

RH
WL1
C792
No. 5
1972

HAMMER & STEEL NEWSLETTER

September 16, 1972 No. 5

THE FRUITS OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

MUNICH • REYKJAVIK • HANOI

U.S. DESERVES THE MEDALS

The Czechoslovakian Olympic team described the Olympic games as a contribution "toward strengthening of peace, friendship and cooperation in the world." This statement reflects the line of the world's "Marxists" toward recent events in Munich.

The Czech government and the Czech Olympic team claim to be opponents of US imperialism and supporters of the Vietnamese and Palestinian liberation movements. How can the Czechs and other Eastern Europeans who profess the same opinions participate in any sports or cultural event which includes US imperialist representation? How can the Cuban and North Korean governments' sports personnel do this?

They do it in the name of peaceful coexistence while lying to their people and the world about the real main contradiction. That contradiction is between imperialism, especially US imperialism, and the oppressed peoples.

All the medals at Munich should have gone to the US. Are our rulers not first in dropping napalm and A-bombs on Asians? Have they not used their relay team of Zionists, Arab traitors and revisionist friends to commit torture and genocide on the Palestinians? Is not the US first in the enslavement and destruction of Africans and Afro-Americans?

PALESTINIANS VICTIMS OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

H&S's editorial board considers hijacking planes and taking hostages a very poor substitute for hammering out a correct anti-imperialist program and mobilizing the people to carry out that program. Adventurism in the anti-imperialist struggle is a by-product of Mao's and Breshnev's line of peaceful coexistence with US imperialism.

We mourn the loss of the Palestinian nationalists and regret that their goal of releasing Israel's Palestinian prisoners remains to be achieved. Exposure of Mao's and Breshnev's betrayal of Palestine will make possible an internationally supported struggle focussing on recapture of Palestine and smashing of the Israeli state.

We note that the West German imperialists, with the approval of the Rockefellers' state of Israel, killed most of the Israeli hostages at Munich just as the Nazis and the Zionist leaders combined to murder the Jewish masses in World War II. And we note that Rockefeller did not hesitate to kill off his own prison guards while perpetrating mass murder on Afro-Americans and Puerto Ricans at Attica.

The primary responsibility for participating in the Olympics with the US rests on the governments involved. However, the sports figures themselves are not without responsibility. They too will be punished.

In 1939 Neville Chamberlain went to Munich to bolster German imperialism against the first Socialist country. The revisionists and their capitulationist followers went to Munich to bolster US imperialism against the oppressed peoples. Chamberlain's plans did not work out. Neither will the plans of those twin devils of peaceful coexistence, Messieurs Mao and Breshnev.

U.S. KEEPS COEXISTERS IN CHECK

The Spassky-Fischer meeting produced poor chess. But it was a good example of how US sports figures conform to the needs of US imperialism and its state. And it was an even better example of what happens to competent individuals when they practice peaceful coexistence with US imperialism and its agents.

Fischer the challenger did not arrive on time in Iceland. He made ridiculous demands, most of which were granted. In short, he insulted Spassky, the champion.

Spassky made many childish mistakes in several of the games. Whether he threw the match on orders from Moscow is not the pertinent point. His cringing and crawling were a foregone conclusion once he agreed to play with a representative of the US aggressors in southeast Asia.

Fischer in Iceland acted in the spirit of Lt. Calley in Vietnam. The Vietnamese fight back at the Calleys. Spassky went into oblivion without a pretense of resistance, just as his government cowardly turned its freighters away from the mined port of Haiphong.

Mao instructed the Chinese ping-pong team which came to the US to throw some games. Friendship with US imperialism instead of an anti-imperialist victory represents Mao's thoughts in sports as in all other fields. The Chinese ping-pong team bowed and scraped its way into the White House to shake Nixon's hand on the very day Nixon ordered new bombing escalations.

