Europe

into a flourishing socialist land, despite the ring of enemies, imperialist and revisionist, which surrounds it; it has staunchly upheld proletarian internationalism and fought revisionism in all its guises, from the renegade Tito, through the Khrushchov-Brezhnev gang, to the present-day counter-revolutionary Hua-Teng clique.

Back in 1965 the CPNZ issued a Joint Declaration with the Albanian Party of Labour to which it still adheres. It said then: "The Communist Party of New Zealand expresses its profound admiration and respect for the consistent struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania. . . . Failing in its military efforts to crush the Albanian people and their Party of Labour, the imperialists sought to sabotage the building of socialist Albania by their efforts and also through the activities of the modern revisionists.

"The firm stand of the Party of Labour of Albania for Marxism-Leninism, its principled criticism of the modern revisionists in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been of fundamental importance to the Marxist-Leninist forces of the whole world and served to unmask the treacherous role of Khrushchov and his followers who have proved to be the agents of imperialism within the socialist countries and the international communist movement."

That Declaration was signed for the CPNZ by National Committee member Ron Taylor and by — V. G. Wilcox, then the General Secretary! Now that Wilcox, Hill and Co. denounce the PLA as "left dogmatists", it is useful to recall such a statement and to remind these renegades from Marxism that Khrushchov and the Soviet revisionists who they then correctly condemned, also denounced the PLA in exactly the same way and for the same reason: that they fearlessly exposed and combatted modern revisionism. The adherence to principle for which Wilcox expressed his admiration then, still exists in the PLA, as their present struggle against the CPC's modern revisionism shows. Only, it no longer exists in Wilcox, for the simple reason that he has now joined in with today's modern revisionism, and supports its efforts "to sabotage the building of socialist Albania" as did the Soviet revisionists under Khrushchov.

Refusal to Hold Discussions is Great Power Arrogance

It is evident from Albania's Open Letter to the Central Committee, Communist Party of China, that the criticism of the theory of the three worlds at the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania was nothing like the sudden and unprincipled assault of the type launched by Khrushchov at Bucharest in 1960. The evidence is irrefutable that the PLA made repeated attempts to hold discussions on a wide variety of questions where they had differences of opinion with the CPC. Each time their approach was crudely brushed off, most times without even the courtesy of a reply. This was outright great-power arrogance by the CPC, leaving the PLA with absolutely no recourse, if it wished to take any effective measures to bring its views to the notice of the international Marxist-Leninist movement, other than to state certain of them at its Party Congress. The international working class and the oppressed peoples owe a lasting debt to the PLA and Cde. Hoxha for publicly criticising the opportunist three worlds theory when it did. It has assisted many parties to resist the new revisionist tide and to stand firm on revolutionary Marxism-Leninism.

The revisionist leadership of the CPC have tried by coercion to prevent the PLA from speaking out. To this end they have extended their ideological differences with the PLA to state relations by breaking off economic relations. They have treated the Albanian Party of Labour and the Albanian people as enemies instead of friends, while treating imperialists and their reactionary lackeys around the world as their friends, not their enemies.

In the message of greetings sent by Mao Tsetung to the 5th Congress of the PLA in 1966 he wrote: "The glorious Albanian Party of Labour headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha is firmly holding aloft the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism while encircled ring upon ring by the imperialists and the modern revisionists.

"Heroic people's Albania has become a beacon of socialism in Europe.

"The revisionist leading clique of the Soviet Union, the Tito clique of Yugoslavia and all the other cliques of renegades and scabs of various shades are mere dust heaps in comparison,

while you, a lofty mountain, tower to the skies. They are flunkies and accomplices of imperialism before which they prostrate themselves, while you dare to fight imperialism and its lackeys, fight the world's tyrannical enemies."

