

PEOPLES' TRIBUNE



Vol. 6 No. 7
July, 1974

"The Communist's ideal should not be a trade-union secretary, but a tribune of the people, able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression." Lenin

Donation 10¢

NIXON-BREZHNEV SUMMIT

WAR PLANS EXPOSED

Under the banner of "permanent detente" President Nixon and his imperialist entourage have just returned from the third summit conference with revisionist chief Brezhnev. This conference, which is being hailed as an example of how the world can be run "peacefully", concluded with a ten-year trade agreement, an agreement on the continued exchange of scientists and technicians, and a commitment to continue discussing nuclear arms limitations. It is very clear that neither the Soviet Union nor the USNA has any intention of limiting nuclear arms, as both states exploded nuclear devices less than one week after the conference had ended. The only firm commitments made were in the agreement on exchange of scientists and technicians; as for the others, they only express intent, and neither party is bound to do anything at all. Therefore, in order to understand the significance of this

summit, we must look beyond these documents.

The bourgeoisie of the USNA and of the USSR tell us that this summit, like its two predecessors, is the beginning of a new epoch of "peace" and "friendship among nations". While Nixon speaks of a generation of 'peace', his lackey, Gus Hall, of the CPUSA writes: "One of the basic conclusions we draw from the new epoch concept is the fact that world wars are not now inevitable. In the epoch when imperialism was the dominant force, wars of conquest between imperialist powers for the redistribution of the loot were inevitable. The shift in the world balance of forces has made a shift in the outlook for peace not only possible, but crucial for mankind's survival. The danger of war continues, but its prevention has become a real possibility." (Gus Hall, Imperialism Today, p. 359.)

Almost sixty years ago, Lenin crushed such an analysis of the relation between the imperialist powers, "The 'theory of ultra-imperialism', however, serves Kautsky as a means by which to justify the opportunists to present the situation in such a light as to make it appear that they have not gone over to the bourgeoisie, but simply that they 'do not believe' that socialism could come immediately and expect that 'perhaps a new era' of disarmament and lasting peace will be ushered in." (Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International.)

Both Kautsky and the modern revisionists, such as, Brezhnev and Gus Hall, utilize a very clever weapon against the workers. This is to take political agreements between imperialist states at their face value and thereby to ignore the fundamental truth: politics is a concentrated expression of

Cont. on p. 6

Intl. Report

economics. Before World War I, for example, there was a multitude of "peaceful" alliances. The Triple Entente, an alliance of Great Britain, France and Russia, was formed in 1907. Another alliance consisted of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. Later Bulgaria and Turkey supported Germany, while Italy withdrew her support and joined the Entente. But all these alliances were only an expression of a much deeper fact; all the imperialist powers were hungry for more profits, and that meant more annexation of colonial territory. However, there was no more "free" territory. Thus, Germany craved for the colonies of Great Britain and France, as well as, the Ukraine, Poland and the Baltic Provinces under the domination of Russia. Russia was after Turkey and parts of Austria-Hungary. Great Britain desired Mesopotamia and Palestine, while France tried to steal the Saar Basin and Alsace-Lorraine from Germany. It is not difficult to see how such a situation led to the first imperialist world war.

The Second World War was preceded by a similar proliferation of alliances and pacts, partially concealing the economic necessities of the imperialist powers. In 1928, the USNA proposed the Kellogg Pact, which was to be a world system of "renunciation of war". The major imperialist powers who signed this pact did not fail to add their individual "riders". Britain held that this did not affect her right to defend the Commonwealth, which at that time encompassed fully one-fourth of the world. The USNA held that this in no way would affect the Monroe Doctrine, in other words, all of Central and South America. France held out for her colonies in Northern Africa, etc. The net effect of the Kellogg Pact was simply to show that the imperialist powers would stop at nothing to defend their colonies, yet they had all agreed to defend the concept of permanent "peace". Another famous organization at the time was the League of Nations, under the domination of Britain and France. It soon became clear that these two powers were far less interested in peace than in extracting reparations payments from Germany under the ridiculous terms of the Versailles Treaty. It was under this cover of "world cooperation" and "peace" that the imperialist powers armed themselves to the teeth and prepared for the next redivision of the world which is now known as World War Two.

