

Hanson Baldwin, New York Times military commentator, is a strong supporter of U.S. aggression. Even he admits, "The commitment of more than 200,000 men to Viet Nam supported by strong air and naval forces and the maintenance of two divisions in Korea, more than five in Europe and of smaller units elsewhere, including the Dominican Republic, have reduced the forces in the U.S. to a training establishment."

No, U.S. imperialism is not strong. Compared to 1950, at the time of its aggression in Korea, it is weak. The forces opposing it today are potentially stronger. Why is it able to continue aggression in S.E. Asia, instigate the slaughter of 200,000 militants and peoples of Chinese nationality in Indonesia, establish and control numerous reactionary regimes in South America and Africa? It is meeting some sharp resistance from French capital, but it is able to establish military bases in Australia, Japan, Britain, Holland, Belgium, West Germany and Italy with little resistance.

One reason for the difference is the changed attitudes of the Communist Parties in the Socialist countries of Eastern Europe--Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union. In 1950 these Parties mobilized their people in opposition to U.S. imperialist aggression. Today they pay lip service to international solidarity on Viet Nam. But there is a never ending stream of their sports, cultural, trade and diplomatic personnel prostrating themselves before the goons of Wall Street and Washington.

In 1950 the Parties of France and Italy made some motions against the U.S. invasion of Korea. Since they had disarmed their workers after World War II as a price for entering bourgeois governments they weren't able to do very much, but at least they tried. Today they are among U.S. imperialism's valued agents.

Having fought the most open vulgar aspects of Browderism the U.S. Communist Party under Foster's leadership was able to carry on many effective struggles against Truman-Wall Street on Korea. Sixteen years later the CPUSA, again under Browder's line, has done its utmost to support Johnson-General Motors in the unions, the communities, the elections, among the Afro-Americans and by black-mailing visits to North Viet Nam.

#### THE 81 PARTY STATEMENT

The 81 Party Statement of 1960 placed main, almost sole, emphasis on the contradiction between imperialism and Socialism describing it as, "the principal characteristic of our time." It negated the contradiction between the workers and capitalists in the capitalist countries, between imperialist countries and blocks of imperialists within capitalist countries and the contradiction between the national liberation struggles and imperialism. Actually the fiercest struggles are taking place in Africa, South America and Asia. While, as noted above, a number of Socialist countries in Eastern Europe support U.S. imperialism against the peoples of Viet Nam, the Dominican Republic, the Congo and the Afro-American nation in the South.

The 81 Party Statement included fine words on revisionism as the main ideological danger, on U.S. imperialism as the main enemy and on Titoism as a revisionist development. But it failed to re-establish Stalin as an outstanding leader of the stature of Marx, Engels and Lenin. By including an endorsement of the 20th Congress CPSU with no reservations, it contradicted the fine words on revisionism, U.S. imperialism and Titoism. The 81 Party Statement, by endorsing the 20th Congress CPSU, helped the CPSU leaders in re-endorsing Tito, two days after the meeting ended and helped their vile attack on the Albanian Party of Labor at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

After the meeting of the 81 Parties the Marxist-Leninist forces, especially those in Albania and China, found it necessary to publish many documents criticizing Khrushchev's version of peaceful co-existence, peaceful transition, of his betrayal of the working class in capitalist countries, of his betrayal of the national liberation forces. Were not these documents necessitated by the compromise on principle concerning the 20th Congress CPSU made in Moscow in 1960?

The members of the editorial board of Hammer & Steel were involved in a bitter struggle against the revisionist national leadership of the CPUSA in 1960. Denied information on principled differences at Moscow, as were the members of many Parties, we tried to use the positive section of the 81 Party Statement in the struggle against one of its deeds--its failure to condemn and isolate the treacherous Browderite CPUSA leaders from the world Marxist-Leninist movement.