CPC Embraces Yugoslav Revisionism

It is not Albania's character that has changed since Mao wrote that message of truth and solidarity. Is not the attitude toward the revisionist Tito clique a test of Marxism-Leninism? Everyone knows that the 1957 Declaration of Communist Parties of Socialist Countries condemned Yugoslav revisionism as an enemy of Marxism-Leninism and a willing servant and ally of imperialism. Everyone knows that this was reaffirmed by the 81 Parties' Statement in 1960, but that the Khrushchov clique worked hard to cover up for Tito and Co. and that this was condemned as criminal by the Communist Party of China and Chairman Mao Tsetung. Everyone also knows that during the polemic with the Soviet revisionists the CPC constantly taunted them with their friendship towards Tito, repeatedly condemned Tito himself, the Yugoslav League of Communists, and all their "party" and state policies — including workers' self-management — and exposed Yugoslavia as a capitalist country allied with US imperialism.

Has Tito changed his spots? Has there been a revolution in Yugoslavia since the 1960's? Have the Yugoslav leaders even changed any of their policies, admitted their mistakes, cut their ties with US and other imperialisms? Nothing of the sort. They are worse then ever. And yet on June 19 this year the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China can send Party-to-Party greetings to the Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists saying that, headed by "Comrade" Tito, the League "has applied the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete practice of Yugoslavia. Unswervingly leading the people of the whole country in a persistent revolutionary struggle over the decades it has won continuous victories in the case of socialism." (Peking Review No. 25, 1978).

What is this but a declaration that all previous condemnation of Yugoslav revisionism by Stalin, by the International Communist Movement when it was still united,

by the Communist Party of China and by Chairman Mao Tsetung were all wrong; for if Marxism-Leninism has been applied in Yugoslavia "over the decades", if the League has won "continuous victories" and won them "in the cause of socialism", then Tito has **always** been a Marxist-Leninist and his opponents revisionists, and Titoite Yugoslavia has never been a capitalist country but has **always** been socialist, which is in total contradiction to the former stand of the CPC and Chairman Mao.

In the same greeting we read: "The League of Communists of Yugoslavia has established a socialist self-management system suitable to the conditions at home, roused the socialist initiative of the working class and other working people, and promoted the rapid development of the national economy..." At the same time, press reports mention "an astonishing amount of space" being given in the Chinese press to the last Congress of the "Yugoslav Communist Party" and the publication of books by Tito and Kardelj, elaborating the theory and practice of the Yugoslav system. "There are signs (says a New Zealand Herald feature) that China may be seriously thinking of adapting certain Yugoslav ideas to Chinese conditions."

However, in the pamphlet "Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country" (September, 1963) * we read the following: "In the enterprises under 'workers' self-government' ownership is described by the Tito clique as 'a higher form of socialist ownership'. They assert that only with workers' self-government can one really 'build socialism'. This is sheer deception. Theoretically speaking, as anyone with a slight knowledge of Marxism knows, slogans like 'workers' self-government' and 'factories to the workers' have never been Marxist slogans but slogans advanced by anarchists, syndicalists, bourgeois socialists and old-line opportunists and revisionists.

"The theory of 'workers' self-government' and 'factories to the workers' runs counter to the fundamental Marxist theory of socialism..."

* Published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China as part of the great Marxist-Leninist polemic against Soviet revisionism during the 1960's.

But now the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China speaks of a "socialist self-management system", thereby showing their complete rejection of the Marxist theory of socialism.

This CPC message shows with the sharpest clarity the extent of the betrayal of Marxism and revolution by the present Chinese Party leadership. It is an even more disgraceful somersault than that of Khrushchov, who never dared to describe the League of Communists of Yugoslavia as "Marxist-Leninist". But however much paint and powder the Hua-Teng clique apply to the face of Yugoslav revisionism to try and present it as Marxism, they cannot prevent the face of a scab from showing through.

It must be emphasised that the message was not a matter of state relations between the two countries, but a message of fraternal greetings on a Party-to-Party basis.

The fact that this betrayal of the previously correct stand taken publicly by the CPC is carried out under the cloak of the three worlds theory clearly shows up the latter's counter-revolutionary essence.

The opportunist supporters of the "theory" must now also embrace Tito and Yugoslav revisionism.

