

HAMMER & STEEL NEWSLETTER

OCTOBER, 1963

In our last newsletter HAMMER & STEEL opposed the so-called test ban treaty. We warned that this open alliance of imperialism and revisionism would increase the danger of war and intensify imperialist aggression against the national liberation movements. Both the dead and mutilated Negro children in Birmingham and the jailed, murdered and tortured population of South Viet Nam are testimony of where this "step toward peace" leads.

Either U.S. Marxists oppose the machinations of U.S. imperialists and their government or they advocate revisionism and capitulationism. Imperialism assigned the revisionists in the U.S. certain tasks on the tripartite treaty. It was their job to picture the pact as "humanist", "classless" and "peaceful." Kennedy makes it clear that this was the treaty long advocated by Baruch, Rockefeller and DuPont. But the CPUSA leadership and the WORKER solemnly assure us that it is a result of working class pressure and a great victory for peace.

The NATIONAL GUARDIAN, yielding to pressure from the Kennedy administration and from the revisionists, endorsed the pact. This was a setback for the left progressive forces since the GUARDIAN had indicated in some of its past articles an awareness of Kennedy's role.

Special attention should be given the position of PROGRESSIVE LABOR on the Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement on nuclear testing since PL has occasionally pretended sympathy to the line of the world Marxist-Leninist movement. Recently one of PL's leaders in an interview with the N.Y. Times remained silent on the alleged partial test-ban pact while advancing the claim that he was expelled from the CPUSA for being "pro-Chinese and pro-Albanian." We reserve comment on the latter statement and turn our attention to some of PL's policy statements. Even a brief discussion of PL's program will increase the understanding of the need for a Marxist-Leninist Party with a Marxist-Leninist line in the U. S.

In a recent issue of **MARKIST LENINIST QUARTERLY**, PL states that "the Soviet statement of Feb., 1963 pledging the Socialist camp to Cuba's defense in case of war has helped correct the earlier errors." That Soviet statement was another of Khrushchev's wild threats to use nuclear bombs which he sandwiches in between his capitulationist acts. PL disagrees with Comrade Liu Shao-chi who says that "it is impermissible for any Socialist country to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances." (Peking Review No. 39)

PL has failed to defend the record of Comrade J.V. Stalin against Khrushchev's slander. Evidently they do not regard the collectivization of agriculture, the success of heavy industry, the smashing of Hitlerism and Stalin's great theoretical contributions to Marxism-Leninism on the national and other questions as important matters of principle. We maintain that no real challenge to U.S. revisionism can be made by those who fail to recognize the great harm done to the U.S. revolutionary forces by Khrushchev's pro-imperialist attack on Stalin. Those who avoid the question of Stalin are avoiding a major matter of principle; they will surely collapse in the face of imperialist attacks as the CPUSA leaders have collapsed.

PL's position on the Kennedy administration is contradictory. More often than otherwise it is close to the leadership of the CPUSA. For example, in Vol. 1, No. 1 of MLO we read of a "liberal Democrat like Kennedy." In what way is he liberal? If he is "liberal" then why does PL warn about illusions concerning him? Is PL playing both sides of the street on Kennedy in order to create confusion in the U.S. left and in the Marxist-Leninist Parties of South America? Or in the ranks of the Negro people?

PL poses self-determination (state power in the South) for the Negro people as a question which can only be raised under Socialism. In other words, the Negro question is in no sense a national question, but simply and solely a class question. How does this line, which is taken from the Trotskyites and revisionists, aid either the present

or future struggles of the Negro people? How does it expose either the oppression by Kennedy or the role of reformism?

PL states that they "do not want a fratricidal war with the CPUSA nor with the SWP (Trotskyites)." And the leaders of the PL in New York do not challenge the revisionist theft of the WORKER, POLITICAL AFFAIRS and other properties of the revolutionary working class movement. The line of the world Marxist-Leninist movement calls for struggle against modern revisionism. We ask the PL leadership, do you favor the destruction of the ideological line of the CPUSA leadership or do you not? Are you trying to build a Marxist-Leninist Party or are you establishing a line of retreat for Gus Hall & Co? Do you now accept the world Marxist-Leninist line on the danger of Trotskyism or are you still in favor of avoiding a "fratricidal war?"

PL leadership has initiated campaigns on the Negro question, on the Kentucky miners strike and on Cuba. In each instance they have failed to prepare themselves or their members ideologically on these questions. In each instance they have not attempted to organize all possible forces against the class enemy--they have underestimated U. S. imperialism tactically.

PL's contradictory vacillations on theoretical questions are causing confusion and hesitation in the left-progressive camp. They are acting as a roadblock to a Marxist-Leninist Party. Their leadership suppresses real discussion either within PL or with other forces. Their soft line on Kennedy, their futuristic approach to Negro liberation, their failure to fulfill their obligations in the struggle against revisionism and their defection on the tripartite treaty flow from contempt for Marxist-Leninist theory and over-estimation of U.S. imperialism strategically, important weaknesses inherited from the CPUSA.

The editorial board of HAMMER & STEEL has requested time and again that PL discuss common problems with us and others fighting revisionism and always met excuses of refusal. We again urge joint discussion. We know that there are many healthy forces in PL who want to struggle against U. S. imperialism. We welcome their comments on the above. We urge unity with all those struggling against revisionism and united efforts for a Marxist-Leninist Party in the U. S.

Differences in the international Communist movement are being discussed throughout the world. In many countries the writings of the Chinese are easily available. In the U.S.A. this is not the case due to the policy of the government toward China and its publications. The revisionists have aided the governmental policy. For example, they have not published "A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A." Nor have they even mentioned the 70 page pamphlet, "The Origin of the Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves." Another recent Chinese pamphlet, "On the Question of Stalin" is certain to be a big seller in the U. S.

We will mail you the above pamphlets plus the classic polemic against Togliatti for one dollar. We trust that you will order by return mail--and that you will not forget to order extras for comrades and friends.

Those who make every effort to study the actual statements of both sides in the present controversy will be serving the cause of peace and a Socialist U.S.A.

ISSUED BY: HAMMER & STEEL, Box 101, Mattapan Station, Boston, Mass.

RATES: 1 Year Subscription--\$1.50 - Single Copy 15¢