Today we see a dangerously similar situation brewing. The Soviet social imperialists and the imperialists alike are all talking about "peace". The Marxist-Leninists of the World War I period and the World War II period were not fooled by such talk and neither will we be fooled. This imperialist "peace" today has a different name - it is called "detente". Behind this detente is brewing not only a vast overproduction

crisis, but also as a result of this crisis, a drive for new colonial territory, a new re-division, a new war. It would be foolish indeed to await some formal declaration of this war. World War Two began as an undeclared war. No, we must do as the Bolsheviks of the thirties did: warn the proletariat of the impending danger; show the workers why it has developed; and prepare our class to fight for itself as a class.

As we have pointed out in previous People's Tribunes, the danger of world war stems from the heightening contradictions between the imperialist powers. Rather than repeat again why this is so, we will look into the latest development of these contradictions during the last few months, and from this, develop a clearer understanding of how to carry out our tasks.

Of course, the two powers which have been commanding the most attention are the USNA and the USSR. On the one hand, "detente" has given the Soviet Union and the USNA a "breathing space" during which the former can further try to destroy the socialist relations of production within the USSR and the latter is afforded the opportunity to open up new markets both within the Soviet Union and around the world. On the other hand, however, detente means a heightening of the contradiction not only between the Soviet Union and the USNA, but indeed between all the imperialist powers.

The Soviet revisionist chiefs face an incredibly difficult task in trying to convert the socialist relations of production into capitalist ones. They must fight on two fronts. First, they have to subdue the millions of revolutionary Soviet workers and peasants who were reared under the 1937 Constitution and remember Joseph Stalin as a true proletarian leader. The Soviet rulers, unable to crush the memory of Stalin, are resorting to new attempts to confuse and distort this living history. The publication of several new books "praising" Stalin's leadership in the anti-fascist war have a clearly reactionary intent - to warp Stalin's defense of the Soviet Union against the fascist onslaught into a social-chauvinist line to back up their preparations for predatory war against China and Europe.

The second front is against China, on whose border the Soviet leaders have installed over a million troops. China does not only represent a vast market for the Soviet bourgeoisie to exploit. She also represents a living antithesis to the imperialist policies of the present Soviet rulers. China is a beacon of socialism not only for the Soviet workers, but for all the workers of the world. It is small wonder then that Izvestia two months ago paid tribute to the traitor,

Lin Piao, and admitted that he was indeed seeking rapprochement with the Soviet bourgeoisie. So long as the Marxist-Leninists of China wage a principled struggle against the Lin Piao band of anti-party elements, the Soviet Union is forced to step up its attack on the Communist Party of China. The Soviet social-imperialists know full well that they can never fully reestablish capitalism so long as China is under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party. That is why they not only give support to enemies within the CPC (note that both Lin Piao and the revisionist CPSU agree that we are in a "new era" of the final collapse of imperialism, an era in which imperialism is so weak that it will simply die of its own accord), but they also are determined to surround and isolate China from the outside. After the first summit came the partition of Pakistan and the attempt to set up a base of operations on China's southern front. Since the second summit meeting, the Soviet Union has been propagandizing for the formation of an "Asian Security Pact"; the purpose of which must be clear: to form a bloc against socialist China. But the Soviet Union has been unable to bully North Vietnam and North Korea into participating in such a cabal. We must do our part in aiding our Chinese comrades by exposing this treachery of the Soviet revisionists for what it is: an attempt to annex China, to rob the Soviet workers and the proletariat around the world of its faithful ally.

