

HAMMER & STEEL NEWSLETTER

AUGUST 1961

The 1961 presidential elections have produced one expected result. Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA, has rehashed and reintroduced the "good imperialists versus the bad imperialists" line.

The "bad" imperialists want to "sell out the interest of the people." "Their weapons are terror, murder and provocation against the Negro people. They speak of Cuba, Ghana and Panama with imperialist and chauvinistic arrogance." These bad imperialists "have deliberately and demagogically made the world's resistance to U.S. big business imperialist policies of aggression appear as if they were rebuffs and setbacks for the people of the U.S." They defeated "the forces of modernization within the Republican Party." These bad ones back Goldwater.

The good imperialists have achieved a situation where "the country is in the midst of adjusting to new world relations and to very deep-going domestic changes." "Their concern is about the self-interests of U.S. capitalism. The parallel self-interest of the masses and of sections of the capitalist class adds greatly to the strength of a broad peoples movement." Behind these good imperialists "it also now appears that labor will be united at least along parallel lines in this campaign." (Does the unity-of-parallel-lines concept indicate that Hall is revising geometry as well as Marxism-Leninism?) By uniting around the good imperialists, says Hall, "it is not only possible to meet the challenge but also to deliver such a crushing blow as to send this ugly alliance into generations of paralysis." These good imperialists back L. B. Johnson.

The above quotes are from an August 2, 1961 article in the WORKER. Is it not completely clear that Hall, obsequious supporter of Khrushchev, was assuring President Johnson that he could commit aggression against North Vietnam, China or any national liberation movement without opposition from the CPUSA leadership or Khrushchev?

Hall wants "the Left" to become "the initiative force" in this struggle between the good and bad imperialists. But some resist, and he wants to know "why is it so difficult for some on the Left to understand this tactic?" We can't answer for all the Left, but we suspect some were beaten by the cops of that good imperialist, Mayor Wagner. Others may have read of the Hoffa frameup by that good imperialist, R.F. Kennedy. And others may have wondered why Allen Dulles and J. Edgar Hoover, white supremacist terrorists, were sent to Mississippi by that kind imperialist,

L. B. Johnson. Perhaps, some were not then among the 17 million poverty-stricken whom Kennedy discussed in 1960 but are now among the 30 million poor over whom Johnson weeps crocodile tears in 1964.

Hall attacks those in the Left who see "no differences in the two old parties." Capitalism in its imperialist stage is characterized by intense contradictions between capitalist nations and between imperialist groupings within given nations. The rivalry of imperialist groupings is reflected in the struggles between R.F.Kennedy and L.B.Johnson as well as between Rockefeller and Goldwater. Kennedy and Rockefeller represent the Eastern group as Goldwater and Johnson are spokesmen for the Texas group. These power struggles concern who is to have the best sources for investment at home and abroad.

U.S. capitalism, unlike German, Italian and Japanese imperialism in the twenties and thirties, is the most powerful imperialist country in the world and has found it possible and useful to use democratic phraseology to cover up its practices. But U.S. imperialism is in trouble and losing ground in S.E. Asia, Latin America and Africa. The desperation of U.S. imperialism is reflected in the "choice" between Goldwater and Johnson -- both of whom are servants of U.S. imperialism; either of whom will yield to fascism or jump on the white horse himself if necessary.

Praise by the revisionists for one group of campaigning imperialists is an attempt to bolster imperialism as a whole. They are well aware that the Democrats' liberal facade is used primarily to break down mass resistance to fascism and war. It is no accident that unjust wars have been initiated by Democratic administrations. The Democratic party in the U.S.A. performs some of the functions of right-wing Social Democracy in Europe.

Lenin taught that Marxist-Leninists are involved in bourgeois elections primarily to expose the bourgeoisie. He often stated that the contests between the bourgeois parties were essentially a smokescreen to cover up the real government: the monopolies and finance capital. The CPUSA, having long since deserted Lenin, loses all restraint in describing what can be achieved when capitalism holds an election in the U.S.A. It seems "that the nation will take a path to greater democracy, peace and economic security." Such wild, ludicrous statements by Hall can serve a useful purpose. Their negative example is a reminder of the illusions concerning bourgeois elections that many of us failed to criticize in the past. Confusing the effect with the cause, we were unprepared for new reactionary legislation. For example: the Wagner Act was largely negated by the Taft-Hartley and Kennedy-Griffith-Landrum Acts. Hall's claim that in '64 we have a real choice is in support of avowed bourgeois writers like Reston and Lippman.

How can the millions of voters who want a military withdrawal from Vietnam find a choice between Goldwater and Johnson?

How can a teamster who doesn't like the Hoffa frame-up find a choice?

Can those who are opposed to the Administration's policy toward Cuba or China express their feelings by voting?

Both Republicans and Democrats were bragging about the civil rights law in July. In August they are using the election as an excuse to deny the Afro-Americans their constitutional rights to demonstrate. How can anyone advance civil rights by voting for either hypocrite -- Goldwater or Johnson?

Every voter who refuses to vote for president strikes a blow against U.S. imperialists and their revisionist stooges, the CPUSA leadership.

Marxist-Leninists have a vital role to play in this election. We must show the workers, Negro people and middle-class people who are alarmed by Goldwater that it is possible to stop fascism and war. This can be done by struggle against Johnson's aggression in Vietnam; by a more powerful Negro armed liberation movement and by a more powerful labor movement with a leadership who fights the enemy not joins him.

The desperate, chauvinistic maniacs in the Johnson administration have involved our nation in war against the people of Asia. Whatever initial advantage aggression may bring Johnson, U.S. imperialism will prove to be weaker than the peoples of the world. Just as the outcome of Hitler's aggression against Poland and Japan's aggression against China was the end of imperialist domination in large areas, so Johnson's aggression against Vietnam will result in a further weakening of capitalism and imperialism.

NO SUPPORT TO AGGRESSORS

NO VOTE IN '64!

EXPOSE THE JOHNSON-GOLDWATER TWO-FACED POLICY OF SWEET TALK AND ARMED OPPRESSION!

UNITY OF BLACK AND WHITE AGAINST U.S. IMPERIALISM!

The "good imperialists" line is the continuation of the lesser evil theory. This is the theory that in 1960 said:

support Stevenson not Kennedy
then, support Humphrey not Kennedy
then, support Kennedy not Johnson
then, oppose Johnson for Vice-president;

now it says: support Johnson not Goldwater

When will the so-called "responsible Left" -- the CPUSA -- stop capitulating!

HALT THE AGGRESSION IN VIETNAM!

NO VOTE FOR THE TWIN CANDIDATES OF IMPERIALISM!

BOYCOTT THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS!

Issued by: HAMMER & STEEL, P. O. Box 101, Mattapan Station, Boston, Mass.

Subscription rate: \$1.50 per year -- 15¢ Single Copy