

new
sub

HAMMER & STEEL NEWSLETTER
February 14, 1975 No. 1

AND FROM THE PROPHET UNTO THE
PRIEST EVERY ONE DEALETH FALSELY....
SAYING, 'PEACE, PEACE'; WHEN THERE IS
NO PEACE.

Jeremiah, the Bible

Secretary of State Kissinger and President Ford are threatening military action against the oil-producing nations of western Asia and north Africa.

These threats are aimed at bolstering the US-owned gendarme state of Israel and stopping international support to the Palestinian liberation struggle.

Such threats are a warning to the USSR to curtail its trade with the nations of western Asia. Kissinger and Ford are also warning Japan and western European nations to accept the US as the primary force in western Asia and north Africa.

Such threats are aimed at controlling the demands of the Arab monarchists and bourgeois rulers. The oil embargo indicated that all oppressed nations can, in the future, use the embargo on minerals and oil as an important anti-imperialist weapon, especially if it is combined with an international anti-imperialist boycott of US goods.

The threats of Kissinger and Ford are an indication that the US financiers are prepared to depreciate the dollar and thereby pay nations who export raw materials, including oil, in dollars whose purchasing power is less than ever. In this way the Rockefellers hope to force oppressed nations and rival imperialist nations to shoulder the US budgetary deficit.

Ford and Kissinger statements threatening war in western Asia coincide with Nelson Rockefeller's becoming Vice-President. The Rockefellers are not only the most powerful financiers in oil but the most powerful imperialist grouping in the world. The Rockefellers and their Chase Manhattan Bank had their way in Vietnam, at Attica, in Israeli aggression, in abortion and other genocidal means of controlling the politics and populations of oppressed peoples.

The partial oil embargo of a year ago did not create, as the US capitalist politicians and press claim, a new powerful force in the world. If the Arab owners of oil are such a powerful new force why do they have to come to the US for arms, food and trade?

The main contradiction in the world is between imperialism dominated by US imperialism and oppressed

nations. Seen in the light of the main contradiction, Ford's and Kissinger's threats are an ugly but inevitable development.

The main danger is west Asia in not war but complete US hegemony over Arab oil.

HELL AIR-CONDITIONED?

President Ford envisions a United States which will be independent of foreign oil by 1985. The "US" produces more oil than any other nation--mainly looted from the Afro-American nation in the Black Belt--and has substantial reserves--mainly the rightful property of Indians and Eskimos. These huge reserves which US imperialism unjustly controls in the first place are insufficient for a nation which consumes 40% of the current world production.

But even if the US could supply its huge and spiraling consumption without west Asia, north Africa and southeast Asia, this would not end the possibility of a US war over the oil in these areas. The Arab oil sold to Europe and Japan by US oil companies produces superprofits for US imperialism. The only possible way to prevent US financiers from grabbing other peoples' oil is to contain and defeat US imperialism politically and militarily.

World War II teaches us that even when imperialist nations have only a slim chance for conquest of oil and the resulting superprofits, they will wage war. Hitler

and Hirohito proved that. US imperialism will peacefully give up its control of foreign oil when Hell becomes air-conditioned.

WESTERN EUROPE AND JAPAN

Can the nations in western Europe and Japan weaken US dominance of the oil in west Asia and north Africa? US hegemony over west Asian oil is a threat to these imperialist nations, each of them weak compared to the US.

Will the struggle over oil force realignment of the imperialist nations? Will contradictions between some of them and US imperialism sharpen? Is an anti-US alliance between western European or Japanese interests and some Arab oil-producers possible? Yes, very possible. Such developments could produce an armed struggle, a war.

RUSSIA AND WEST ASIA

Russia joins with the US in diverting Arab liberation struggles from achieving self-determination. The CPSU and the CPC Maoites have prevented the development of a Marxist-Leninist movement in west Asia. The CPSU has not even called on the peoples of west Asia to mobilize against the threats by Kissinger and Ford. Russia did not have the guts to challenge the US blockade of North Vietnam.

It does not now have the courage to condemn US aggression in west Asia.

When the USSR was a dictatorship of the proletariat it had the strength of Socialist construction and the support of tens of millions in all continents for its Marxist-Leninist principles in international affairs. Today, even with its H-bombs, it is weak compared to its past status because it is a bourgeois state with capitalist attitudes toward other nations, including opportunism on national liberation struggles vis a vis US imperialism.

In the past twenty years Russia has increased its trade with some nations in west Asia. It has more naval forces in the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean than before but nothing compared to the US Sixth Fleet plus the US bases in Greece, Turkey, a west Mediterranean island, the Azores and the Indian Ocean which help determine who controls what. Despite absurd statements to the contrary by the Maoites, the Russians have little influence or power in the area compared to the US.

The new bourgeois ruling class in Russia, which came to power with Khrushchev in 1956, obviously does not welcome the prospect of US hegemony over west Asian oil but it is doubtful that it would initiate military action to oust the US. It might become involved at some later stage, especially if a European imperialist country or countries and Arab forces took action against the US.