We have seen what happened to many former left-wing forces in the US who support peaceful coexistence with US imperialism. They first turn neutral on the Afro-American, Palestinian, Vietnamese and Biafran questions. Then they degenerate into servants of US imperialism against the oppressed peoples. Now they shed tears because some of Rockefeller's genocidal thugs from Israel were lost at Munich.

Of course the revisionists rationalize their treachery and cowardice. They say that it is either peaceful

existence or death and destruction by US nuclear weapons. This line strengthens nuclear blackmail and the possibility that the US will again use nuclear weapons.

PRESIDENT SADAT RAISES A QUESTION

The key to revolutionary principle is the struggle against the peaceful coexistence line of Mao and Breshnev. To struggle effectively their posture as friends of the oppressed peoples must be exposed as a farce.

The Russians' partial withdrawal from the U.A.R. is an interesting case in point. It followed Nixon's visit to Moscow and was probably discussed there.

Sadat, head of the U.A.R. government, pretended to take the initiative in the Russian withdrawal. Whatever his role in that matter it is clear that he does not recognize the importance of liberating Palestine, that he and his friends in other Arab nations are incapable of mobilizing their own people, and that he capitulates to the Rockefellers and their state of Israel more than he struggles against them.

For the near future US imperialism's dominance in West Asia and North Africa is strengthened by the Russian withdrawal. Even before this event the main characteristic of US-USSR relations was collusion against oppressed peoples

with the US giving the orders. Contradiction between the USSR and the US has not been the major characteristic of their relationship for well over fifteen years.

It is clear then that the major reason for the Russian withdrawal was their subservience to US imperialism. But the Russian and Chinese governments' great contribution to the US drive for world hegemony is based on their pretense of friendship with oppressed peoples.

Sadat's observation that the USSR refused his nation offensive weapons is of great importance. Formerly only H&S had noted that Mao and Breshnev refuse to supply nuclear weapons, bombers, submarines, etc., to national liberation movements.

It was already clear enough that Puerto Rico, Quebec, the Afro-American nation in the Black Belt, Ireland and Biafra did not receive military and political support from Mao and Breshnev. Now Sadat raises the question of Russian "aid" to the Arab nations, the subject of so much revisionist boasting and deception.

US imperialism is paying dearly for its gains in West Asia. It is helping expose its Russian partner as a fraud. In the long run this will mean new international alliances against US imperialism which will exclude the traitors and colluders, Mr. Mao and Mr. Breshnev.

SACRIFICING VIETNAM

Every statement and action of the US imperialists and their government reflects their belief that they have the world by the tail. This is understandable. Since 1960, when eighty-one Communist parties adopted the line of peaceful coexistence, resistance to US imperialist aggression has been hamstrung and sabotaged by the official policy of the revised Marxist-Leninists.

The "Socialist" countries and the "Marxist" movement in the world have a common line on Vietnam. That line calls for sacrificing the Vietnamese as offerings to US imperialism so that Mao, Breshnev and their followers can live in peaceful coexistence.

Mao and Breshnev have sent token aid to Vietnam in order to pose as supporters of national liberation movements. At the same time, as the Nixon visits prove, they have given real aid to US imperialism.

RESISTANCE TO THE SACRIFICE

The leaders in North Vietnam have not publicly criticized the treachery of Mao and Breshnev. Their failure to do so has created severe problems for those supporting an anti-imperialist victory in Vietnam. The Maoites claim that any criticism of the PRC on Vietnam is divisive and unjustified. Breshnev echoes this hypocrisy of Mao.

The New York Times of August 18, 1972, reports an important new development in North Vietnam. An editorial in Nhan Dan, North Vietnam's most influential newspaper, has levelled some sharp criticism at the CPSU and the CPC. It does not name them but they are the obvious targets.

The statement says, "...to carry out the Nixon doctrine, US imperialists have applied the policy of reconciliation toward a number of big powers in the hope of having a free hand to consolidate their forces, oppose the world revolutionary movement, suppress the revolution at home, bully the small countries, break the national liberation movement, while not relinquishing its plan to prepare a new world war."

