

HAMMER & STEEL NEWSLETTER

JULY 1965

NO: 7

The editorial board of HAMMER & STEEL has made serious efforts to study contemporary Marxist-Leninist writings from other countries. We have stressed the importance of studying the viewpoint of the Albanian and Chinese Parties. These two parties have been able to play special, heroic roles in the defense of Marxism-Leninism and in the struggle against revisionism and imperialism. They have responded to the needs of the world's peoples in a Marxist-Leninist fashion. The support and assistance being given their policies by the Marxist-Leninists in all countries increases daily and strengthens the national liberation movement and the struggle against imperialist aggression and war.

HAMMER & STEEL has also studied the writings of new Marxist-Leninist groups and parties in the capitalist countries. Their responsibilities are great, and so are their problems, as are ours.

To build a vanguard revolutionary party of the working class, forged in the struggle against revisionism and imperialism is no easy task. It is not simply a matter of finding "good" leaders and getting rid of the "bad" leaders. Fighting revisionism is not only fighting the Gus Hall clique in the United States or the Aarons clique in Australia, although this is a necessary part of the whole.

Forces building Marxist-Leninist parties in the capitalist nations have both a positive and negative side. Almost all, if not all, have participated in the struggles against

revisionism in the revisionist parties. This experience is useful and necessary for leadership. But since such forces have been in the revisionist parties for many years they find it difficult to break with all bad methods of work inherited from past activity. This is the organizational expression of the difficulty in fully breaking with revisionism ideologically. This is the most difficult problem for HAMMER & STEEL. In our view and experience this is the negative side of most forces building new Marxist-Leninist parties. Such forces, including ourselves, tend to solve ideological questions by premature organizational steps.

Marxist-Leninist forces in the capitalist countries must develop the positive side of our work and eradicate the negative side. This struggle requires discussion, criticism and self-criticism--not in the abstract but tied in with concrete steps taken against revisionism and imperialism. It is unfortunate that newly developing Marxist-Leninist organizations have not yet found more space to discuss each others policies and their application. It would seem that the organizational relationship is not to be "disturbed" by consideration of ideological differences. Marxism-Leninism is a science; its main features apply to all nations. Marxism-Leninism develops by all-sided examination; printing only the good and ignoring the erroneous is not the comradely way, not the Marxist-Leninist path.

We have studied closely the recent important theoretical effort by the Australian comrades on breaking ideologically with revisionism. We have urged its study by other groups and individuals in the U.S.

We also urge study of the lead article in the July "Australian Communist". The Australian comrades plan to unite with "90 per cent of the Australian people against U.S. imperialism and the local reactionaries." Since large numbers of the Australian people are poisoned with white chauvinism, since many of this 90 per cent support the war in Viet Nam, or certainly do not actively oppose it, we can only hope that the wrong impression is given. We trust the Australian comrades mean they are prepared to unite with 15, 10 or 5 per cent today, that objective developments and their courageous leadership will prepare millions of others for that qualitative leap to 90 per cent in the future. The 90 per cent are the Australian "workers, farmers, middle class, university personnel, small shopkeepers." The Aborigines and other peoples oppressed by the white Australian ruling class are not mentioned in this concept of unity.

Where this kind of thinking leads is seen in an article, "Notes on Australian Agriculture" in the same issue.

The article states, "The limitation of Australian agriculture by the dearth of water and the resulting practical impossibility of greatly extending its area is of international significance as it certainly makes Australia useless for solving of any problems of over-population among Asiatic peoples."

We must ask the Australian comrades which Asiatic countries are over-populated? What is the basis for a conclusion alien to all past and present Marxist-Leninist concepts?

The next sentence in the article, "Australia, therefore, is a temptation only to monopoly capitalist nations, namely, the U.S.A., as a source of cheap raw materials, cheap labor, for the investment of money and the establishment of military bases."

Then the next paragraph, "This is of the utmost importance for it directs us to the real source of danger and not to the bogey raised by the imperialists, namely the People's Republic of China. The P.R.C. cannot find any real motive for seizing Australia, but can find many excellent reasons for not doing so, namely, first the impossibility, as the Australian people can well defend themselves; secondly, the hostility such a step would raise among the socialist peoples; thirdly, the great advantage the imperialists would draw by finding a justification for their hostility and an opportunity to unite against China."

Nowhere in the article is it mentioned that the Chinese are led by Marxist-Leninists, are schooled by the teachings of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, and do not invade other countries unless attacked by them because Socialist China has a Marxist-Leninist foreign policy.

As to the sentence that the Australian people "can well defend themselves" against China--What is this but the penetration of U.S. imperialist propaganda against China into the Party of Merxism-Leninism in Australia?

While Chinese armed forces remain in China, Australians are engaged in aggression against Viet Nam. They may be used against China. This means that Chinese troops may have to

counter attack in many areas. All true Australian patriots will understand such a development and join the struggle against U.S. and British occupiers of Australian territory, and against the Australian fifth columnists who serve Wilson and Johnson.

"The Australian people can well defend themselves" say the Australian comrades. True, the British and U.S. imperialists and the revisionists have stopped all colored peoples from settling in Australia, not just the Chinese. Sometime ago we urged Marxist-Leninists in Australia to strike out on new lines concerning the immigration laws in their country. Instead we receive this shocking reference to Asiatics in general and the Chinese in particular. Neither the Australian land question nor any other major question can be discussed by Marxist-Leninists without polemicizing against Australia as a sanctuary for white supremacy in the Pacific.

The sentence "explaining" that China does not plan to attack Australia because of, "the hostility such a step would raise among the socialist peoples", is very odd. In order to print such stuff a lot of the Khrushchev-Tito filth must have been swallowed about "Chinese warmongers". In the other article "calm patience, calm systematic, hard, intense mass work" is requested. Evidently now is the time to be impatient, bold and critical in a sharp comradely way if we are to play a vanguard role in the struggle against white chauvinism, revisionism and imperialism.

U.S. imperialism is having great difficulty in mobilizing mass support for its aggression in Viet Nam. But they have confused a few people with the lie that if they don't run Viet Nam then China will. Does not the formulation quoted above dovetail with anti-Chinese slander issued by U.S. imperialism?

How could an article on land in Australia have been printed without discussion of the Australian Aborigines rights on this matter?

Some of the new Marxist-Leninist groups and organizations are publishing more than they are equipped to handle. They are printing articles on questions not thoroughly discussed. Since they have not developed a Marxist-Leninist line they revert to a revisionist line on some questions. More modesty in the number of subjects is needed, more discussion before publication.

Talk such as "The Australian people can well defend themselves" can be interpreted as support of Menzies' foreign policy, as a call to arms against the Socialist countries. Facts prove that the Australian people are unable to yet defend themselves because many don't know friends from enemies; they don't have a strong anti-imperialist coalition which seeks friendship with Asian peoples. The Australian comrades might well answer, "Neither do the people of the U.S." That is true--but do such articles help or hurt us and the rest of the Marxist-Leninist movement? The Marxist-Leninists in Australia will face the issues in a more determined, more correct fashion if they reconsider and repudiate the main theme of "Notes on Australian Agriculture."

Issued By: Hammer & Steel, Box 101, Mattapan Station, Boston, Mass.
Subscription Rate: \$1.50 per year.