Were we correct in upholding the compromise on principles arrived at in Moscow in 1960? Can we effectively struggle against the opportunist line of the CPUSA now without self-critically examining our position in 1960? We could not see, in 1960, any possible way of stopping U.S. imperialism without Sino-Soviet unity. Thus we over-estimated the power of our imperialists. For they will be defeated by the peoples regardless of how deep the betrayal of CPSU revisionism goes. Far more important than state relations, in 1960 as well as today, is the ideology, the principles based on objective truth. We did not sufficiently understand in 1960, the future of a Soviet Union without Stalin, without sacrifice for national liberation struggles, without the ability to strengthen Socialist agriculture, industry and military might, without a correct attitude toward China and Albania. Today the Soviet Union is a country led by revisionist paper tigers, treated with increasing contempt by the imperialists and increasing distrust by the peoples of the world. Only by eliminating revisionism can the Soviet peoples regain their strength.

Lenin said in 1915, "To keep united with opportunism at the present time means practically to subjugate the working class to "its" bourgeois, to make an alliance with it for the oppression of other nations and for the struggle for the privileges of a great nation; at the same time it means splitting the revolutionary proletariat of all countries." (Socialism & War). Failure to correctly study Lenin and apply his teachings to the U.S. led us to endorse the compromise between the 20th Congress CPSU and Marxism-Leninism.

The recent Havana Conference was supposed to have been aimed at imperialism. But it welcomed the CPSU revisionists with open arms. Cleverly using the compromise line of the 81 Party Statement, the revisionists secured endorsement of peaceful co-existence with U.S. imperialism. Was it not inevitable that Premier Castro, of the host country, soon attacked China rather than U. S. imperialism? Castro, signer of the 81 Party Statement, contributed his bit to the imperialist-revisionist effort to encircle China. U.S. imperialism regards Castro's speech as a softening up of the Cuban revolution. The Cuban people will be among the first victims of Castro's latest bowing before revisionism, bowing that aids only imperialism.

Have Premier Castro's relations with the Soviet Union been good Marxist-Leninist examples of how big and small countries arrange trade and other agreements? Premier Castro, pleading for a false unity with revisionism, has failed to call for a Marxist-Leninist conference on trade policies. Hammer & Steel called for such discussion over a year ago in our February, 1965 newsletter. Such discussion would help strengthen anti-imperialist unity, genuine unity.

#### LEADING ROLE

On several occasions we have discussed the leading role of the Communist Party of China. Because of several factors such as size of country, geographical location, semi-colonial background, identity with national liberation struggles and experience, the CPC occupies a special role. Every Party has the duty to raise the level of Marxism-Leninism and strengthen the unity of the world Marxist-Leninist movement. But within that context the CPC has a greater responsibility to contribute ideological and organizational initiative in the world Marxist-Leninist movement than any other Party. The concept of a leading Party is a healthy antidote to revisionism and anarchy in the international Marxist-Leninist movement.

Almost every day some spokesman for U.S. imperialism contemplates the possibility of revisionism gaining ascendancy in the CPC. They realize that CPSU revisionism by itself cannot do the job of keeping imperialism alive for another generation. Therefore the question of victory for Marxism-Leninism in China is not of sole interest to the Chinese people. It is of prime concern for all peoples since it involves the question of whether progressive mankind can destroy U.S. imperialism at an early date.

As Comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out on several occasions, the class struggle in China, as in other Socialist countries, continues for decades after the initial establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He indicated in the Snow interview that this class struggle produces in China, as in all countries, both Marxist-Leninist views and revisionist views.

The CPC has recently made a number of outstanding Marxist-Leninist contributions. They are of great service to the science of Marxism-Leninism. Among them are Comrade Lin Piao's article on Peoples War, "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement," the polemics against Togliatti and the articles exposing the CPSU's unity call as a call for unity with imperialism.

#### ACCEPTING CRITICISM

The CPC has said it "will accept criticism" on its endorsement of the 20th Congress CPSU as part of the 81 Party Statement.