Wilcox Betrays N.Z.'s Earlier Stand

In New Zealand Wilcox and his opportunist clique should take the trouble to re-read "Against Revisionism", the published title in N.Z. of the Joint Statement made by the Communist Parties of China and New Zealand on May 25, 1963, drawn up by Chairman Mao Tsetung and V. G. Wilcox (when the latter was opposing revisionism) and signed for the CPC by Teng Hsiao-ping. Here is part of what that statement said of Yugoslav revisionism:

"The Yugoslav revisionists are renegades from Marxism-Leninism and are representative of modern revisionism. They have been facilitating the restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia and are providing imperialism with means to carry out its policy of "peaceful evolution", which aims at restoring capitalism in the socialist countries. They serve as a special detachment of the U.S. imperialists, undermine the socialist camp, disrupt the international Communist movement, wreck the revolutionary cause of the oppressed nations and peoples and sabotage the struggle of the

people of the world against imperialism. The Yugoslav revisionists cling to their revisionist programme, which they counterpose to the common programme of the Communist Parties of all countries, and they are going further and further down the road of revisionism and have not in any way modified either their theory or their practice.

“It is the sacred duty of Communists in all countries to continue to wage an uncompromising struggle against Yugoslav revisionism in accordance with the 1960 Statement. **To side with the Yugoslav revisionists is nothing but betrayal of Marxism-Leninism**”. (Our emphasis)

That appraisal was and is a correct one. It accurately describes both the ideology and the practice of Yugoslav revisionism, which is today what it was yesterday. Therefore, no amount of shouting “dogmatists!” at those who recognise and uphold the truth can cover the betrayal of the new pro-Titoite revisionists.

The reality is that Teng Hsiao-ping and the Central Committee of the CPC have made a disgraceful about-face. But the CPNZ still upholds the correct stand it took towards Yugoslav revisionism in 1963. Only Wilcox and a handful of opportunists have deserted. They have found allies and bedfellows in the Manson-Bailey and Hieatt cliques with whom they want to unite as “Marxist-Leninists”. The Manson-Bailey journal “Struggle”, and the publications put out by its other wing known as “Milo”, all of which were formerly condemned by Wilcox, can now all get together in one happy revisionist family under the umbrella of the counter-revolutionary three worlds theory, and accordingly all must pay their respects to the senior revisionist, Tito, and his US imperialist masters.

As this Report is being prepared, a visit is being made by Hua Kuo-feng to Yugoslavia, Rumania and Iran. Whatever China's intent may be towards the Soviet Union, the fact remains that, coming on top of the spurning of socialist Albania and the breaking by China of all the former friendly ties between China and Albania, it can only be regarded as a direct encouragement to Yugoslavia's long-standing expansionist aims towards Albania and hence a disgusting piece of imperialist great-power pressure. Such is the road of revisionism.

Revision of Marxism-Leninism on War and Peace

Finally on the extent and depth of the new revisionism of the CPC and its followers, we have to note their revision of the basic Marxist-Leninist standpoint on war and peace. This was, of course, one of the things Khrushchov also did. He distorted this standpoint to make it appear that Lenin supported the view that all wars of any kind were bad, thereby obliterating the distinction between just and unjust wars and turning Lenin into a bourgeois pacifist. The Hua-Teng clique also distorts Marxist-Leninist theory by justifying support for one imperialist bloc in a war against another imperialist bloc. This is a feature of the revisionist three worlds theory and is followed in practical terms by the adherents of this theory such as E. F. Hill. It is undisguised bourgeois nationalism.

Issue No. 5 of the Peking Review for 1978 carried an article originally published in the Peking “People's Daily” entitled “Defence of National Independence and Second World Countries” which purports to show that Western European states — including all the second-rank imperialist powers — would be justified in fighting in “defence of the fatherland” in the event of a Soviet attack on any of them.

While paying lip service to the need for historical concreteness in analysing wars, the authors in practice quite ignore this requirement in putting forward their hypotheses. By some strange oversight they make no mention of the existence of the Nato Pact! Thus they are able to treat all the West European states as though they were small independent states about to be gobbled up by Soviet aggression.