Russian contributions to any anti-imperialist, anti-US struggle are those of a weaker capitalist nation resisting a stronger capitalist rival. We recall the weak, belated gestures in support of Bangladesh and the pitifully inadequate aid to Vietnam, as well as arms sales to Arab governments.

THE LIES OF CHOU EN-LAI

In Chou's report to the recent National Peoples' Congress he spoke of "firm support" to Vietnam. But James Markham in the New York Times of January 15, 1975, wrote from Saigon that "There is also circumstantial evidence that the Soviet Union and China would not be pleased to see the Vietnam war flare up to a degree that might set back their relations with the US." Markham could have left out the word "circumstantial". Mao's and Chou's welcome of Nixon during the bombing and blockading of North Vietnam was enough direct evidence to satisfy any thinking person.

Chou said nary a word about US threats of direct military action to guarantee its "right" to Arab oil. Meanwhile nearly every issue of Hsinhua attacks Soviet arms shipments to Arab governments. Chou's silence points out the need for critical examination of his statement that "China is a developing Socialist country belonging to the Third World".

Teng Hsiao-ping, Deputy Premier, in an interview with a delegation of US university presidents carried Chou's

Feb 14 '75

thoughts further. According to participant Merle Goldman writing in the New York Times, "Because of the aggressive nature of the Soviet Union [Teng] advised the US to balance its strategic arms upward, rather than downward. He implied that China can concentrate on agriculture and conventional weapons because it hopes that the US will act as the bulwark against Soviet nuclear weaponry." Since Teng made this revealing statement he has been appointed Chief of Staff of the Chinese armed forces.

The Peking Peoples Daily, writing on USSR-USA relations, states: "The contradictions between the two hegemonic powers are irreconcilable and a matter of life and death."

Add to these quotes the numerous statements from top Peking Maoites that the "Third World" struggle is everywhere victorious. The Maoites pretend to believe the struggle between oppressed nations and US imperialism is just about over.

To the Maoites the main struggle is between the US and the USSR. It is clear not only from what the Maoites say but from what they do or don't do in west Asia and Vietnam, that the Maoites are now siding with the US and intend to in the future.

The immediate objective result of the Maoite line in west Asia is to strengthen US imperialism's grip on the oil. For the USSR can hardly be expected to give even limited resistance to US threats and aggression when Peking is threatening its Asian frontier.

MAO-CHOU-TROTSKY

Trotskyism in World War II took the line that there was no essential difference between the sides--that the Axis powers and the Allied imperialist states which fought on the side of the USSR, Chinese and other Communist-led forces were equally evil.

Today Mao and the Maoites use the line that the USSR and the USA are twin evils. This simplistic view is a denial of Marx's, Engels', Lenin's and Stalin's teachings. Capitalism does not develop evenly. There has never been, and never will be, a war involving national liberation in which two capitalist nations are identical enemies of progress.

We do not imply that Trotskyism is alien to the CPSU leaders. Their line of denying the main contradiction also has a Trotskyite ring and plays into the hands of the neo-Trotskyites in Peking.

The fact remains that the USSR is not the superpower; it is in no position to conquer the world and is not the aggressor in west Asia or southeast Asia. US imperialism is the main enemy despite all Mao's Trotskyite diversionary cries.

SINO-SOVIET CONTRADICTIONS

Although both Breshnev and Mao are exponents of peaceful coexistence with US imperialism they cannot implement

peaceful coexistence between themselves, Capitalism is developing in both states, but the rate of development is uneven and this helps create tension and contradictions.

The USSR is much stronger industrially than China and has a certain degree of independence from the US in trade, in military actions and foreign relations. China can hardly move outside her frontiers without US permission, protection and direction. Who can forget the hero's welcome given Kissinger in Peking when that worthy came there from west Asia after the October war?

The new Chinese bourgeois wish to become an Asian superpower in this century, according to Chou En-lai's recent report to the National Peoples' Congress. Of course, he didn't describe China's goals in that way but since he spoke of a China "in the front rank" and didn't speak of strengthening India or the nations of southeast Asia as a common Asian goal then the term applies.

In order for a bourgeois China to become "front rank" there are now three main prerequisites: 1) great protection by, and collusion with, US imperialism; 2) a prostrate, weak USSR with the wealth of Siberia under Chinese-US control; 3) continued oppression of non-Han peoples within the Chinese state frontiers.

As pointed out above, Chinese political and military pressure on the USSR helps prevent the latter from hindering the US in west Asia, southeast Asia, etc. It also prepares for a possible military attack on the USSR to advance the Han bourgeoisie's imperialist goals under the protection of US imperialism.

WAR AND U.S. WHITES

The vast majority of the people in our country are not greatly concerned with the danger of war. There was some resentment about the Korean war and the Vietnam war. As soon as US youth were no longer killed the right of the Rockefellers, et al., to determine foreign policy was again conceded--it had never been strongly questioned, never mind challenged.