Our criticism is in two parts: (1) As already indicated the Chinese signature to the 81 Party Statement placed, in practice, state relations ahead of the class struggle, ahead of Marxist-Leninist ideology. As a result the CPC has not exercised sufficient leadership in the world Marxist-Leninist movement. (2) Our experience in the U.S. indicates that the compromise reached at the 81 Party Meeting leads to contradictions between the Marxist-Leninist general line stated in "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" and the specific application of this line. We refer to support given elements and policies in the U.S. which are condemned in "A Proposal, Etc." and other CPC works.

In his discussion of the 1905 revolution Lenin commented in 1917 on the petition of the workers and the priest, Gapon. He said, "Involuntarily one compares this naive petition with the peaceful resolutions passed today by the Social-pacifists, i.e. those who claim to be Socialists but who, in reality, are bourgeois phrase-mongers." Then Lenin went on to say, "Nevertheless the great difference between the two is that the present day social pacifists are to a large extent hypocrites, who, by mild suggestions, strive to divert the people from the revolutionary struggle whereas the unenlightened workers.....proved by their deeds that they were straightforward people....."

Do contemporary pacifists in the U.S. meet this description of Lenin's? Are they hypocrites? We need barely mention the Norman Thomas-Gottlieb type leaders since their vicious rotten chauvinism at the November Washington "peace" conference was so obvious. We will briefly examine the "radical" element in the pacifist movement: According to the National Guardian, Aptheker, Central Committee member and theoretician of the CPUSA, proposed to the Premier of North Viet Nam that his government place their case in the UN. The North Vietnamese refused but after Aptheker's return to the U.S., L.B. Johnson put the Viet Nam "question" in the UN.

Aptheker helps edit Political Affairs which has published an attack on, and distortion of, Comrade Lin Piao's article on Peoples War. In the January P.A. page 8, we read that the line of Comrade Lin Piao and the CPC will lead "in Viet Nam to an interminable bloody stalemate, enormously costly in lives and property." Is not this a call for surrender to U.S. imperialist aggression in Viet Nam? Is not such "concern" for the Vietnamese actually concern for their own lives and property?

In the second section of the same article (February P.A., page 6) we read, "especially noteworthy on the American scene.....the striking rise of the peace movement." Political Affairs uses this pacifist movement as one reason to attack Lin Piao's policy on wars of national liberation, claiming such wars are not needed.

Hayden of Students for a Democratic Society, a pacifist organization, went to Hanoi with Aptheker. Hayden, like Lynd, the other fellow traveler, played a leading role in the Washington "peace" conference. When Hayden came back he said, "Reliance on the peoples to defend their own country means, to both Vietnamese and Chinese we spoke to, that the Chinese must stay out." (National Guardian, Feb. 5, 1966). Here we have the pacifist-revisionist combo in fine tune—the UN and U.S. imperialism in Viet Nam and the Vietnamese people denied the right to call on China under any circumstance.

Renmin Ribao of Peking in an editorial of 11/29/65 said, "The mounting tide of the American peoples struggle against the U.S. war of aggression in Viet Nam is shaking Washington. Tens of thousands of American citizens on November 27 took part in a protest march and demonstration on an unprecedentedly large scale in the capitol of the U.S., strongly opposing the Johnson administration's policy of aggression in Viet Nam." If the editors of Renmin Ribao had followed Comrade Mao Tse-tung's advice of investigating before speaking they would certainly have changed one word in the last sentence. Instead of "opposing" they would have written "endorsing." For even a superficial look at the speeches, the program and 95% of the signs would have identified the whole show as a part of Johnson's peace hoax, as an endorsement of his negotiation propaganda. Could this editorial, reprinted in Peking Review, be considered a break "politically and organizationally" with revisionism?