Nhan Dan aptly describes the character of Mao and Breshnev when it refers to those "who are departing from the great all-conquering revolutionary thoughts of the time and who are pitifully bogging down on the dark, muddy road of compromise."

Nhan Dan notes that "if out of the narrow interests of one's nation, one tries to help the most reactionary forces avert the dangerous blows...that is a cruel reconciliation beneficial to the enemy and not beneficial to the revolution." Precisely. This is exactly what Mao, Breshnev and their pseudo-Marxist followers holding state power in other countries are doing.

After publication of the Nhan Dan editorial, Mao suddenly felt compelled to issue a statement on Vietnam. The statement avoids the obligations of Marxist-Leninists in

other nations toward Vietnam. Mao tries to cover up his treacherous collusion with Nixon by praising the Vietnamese struggle.

Possibly Nhan Dan had anticipated Mao's latest trick since its editorial states, "The vitality of Marxism-Leninism manifests itself first of all in revolutionary deeds, not in empty words."

The most positive contribution of the Nhan Dan editorial, in our opinion, is its criticism of so-called Communist countries that give preference to peaceful co-existence. Such a policy benefits only "the narrow immediate interests of a country" and not the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle.

FULL SELF-CRITICISM NEEDED

We do not wish to imply that the Vietnamese Workers' Party will continue to develop consistently its important attack on opportunism and revisionism. It is under severe pressure from Mao and Breshnev to turn South Vietnam and its rich oil and mineral deposits over to US imperialism.

Nor can we accept the positive evaluation of McGovern by North Vietnamese leaders. It is correct to utilize what is positive in McGovern's criticisms of Nixon on Vietnam. It is wrong to create illusions that the Democratic Party is not controlled by the Rockefellers and their US financial interests who also seek to rob Vietnam of its oil and mineral wealth using both old and new methods.

McGovern is an open supporter of Rockefellers' investment in North Africa and West Asia. Optimism on McGovern is support to oppression of the Palestinian people. Such support contradicts the views of Nhan Dan on international solidarity.

The Vietnamese Workers' Party shares some of the responsibility for the degeneration and unprincipled divisions which it observes in the Marxist movement today. The Vietnam Workers' Party voted for the peaceful coexistence line of Mao and Khrushchev at the eighty-one party meeting in Moscow in 1960. Self-criticism from the North Vietnamese Marxist-Leninists on peaceful coexistence will greatly strengthen the struggle against the revisionism of Mao and Breshnev.

Acceptance of Mao's and Breshnev's anti-imperialist pose and peaceful coexistence line have tied Vietnam to its main betrayers for material aid. The struggle against revisionism will enable Vietnam to appeal to states like India and France, which have greater contradictions with US imperialism than do Russia and China. An appeal should be made to all nations in Asia, Africa, and South and Central America.

SELF-CRITICISM

Self-criticism for Marxist-Leninists is a valuable weapon which strengthens understanding of the past, increases revolutionary vigor and vigilance in the present and helps guarantee revolutionary victories

in the future. The imperialist enemy cannot admit or correct his errors because the drive for superprofits is his main motivating force and self-criticism would aid his own destruction by the people.

Hammer & Steel has waged a principled struggle against the eighty-one party Moscow Statement of 1960 since 1967. Even before that we began to question its main line. Should we and those we influence now grow "dizzy with success" because some support for our position is developing? Or should we ask ourselves what took us so long and thus strengthen our struggle against the revisionist capitulationist line of Mao and Breshnev? We believe the latter is the only correct course.

Hammer & Steel's leadership was too concerned, in the period 1960-1967, with being isolated from the revolutionary movement in other countries and not sufficiently concerned with principle in the revolutionary movement.