When Afro-Americans, North American Indians or Mexicans in the present US southwest make demands on the US establishment the vast majority of the US whites side with the Rockefellers. Was that not clear at Attica or in South Boston?

The material basis for this collusion with the Rockefellers is the powerful position of US imperialism since World War II. As H&S has consistently pointed out, the US ruling class has bribed the US white workers with cars, homes, TV's, etc.; as well as minimal sacrifice in US imperialism's wars on oppressed peoples.

When Israeli cutthroats, Nazi-trained and US-financed, blow up Lebanese mothers and children it is not war in the opinion of most folks in the US but "a small nation defending its borders". Palestinians are tortured and murdered by the Israelis and the CIA while most US citizens

worry about whether to get a car that's better than their neighbor's.

To most US citizens it is not war when US firms finance the butchery of Indians in the Amazon and other nations of the Americas. It is not war when Biafrans are slaughtered and starved by forces financed by US oil interests or when millions in the sub-Sahara are starved to facilitate the expropriation of the mineral wealth. And yet these are wars--one-sided and genocidal but nevertheless wars.

The oppressed people are weak and divided. They have had no consistent leaders or leadership since Stalin died. His death was followed by catastrophic setbacks for Marxism-Leninism and anti-imperialism in Russia and China which in turn left the anti-imperialist camp leaderless ideologically and organizationally. Except in Korea, Bangladesh, Palestine and southeast Asia, the US war against oppressed peoples has met only slight armed resistance.

The US Maoites (or Breshnevites) tell us that we are better off because US imperialism has allies in Peking (or Moscow). These allies have meant US imperialism obtains superprofits and our bribes with minor demands on US whites.

The US Maoites and Breshnevites claim their Peking and Moscow sponsors have engineered peace. Ironically, they have contributed to great-power chauvinism so well that some whites would fight eagerly--for US imperialism.

US WHITES WILL LEARN

The notion that the struggle for land by oppressed peoples, the world's vast majority, is less important than a car for a worker in an imperialist or revisionist country will be destroyed by the reality of the main contradiction. The long-range interest of the workers in any country is not served by this modern version of Trotskyism. Only the imperialists benefit.

With the defeat of Mao's, Chou's and Breshnev's revisionist lines, the oppressed peoples will be able to wage victorious national liberation struggles. Military defeats will force massive involvement and suffering of US whites in imperialist wars.

In the future the US whites will learn that supporting the Rockefellers means war and more war, with the destruction of US imperialism in the end. Whether knowledge will come in the form of H-bomb attacks, invasion by other nations or by both methods cannot be precisely forecast, but most certainly it will come.

Knowledge will certainly come in the form of dismemberment of the US imperialist state as Afro-Americans, Mexicans and Indians respectively recover the Black Belt, the "southwest", and the land and resources needed for livelihood and national development.

US imperialism is the Number One Enemy of the world's peoples. The main ally of the whites in the US is the

oppressed people. Every victory for them is, in the long run, our victory.

WARS ARE INEVITABLE: WHICH SIDE ARE YOU ON?

As J. V. Stalin noted, worldwide wars do not always break out over the main contradiction. It is not possible to pinpoint or blueprint the exact location of the next war. The only certainty is that the main contradiction between oppressed peoples and US imperialism has, since World War II, resulted in war and that these wars will continue. Peaceful coexistence and detente by revisionist states with US imperialism are but a means of freeing the US rulers to make war on the oppressed.

Chou En-lai, comprador "Marxist", hails turbulence in the world when there's no anti-imperialist line or leadership. Everyone knows there's turbulence. But Chou, posing as a Marxist-Leninist, praises this turbulence in which US imperialism has the initiative and two peacefully coexisting allies.

The leaders of the USSR have helped create a situation that makes possible a Sino-US attack on their territory. Nevertheless, in a world ruled by the Rockefellers with the Maoites as their bagmen the anti-imperialist will side with the USSR. For such a struggle would by its very nature expose and destroy the revisionism of the Russians as well as that of the Chinese. Such a struggle would involve the oppressed peoples and increase the possibility of their victory over US imperialism.

Any resistance to US imperialism must be supported, even though such support may be critical support. However, all foes of imperialism must eventually challenge the revisionist and imperialist lies about peace and the possibility of peace without destroying US imperialism. West Asia proves again how little reality conforms to the line of Mao, Breshnev and the pacifist servants of US imperialism.

As long as imperialism exists there will be war. To prepare the peoples of the world for wars, to win them to the anti-US-imperialist side in those wars, is the prerequisite for a common anti-imperialist line and leadership--and ultimate victory over US imperialism.

ISSUED BY: HAMMER & STEEL, Bcx 101, Mattapan, Ma 02126, USA.
SUBSCRIPTIONS: \$2.00 per year (no checks, please).