Now undoubtedly the Soviet Union is in fierce contention with the U.S., and is quite capable of committing aggression. But what is the concrete reality? The reality is that at the beginning of June, 1978, President Carter re-affirmed the US intention to immediately defend any Nato state attacked by the Soviet Union. Speaking at a 2-day Nato Summit meeting in Washington, June 1, he said: “An attack on Europe would have the full consequences of an attack on the United States. Let there be no misunderstanding, the United States is prepared to use all the forces necessary for the defence of the Nato area”.

Thus, in the concrete situation that has existed for many years, exists at present, and is likely to last some years yet, a Soviet attack on a Nato power would mean immediate war with the USA and the entire Nato alliance. Any such war would be a war between two imperialist blocs, and would not in the least be a war of national defence by the country attacked. How is it that the CPC spokesmen in the People's Daily, managed to overlook such a little, such a very little matter, as the Nato Pact? Only because they are grossly distorting Marxism.

Lenin's Views on Imperialist War

Every student of Lenin's knows how he exposed the perfidy of the bourgeois nationalists masquerading as "socialists" who supported their "own" imperialist bourgeoisie in World War I, and how he pointed to imperialist wars as wars between two gangs of robbers between whom there is nothing to choose from the point of view of the oppressed classes. Rebutting the philistines and chauvinists who support "defence of the fatherland" in a war of imperialist blocs, Lenin wrote:

"The Socialist, the revolutionary proletarian, the internationalist, argues differently. He says: 'The character of the war (whether reactionary or revolutionary) is not determined by who the aggressor was, or whose territory the 'enemy' has occupied; it is **determined by the class** that is waging the war, and the politics of which the war is a continuation. If the war is a reactionary imperialist war, that is, if it is being waged by two world coalitions of the imperialist, violent, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the **world proletarian revolution** as the **only escape** from the horrors of a world war.

"I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for this is the argument of a poor, stupid, nationalist philistine who does not realise that he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of **my share** in the preparation, in the propaganda and in the

acceleration of the world proletarian revolution," ("The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", Sel. Wks. L&W, vol. 7 p. 177).

We have used this rather long quotation in full because it is so extraordinarily pertinent to the present situation, because it clearly shows that in their theoretical views the Chinese leaders are peddling bourgeois nationalism in place of socialism just as did the opportunists of the Second International.

It is beyond dispute that the Nato powers of Europe are an integral part of a world imperialist coalition. A war between this coalition, headed by US imperialism and another, headed by Soviet social-imperialism, would be "a reactionary imperialist war", and certainly not a just war. In these circumstances, every Nato bourgeoisie would become "a participant in the plunder", and to tell a worker of any of these countries that he would be justified in defending "national independence" as does the Peking People's Daily article is to dupe him into being "a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie". This is social-chauvinism of the Kautsky and Khrushchov type.

Particularly apposite for N.Z. and Australia is Lenin's reference to "the bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country)", for the N.Z. bourgeoisie is just such a case, so is the bourgeoisie of Australia. Both of these bourgeoisies already participate in the plunder of weak nations by virtue of their part in great-power imperialism; a war between the two great-power imperialist blocs involving them through present alliances such as ANZUS, which China speaks highly of, would simply be an extension of the existing politics of plunder by other, i.e. forcible, means. In such a war to tell the workers of New Zealand and Australia to "defend their fatherland" — which they certainly do not own — would be to tell them to defend the interests of the "imperialist, violent, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie". And, under the influence of this new revisionist theory embodied in the three worlds theory, the CPA (ML) is telling the Australian workers to do just that when it tells them to defend bourgeois Australia!