In another editorial from Renmin Ribao, Feb. 7, is the following: "The Johnson administration's expansion of its criminal war of aggression against Viet Nam has hastened the new awakening of the American people. Harsh reality has opened their eyes and made them see that the dirty war can only bring them endless misery.....Under these circumstances, Americans of various social strata cannot but unite and struggle against U.S. imperialism." In all recent articles of Renmin Ribao there is much talk of abstract unity, but no talk of the real unity that comes out of the struggle against revisionism in the U.S. Nor is there one word on the need for a Marxist-Leninist Party in the U.S. True, "harsh reality" opens eyes. But as "A Proposal Concerning the General Line, Etc." and "On Peoples War" says, it takes a Marxist-Leninist Party, not bourgeois pacifists, to lead anti-imperialist struggle, to lead the people along revolutionary paths.

China's periodicals have strongly condemned Shelepin's trip to Hanoi as in the service of U.S. imperialism. But the trips of Aptheker, Lynd and Hayden have not been condemned by Chinese periodicals. Were not both trips for the same rotten purpose? Does not the silence on Aptheker strengthen tendencies which puts state relations with the Soviet Union ahead of Marxist-Leninist ideology? Does not silence on Aptheker express covert support of Shelepin's trip? Do not periodicals in China have the duty to point out that Shelepin and Aptheker knew when U.S. imperialism would stop and start bombing?

#### DIFFERENCES

Within the editorial board of Hammer & Steel sharp differences came to the surface during the discussion of Renmin Ribao's editorial, "Onward American People." One view wished to constructively criticize the editorial in our newsletter. This view wished to discuss revisionist tendencies in the CPC resulting from class struggle in China. This view was attacked as suffering from petty-bourgeois euphoria and depression, from white and great power chauvinism, from a one-sided evaluation and a negative attitude toward the contributions of the CPC. Charges of arrogance toward the international Marxist-Leninist movement were also made.

These charges represented a tendency in our editorial board to live with what Lenin called "social-pacifism" instead of struggling against it wherever its origin or support. They also represented tendencies to jump when someone in another country waves the baton, even when the baton calls for notes in discord with Lenin's teachings.

These charges represent sympathy for the support to spontaneity in the Renmin Ribao editorials on the U.S. Stalin said in "Foundations of Leninism," "The theory of spontaneity is a theory of opportunism, a theory of worshipping spontaneity of the labor movement; a theory which actually repudiates the leading role of the vanguard of the working class." Spontaneity under present circumstances in the U.S. cannot be other than political and organizational support of the CPUSA (Revisionist) and of the Khrushchev line generally.

The charges of arrogance and chauvinism in this discussion deny that the Socialist countries and their publications are the property of the working class and national liberation movement throughout the world. If we disagree with Chinese periodicals, particularly on questions concerning the U.S. which they have not raised with us, despite opportunities to do so, would we not be arrogant and chauvinistic if we did not reply? Or should we be like certain echoes in this and other countries and agree that the American people are spontaneously, 90%, unitedly, courageously, and so on, fighting U.S. imperialism? Wouldn't that lead to support to labor opportunism since the class base of the chauvinistic labor leaders is part of this 90%? Would it not lead to revisionism and pacifism and to unity with the CPUSA?

Draft Director, Lewis B. Hershey said on March 1, 1966, "Americans don't like and don't understand the distant dim war in Viet Nam, but they like the prosperity it generates." (Boston Globe, 3/2/66). Marxist-Leninist in all countries should consider these words. Only those blinded by American exceptionalism and by pacifism will ignore them. Marxist-Leninists will not deceive themselves or create false hopes in Viet Nam. Our task is to recognize truth, have confidence that the people will learn as the struggle develops, as the cost of the temporary "boom" becomes clear to the working class and its allies.

#### C.P.U.S.A.

The CPUSA, in Madison Avenue fashion, has unveiled its "Program for Socialism." By peaceful co-existence, by peaceful transition, by "unity" with the Democratic Party and top labor leaders, both of whom are chauvinistic supporters of imperialism in Viet Nam, the people will quietly march to the promised land. No sweat--no tears--no blood--no Viet Nam--no Alabama--no Dominican Republic--no reality!