Domestically, the Soviet revisionists are using "permanent detente" to try to explain away the large number of capital investments of the USNA in the USSR. In 1971, USNA-USSR trade was a mere \$200 million. In 1973 this figure jumped to \$1.5 billion, 87% of this representing capital imported into the Soviet Union. This does not include the recent agreement with Occidental Petroleum for contracts totaling \$20 billion. What is going on here is not trade between nations based on Leninist principles. What is going on is the import of USNA capital, that is, capitalist relations of production, into the Soviet Union. To justify this development, the Soviet revisionists are harking back to the days of the New Economic Policy in the Soviet Union. But to compare the Soviet Union of today which produces 1,378,000 cars and trucks a year, which has an electrical capacity of 153,790,000 kilowatts, to compare this Soviet Union with that of the early '20's where famine reigned and the largest plant was a cigarette lighter factory - this is foolishness. Secondly, the capitalists who were allowed into the Soviet Union fifty years ago were unde-

the strict control of the dictatorship of the proletariat, whereas today, this is hardly the case.

But it would be a mistake to assume that the USNA is only expanding its influence in the Soviet Union. It was not for nothing that Nixon also visited the Middle East, as well as, Europe this past month. In the last six months, Europe has been the scene of a great political upheaval. Virtually every head of government in Europe has been replaced. The policy of fascism is being considered more and more seriously by governments throughout the capitalist world. But if the political situation in Europe is grave, this is no more and no less than a concentrated expression of the economic situation.

The fact that the bourgeoisies of the various nations of Europe were ruined by the last world war does not at all mean that they have relinquished their imperialist strivings. Imperialist strivings, though, mean little without the proper economic basis. Over the last twenty years, the bourgeoisie of Europe has been building up such a basis. Like other imperialists, they must somewhere find markets. This brings them into confrontation with the USNA on the one hand; on the other hand, this confrontation brings into sharp focus the relative weakness of these bourgeois classes.

The key to Europe is not in Europe itself, but rather in the colonial world, especially in the Middle East. The bourgeoisies of the USNA, the USSR and Europe all realize this. The USSR's position in the Middle East has been relatively weakened by the contradictions discussed above. The European bourgeoisie's position historically was weakened by the Second World War. It is in this context that the USNA has been able to take advantage of the situation in the Middle East. One year ago, the bourgeois leaders of Western Europe were taking an increasingly aggressive stance toward the USNA. This was particularly true in France. At that time, the USNA controlled 60% or more of all the crude oil in the Middle East. So when the price of oil for the nations of Europe went up 300%, this was a maneuver of USNA imperialism, rather than of the Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC). Preceding this, the USNA pushed Britain into the European Economic Community (EEC), thus weakening it internally because of Britain's incredibly poor economic situation. Sure enough, Britain is now claiming it cannot pay its share of the EEC's budget. And to add to this fact, Italy is nearly bankrupt, has used up almost all of its currency reserves and has virtually no credit left. Denmark and Italy

have imposed curbs on imports since May, which supposedly goes against the "spirit" of the EEC. Prices in France went up 1.6% in April alone, which means an annual inflation rate of 18%. The general situation in the EEC was summed up by Helmut Schmidt (Chancellor of W. Germany) when he said, "We should not sacrifice the stability of our economy and the prosperity of our citizens and their confidence in their economic future to an impotent European Community".

What is the political manifestation of this economic situation? For one thing, in just about every nation in Western Europe, there has been a change in government. The new leaders of states are far more conciliatory toward the USNA. These are the main reasons Nixon and Kissinger were able to go to Europe and forge a "new unity" in NATO.

Finally, the USNA was able to take advantage of the fact that the bourgeoisies of the OPEC hunger after maximum profits true to their class nature. Striking proof of this was the recent meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). The oil question dominated most of the discussion. The OAU includes 42 countries, among them the oil-producing countries of the Middle East. Countries, such as, Zambia and Kenya, which have no oil of their own, pleaded for a special discount on oil prices, but to no avail. The members of the OPEC cited "technical problems"; in other words, they feared members of the OAU would take the cheaper oil and resell it on the world market for higher prices, thus cheating the OPEC out of its "rightful" profits. The non-oil-producing colonies around the world have of course been hardest hit by the "oil crisis". The increase in oil prices has added over \$10 billion to their fuel bill and \$5 billion to their fertilizer bill. Because they cannot pay for this, they are forced to turn either to the USNA dominated World Bank or to the Soviet Union for a loan. Thus, what seems to be outwardly a fight against USNA hegemony by the OPEC, actually ends up temporarily strengthening this hegemony by tying the non-oil-producing colonial world closer to the imperialists with financial aid. Thus, we see once again that there is no such thing as a united front of the national bourgeoisie against imperialism, despite what the revisionists try to tell us. A united front against imperialism is composed of the proletariat, the peasantry and those members of the national bourgeoisie who are opposed to imperialism. But it is led by the proletariat. The national bourgeoisie as a class is too weak and too corrupted by imperialism to lead any national liberation struggle.