Take, for example, the Afro-American question. The line of Enver Hoxha and Mao Tse-tung on the right to self-determination for Afro-Americans in the Black Belt was no different from that of Browder, Tito or Khrushchev.

We were too concerned about the tactics of changing the line of the Albanian and Chinese Parties. We should have been more concerned about upholding principle and publicly exposing the unprincipled revisionism of Hoxha and Mao on the Afro-American question. What harm would it have done them if they had been real Marxist-Leninists making errors?

No harm whatever. Real Marxist-Leninists would have welcomed criticism. On the other hand, if we had been wrong (and developments since then show our general line was correct) they could have criticized us. The struggle against US imperialism would have been strengthened.

The "Marxist-Leninist" imposters in Moscow and Peking do not welcome criticism. They have suppressed Nhan Dan's recent important editorial which was broadcast from Hanoi in several languages. There is not a word on it in the Daily World, the CPUSA's foul mouthpiece. Nothing in Pravda. Where are the Peking Peoples Daily's comments? Nowhere. What abject silence from the "friends" of Vietnam! If they finally acknowledge the editorial it will be after a discussion with Kissinger.

The bragging and boasting of Khrushchev, Tito and Mao have convinced a lot of people that being a good Communist is something like winning a popularity contest. As long as one is popular at the moment nothing else matters. Responsibility and principle are lost in the shuffle.

Mao sponsored Lin Piao, then denounced him. Anybody but a rotten opportunist and an unprincipled careerist would explain his actions. Instead Mao orders a flunky to write another article praising his great thoughts.

THE EXAMPLE OF LENIN

Of great value in today's difficult situation is Stalin's evaluation of Lenin as a principled leader:

Fidelity to Principle

Party leaders cannot but prize the opinion of the majority of their party. A majority is a power with which a leader cannot but reckon. Lenin understood this no less than any other party leader.

But Lenin never was a captive of the majority, especially when that majority had no basis of principle. There have been times in the history of our Party when the opinion of the majority or the momentary interests of the Party conflicted with the fundamental interests of the proletariat. On such occasions Lenin would never hesitate and resolutely took his stand on principle as against the majority of the Party. Moreover, he did not fear on such occasions literally to stand alone against all, considering--as he would often say--that "a policy of principle is the only correct policy."

...[Take for example] the period 1914-1917, when the imperialist war was in full swing, and when all, or nearly all, the Social-Democratic and Socialist parties had succumbed to the general patriotic frenzy and placed themselves at the service of the imperialism of their respective countries. It was a period when the Second International had hauled down its colours to capitalism, when even people like Plekhanov, Kautsky, Guesde and the rest were unable to withstand the tide of chauvinism. Lenin at that time was the only one, or nearly the only one, to wage a determined struggle against social-chauvinism and social-pacifism, to denounce the treachery of the Guesdes and Kautskys, and to stigmatize the half-heartedness of the betwixt-and-between "revolutionaries." Lenin knew that he was backed by only an insignificant minority, but to him this was not of decisive moment for he knew that

the only correct policy with a future before it was the policy of consistent internationalism, that the only correct policy was one of principle....

"A policy of principle is the only correct policy"—this was the formula with which Lenin took "impregnable" positions by assault and won over the best elements of the proletariat to revolutionary Marxism. (Joseph Stalin, "LENIN: Speech Delivered at a Memorial Meeting of the Kremlin Military School, January 28, 1924", in V. I. Lenin: Selected Works, volume I, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1946, pp. 34-35.)

Dare to stand alone if necessary against Mao, Breshnev and all other revisionist colluders with US imperialism.

Let all Marxist-Leninists in imperialist countries act in a principled way: Full support to the national liberation struggles! Destroy revisionism to destroy its sponsor-- US imperialism.

ISSUED BY: Hammer & Steel, Box 101, Mattapan, Mass. 02126.
SUBSCRIPTIONS: \$2.00 per year (cash or money order, please).