The CPUSA revisionist betrayal of Afro-American liberation, of international solidarity, of the U.S. working class is propped up by peaceful transition and peaceful co-existence with the main enemies of mankind. These props can be knocked out. Social-pacifism can be defeated by attacking its absurd pretensions on every possible occasion. We assume some of the responsibility for tolerance of social-pacifist ideas both here and abroad. We have not been sufficiently critical of pacifism in Hammer & Steel, particularly its interconnection with concepts of peaceful transition and peaceful co-existence.

We repudiate our past support of the CP Party Statement as support to an unprincipled compromise. Compromise on principles has led to serious setbacks for the peoples of the world. Compromise on principles has slowed down or stopped the growth of many revolutionary Parties already in existence; it has hindered the organization of new Marxist-Leninist Parties where none exist. It has resulted in failure to mobilize maximum support for Viet Nam; it has resulted in failure to mobilize meaningful mass protest against the murder of our comrades in Indonesia.

VANGUARD PARTY

The path to a Marxist-Leninist Party in the U.S. is interconnected with the defeat of revisionism. We are confident that the great Chinese Communist Party will simultaneously eliminate revisionist-pacifist tendencies in its own ranks and provide leadership in the world Marxist-Leninist movement. This will help establish a correct policy and a unified effort by Marxist-Leninists in every land.

Lenin said that revolutionaries, ".....will not deceive the people by assuming that in the absence of a revolutionary movement it is possible to have peace without annexations, without the oppression of nations, without robbery and without planting seeds of new wars....." Let the students of Marxism-Leninism in the U.S. study this warning.

Tolerating social-pacifism leads to ignoring the real anti-imperialist forces and their struggles. We mean the semi-skilled and unskilled workers who partially shut down New York City with a subway strike. And the Illinois gun powder workers who struck and stood their ground for many weeks against all phoney jingoistic calls to give in. We mean the Afro-Americans fighting for land and power as in the abandoned, federally owned, air base in Mississippi. We mean the Puerto Ricans fighting for self-determination of their homeland. And we mean the exploited Mexican-American national minority efforts for freedom as well as those of the native Indian population. The struggles of such forces will attract the support of worthwhile middle class and intellectual forces who are able to subjugate the greediness typical of so many of their sector. There is an anti-imperialist tradition in our country. It goes back to the opposition to the Mexican War, it was present in World War I and in opposition to the Siberian expedition. It was important in the Korean struggle.

Big battles can be won against General Motors and other U.S. imperialists if the international Marxist-Leninist movement has a correct line. If we establish a revolutionary Party able to apply and help develop a correct Marxist-Leninist line.

VICTORY

SOLIDARITY OF U.S. WORKERS AND THE AFRO-AMERICAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT WITH THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS IN VIET NAM! DEFEAT GENERAL MOTORS AND U.S. IMPERIALISM! BRING THE TROOPS BACK!

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR AFRO-AMERICANS IN THE SOUTH! NATIONAL MINORITY RIGHTS IN THE NORTH!

PRESS FORWARD THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNSKILLED AND SEMI-SKILLED! DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT AGAINST ALL OPPORTUNIST EFFORTS TO SACRIFICE UNIONS FOR IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION!

oust the top leaders of the AFL-CIO--SERVANTS OF GENERAL MOTORS AND TRAITORS TO THE WORKING CLASS!

DEFEAT REVISIONISM AND PACIFISM! UNITE THE MARXIST-LENINIST FORCES OF THE WORLD IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST U.S. IMPERIALISM!

\*\*\*\*\*

Issued By: Hammer & Steel, P.O. Box 101, Mattapan Station, Boston, Mass.

Subscription Rate: \$1.50 per year.