Though the USNA has temporarily gained over the last few months, it would be altogether wrong to ignore the fact that the USNA, and indeed the world, is facing a huge over-

production crisis. In fact, the more the USNA attempts to dominate Europe, Japan and the Soviet Union, the more furiously must these same countries seek new markets and produce more commodities to stay in business. We can look at the production figures for a vast number of commodities and see this is the case. Take oil for example. Before the embargo, oil production in the Middle East was 48 million bbl. daily while demand was only 47 million bbl. daily. After the embargo, a huge increase in demand was anticipated, so production is up to 49 million bbl. daily, yet they are only able to sell 47 million bbl. That means that there is an overproduction of some 2 million bbl. per day, and that just from the Middle East! If we look at the inflation around the world we can see why no one can afford to buy this oil: Britain - 51%, Italy - 45%, Sweden - 43%, France - 40%, (since 1969) South Vietnam - 1200% (over 10 yr. period), Chile - 700%.

Thus, we see that overproduction is the economic force behind the diplomacy of the Moscow summit meeting. It is also the force behind the imperialist powers' great rush to arm themselves to the teeth. The bourgeoisie knows well that in the final analysis it can only win markets through force, through war. Forty years ago, the imperialist powers, still reeling from the effects of the world wide economic crisis, were signing "peace" treaties with one hand and armaments contracts with the other. Today much the same process is taking place. But in every nation, the bourgeoisie is faced with an increasingly restive proletariat. They are faced with national liberation struggles in their colonies that they cannot control. They are preparing for war, but as Stalin wrote, "not a single capitalist country can wage an important war unless it first strengthens its own rear, unless it curbs 'its' workers, unless it curbs 'its' colonies. Hence the gradual fascistization policy of bourgeois governments." (Stalin, Political Report of the CC to the 15th Congress of the CPUSA)

This process is now taking place not only in the USNA, but throughout the entire capitalist world, including the colonies. It is this environment that determines our immediate tasks. First, we must expose to all the workers the treachery behind this idea of "permanent detente." Before every world war there has been an outburst of bourgeois pacifism on the part of the bourgeoisie and the revisionist and social democratic parties. This bourgeois pacifism has concealed the real aims of the imperialist powers; it tries to take advantage of the proletariat's genuine love for peace and turn it into apathy. Thus, it is our task as communists to lead the workers into a proletarian fight for peace. This does not mean rejecting all war. We reject imperialist war; we reject it by fighting as a

Intl. Report Cont. from p. 7

class and defeating our own imperialist bourgeoisie. To do this we require first of all a Marxist-Leninist Party which can take the truths of Marxism and apply them to our conditions here in the USNA. Secondly, we must build the United Front against fascism. The heart of this united front must be the mass of proletarians who have nothing to sell but their labor power and have the least ties to capital. This cannot be accomplished without strong Party nuclei in the factories, in the communities, in the mass organizations where the workers gather. Let us seek out the most active fighters against fascism and win them to the cause of communism and in this way make our party a vanguard party. At every turn we will meet the revisionist CPUSA telling the workers to grovel before their imperialist masters. Therefore, we must train the workers to expose these apologists of fascism. The Communist Party of a New Type and the United Front Against Fascism - these are not abstract ideals. They are real and immediate necessities if our class is to be victorious. This is our peace program. We will end imperialist war once and for all - by ending imperialism itself.