NEWS FROM NEW ZEALAND

Politicians in N.Z. are beginning to display their various vote baits, in preparation for the General Election to be held in November 1960.

While the Prime Minister (Mr. Nash) has been flying from Country to Country dropping pearls of wisdom here and there, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Holyoake) has been engaging in a meet-the-people tour of the country.

It seems the general discontent with taxation and the anomalies of the pay-as-you-earn method of income tax collection has, it seems, induced the Nationalist Party to make its No. 1 vote bait, a promise to "cut rates of both personal and indirect tax." Imports control, referred to by Mr. Holyoake as "the Socialist control system" is to be modified.

The N.Z. Social Credit Political League has a nine point programme. In no less than three of the points, taxation is stressed.

Point 5 says they will "substantially reduce taxation and cost of production in primary and secondary industries."

Point 6. "Will increase pensions and other benefits without adding to taxation."

Point 7. Will extend without increasing taxation, the present subsidies on consumer goods to cover a far wider range.

Point 8. "Social Credit will drastically cut death duties to combat Socialism and disinheritance, and restore incentive to private enterprise."

At the 44th annual conference of the N.Z. Labour Party the retiring president (Mr. Moohan) made the claim that:

"Reductions in income tax had been effected, and present rates were lowest ever operated for any full year since the war."

Taxation then is to play quite a role in the bartering for votes in the coming general election.

Socialism is no longer a good vote bait for the Labour Party. The abuse of the name of Socialism by the L.P. in the past has destroyed its bargaining value, like the poor relation, little mention is made of it by them.

On the other hand the Nationalists and Socreds are accusing the L. P. of endeavoring to introduce Socialism by stealth.

Worth recording are remarks on both the Labour and Nationalist Parties made by Dr. O. C. Mazengarb a prominent member of the Constitutional Society.

At a public meeting held in Wellington and reported in "The Dominion" Wellington 21-6-60 he said among other things: "Many people are now able to see that the Labour Party had long since abandoned its ideal of Socialism, and had replaced it with a policy of rigid control of economy. On the other hand those who were at the head of the Nationalist Party continued to pay lip-service to 'Freedom' and 'Private Enterprise' while submitting in practice to the desires of bureaucracy." Further on he makes the claim that:

If one side or the other would take its courage in both hands and adopt "the principles of the Constitutional Society it would sweep the country."

There is not room in the scope of this letter to explain the principles of the Constitutional Society, let it suffice to say, that they are merely another set of capitalist reforms.

Should one side or the other take its courage in both hands and sweep the country with the aid of the Constitutional Society principles, the position of the immense majority of people in New Zealand would not alter one iota.

RON EVERSON
Overseas Secretary S.P.N.Z.

ORDER NOW!

ONLY 100 BOUND VOLUMES OF THE WESTERN SOCIALIST FOR THE YEARS 1954 TO 1958 WILL BE AVAILABLE SOON.

PRICE $5.00

— SUPPLY WILL NOT LAST LONG —

THE CRISIS IN THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

Concluded from last issue

In Russia, as in Eastern Europe, the weakness of the small industrial bourgeoisie and the insufficiency of private capital, etc. resulted in the industrial revolution taking place only under conditions of the most extensive State control. The Communist Party has been the political instrument of that development. The question now arises whether the enthusiasm for control and repression engendered by Communist Party ideology does not exceed the bounds of what is actually necessary for that industrial development and of what is in the best interest of the new ruling class. One expression of this was the repudiation of certain aspects of Stalinism. The Current Affairs Bulletin of the University of Sydney, Australia, entitled "The Crisis in Communism" refers to this by saying that "Khrushchev called for an end of the cult (of the individual) and for the strengthening of collective leadership, for a return to the principles of Leninism." The difficulty in this for the Russian ruling class — a point which the author does not make but which is implied later on — is that Stalinism was merely a logical outcome of Leinism.

After all, it was Lenin who propounded the ideas of a nondemocratic party (see Lenin's "What is to be Done?") and, along with Trotsky, a dictatorship of that party over the rest of the population, an iron discipline over the workers, the reign of terror, the seizure and holding on to power at all costs. One illustration of this lies in the fact that the demands of the Polish and Hungarian workers in 1956 were anticipated 35 years earlier by almost identical demands made in the Kronstadt mutiny which were directed against the regime of Lenin and Trotsky at a time when Stalin was a little known figure.

Moreover, in view of what is now being said about "collective leadership" it is of interest to note what Lenin said in a speech on "Economic Construction" on 31st March 1920— "Now we are drawn back to a question that was decided long ago, in a manner approved of and made clear by the Central Executive Committee viz, that the Soviet Socialist Democracy (!) is in no way inconsistent with the rule and dictatorship of one person; that the will of a class is at times best realized by a dictator." Whatever may be said about the absurd and dangerous ideas expressed in this passage, so far as the establishment of socialism is concerned (since it merely illustrates the transfer of power from one minority to another), it at least gives the lie to the claim that Stalin's personal dictatorship was against the principles of Leninism.

It was Lenin, too, who advocated the undemocratic, unscrupulous and dangerous tactic of cooperating, of uniting with A to crush B, and then turning to crush the erstwhile ally. (There are still many left-wingers who believe that they can ride temporarily with the tiger but simply add to the list of victims.) Lenin confined the tactic to classes and political organizations but it was merely left to Stalin to apply the tactic in the internal struggles of the Communist Party itself, Hence, he joined with Zinoviev and Kamenev in his struggle against the first opposition (Trotsky, etc.) then with Bukharin and Tomsky against the second opposition (Zinoviev and Kamenev). Finally, he liquidated the third opposition (Bukharin, Tomsky etc.) along with the rest. Indeed, Stalin was the only one of the Bolshevik "Old Guard" to survive the appalling consequences of their tactics and ideology.

The author has noted that Khrushchev is repeating the Stalinist pattern in this respect and, since, he wrote, Zhukov and Bulganin (like Beria, Molotov, Kaganovitch and Malenkov before them) have been eliminated from the delicate balance of power which arose following the death of