A Typical Example of Reactionary Nationalism

On April 27, "Vanguard" — CPA (ML) journal of ill-repute — published an article on its front page entitled "Australia Is One Nation" which is a prize example of bourgeois nationalism aimed at duping militant workers. Its opening paragraph is this gem: "All Australian workers, working and other patriotic people and their spearhead, the Communists, must develop an **Australian** consciousness. It is necessary to think and work as **Australians** for one Australia." Thus, what is placed in the forefront is **Australian nationalism**, not class. And in case the reader is left in doubt, it adds further on: "The Communists, all of them, must study Australia as one nation, think as it as one nation, **fight for it as one nation**" (our emphasis). Sickening, is it not? This so-called Marxist-Leninist journal telling workers to "fight for Australia" as one nation. And what sort of nation can it be under capitalism? Only a bourgeois nation! And in the event of war between the rival imperialist blocs, or any other war for that matter this paper tells the workers they must fight for their bourgeois fatherland.

Of course this line of betrayal of Leninism does create some problems for the betrayers. How does one justify it, for instance, to people who see that US imperialism has not disappeared from the world scene but is as ferocious as ever, and is, moreover, the dominant imperialism in Australia by far? How does one justify it to people who know that Australia's armed forces (like New Zealand's) are integrated with those of US imperialism and that the country is tied hand and foot to the US system of alliances, so that a US — Soviet war would certainly involve Australia? We find an answer of sorts (the opportunist sort, in fact) in the front-page article of July 13 of "Vanguard", entitled "Three Worlds Theory Essential Guide to "Winning Independence." After justifying the theory in general terms the article states: "If the logic of imperialism compels US imperialism to fight along with the peoples against Soviet social-imperialism so much the better". Already, we see, the expected US-Soviet war has become a war of "the peoples" against Soviet imperialism, so it is a good thing to have American imperialism on "our" side. After another column and a half of wriggling around the question of why it's okay to support US imperialism because while, on the

one hand, it is the dominant imperialism in Australia, on the other hand it really isn't, the article finally comes out for "good old US imperialism" in saying . . . "in the real world, Soviet social-imperialism is the greatest menace, and its menace is growing. If in resistance to it, US imperialism is compelled to join in, then does this assist the cause of independence or not? Of course it does." Thus the article at last comes out in the open — support US imperialism against Soviet imperialism, because this "assists" Australian independence. The fact that it also "assists" — and in truth, not fiction — the imperialist bourgeoisie of one coalition against another is concealed from the reader. He should think only of fighting for his Australian "fatherland" like a good, patriotic dupe of chauvinists!

As for our Party, we still affirm the proletarian socialist position. We will not call on workers to unite with our bourgeoisie in an imperialist war for re-division of the world. To present US imperialism as a "better" imperialism, to ally oneself with it on the pretext that Soviet imperialism is a greater danger, as the Chinese leaders and their slavish followers are doing in the name of the three worlds theory and Marxism-Leninism is plain treachery to the proletarian revolution.

Analysing Causes Will Need Time

The actions of the Chinese Party leadership have demonstrated to the world that the Hua-Teng clique are out and out revisionists rapidly restoring capitalism in China and pursuing a great-power imperialist policy in the same way as the Soviet Union. Naturally the question arises in people's minds, "why has this happened?" At this stage we would not attempt to provide an answer. More information is needed, and also more time for analysis. However, one thing is clear. that it is not simply a matter of the last year or so, for while the present leadership's actions have been most blatantly revisionist in this period, the material contained in the PLA "Open Letter" shows that revisionist tendencies go back for a number of years. It would pay, therefore, not to reach hasty conclusions in this matter but to wait till more evidence is in. In the meantime, the class struggle and the struggle for socialism

still go on, and our Party faces important tasks in carrying forward these struggles within New Zealand and internationally.

In the opinion of the Political Committee, it has now become necessary to inform the people of New Zealand and the world of the views contained in this Report, and also to let them know of our experiences of the new revisionism in practice.

With the agreement of this Extended Plenum, we shall proceed to do this as quickly as possible.

Read the **PEOPLE'S VOICE**

The paper that consistently fights for the interests of the workers and ordinary people against international Big Business and its N.Z. yes-men.

Every Week

20c

From Regular People's Voice sellers, from progressive bookshops in the main cities or from P.O. Box 8851, Auckland.

Wilson Printery Ltd