

---

# FERTILIZER OR GASOLINE?

---

In the sub-Sahara region of Africa twenty million people may die of starvation before another year has passed. This is the estimate of Dr. Norman E. Borlaug of the Rockefeller Foundation. Borlaug is often called the father of the "green revolution".

Dr. Borlaug says the starvation will take place partly because of climatic changes but mainly due to fertilizer cutbacks resulting from the oil shortage. Dr. Borlaug's sponsor, the Rockefeller family, controls much of the world's oil supply. The Rockefellers decide whether the African peoples receive fertilizer or perish by the millions.

Dr. Addeke H. Boerma, director-general of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, says that "pledges of aid have fallen far short of needs." (New York Times, 1/26/74). Dr. Boerma is referring to aid from other nations.

The sub-Sahara region is rich in minerals. The African peoples are a potential obstacle to the exploitation of mineral wealth by western imperialism. During the Vietnam war the US made serious efforts to change the weather pattern in its successful drive to seize south Vietnam's oil. There is a very strong possibility that the radical change in the monsoon season, which threatens mass starvation not only in Africa but in south Asia as well, is a deliberate effort by the Rockefellers and their obedient tools in Washington to commit genocide by changing the weather.

The green revolution concept is based on an agriculture requiring large amounts of fertilizer, utilizing varieties of rice and wheat which may produce heavier crops under ideal conditions but are less resistant to disease than traditional strains and require much larger farms. In concrete practice the Rockefellers' "green revolution" is a cruel hoax to prepare oppressed peoples for population control and genocide.

### THE MARXISTS AND THE SUB-SAHARA

If one believes the pretenses of Mao concerning weak and oppressed nations then one would expect Chinese ships and planes to be rushing wheat and fertilizer to the starving peoples in the sub-Sahara region.

China is importing wheat from Australia, Canada and the US which is badly needed in Africa. Mao is putting extreme pressure on the USSR to keep its ships out of the Mediterranean and away from Africa. (Hsinhua, 1/21/74, pp. 25, 26,27). Breshnev, like Khrushchev, readily yields to Mao's and Rockefeller's plots to destroy the national liberation struggles of oppressed peoples. Breshnev is easily persuaded to let Rockefeller and Mao have their way in any part of Africa where the new Russian capitalist class has little serious contradiction with US imperialism.

Peaceful coexistence between Russia, China and the US is, in the real world, an alliance between China and the US dominated by the latter. The US-China axis can and does pressure the USSR to yield on most major questions.

The US-China axis is the most powerful, most vicious enemy of small, weak and oppressed nations that mankind has ever faced. Its atrocious crimes against the African peoples, the Asian peoples and the peoples of South and Central America make the crimes of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis seem like misdemeanors.

### COMMUNIST PLAYBOYS OF THE WESTERN WORLD

The US, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Australian, Canadian and English "Marxists" are keeping silent on the mass starvation in Africa. This is true of both the open Maoites and their camouflaged version, the Breshnevites in the Communist Parties of the west.

Milt Rosen (PL), Gus Hall (CPUSA), Workers World, the Spartacists, the Guardian, the Revolutionary Union--self-styled US Communists--are not demanding fertilizer and relief for Africans. They are demanding more automobiles and more gasoline for the US people. Quite "by accident" this serves the Rockefellers' genocidal plans in Africa and their preparations for aggression in West Asia and their profits from US investments in General Motors.

### HOW MARXISTS GOT THAT WAY

Readers of earlier issues of I&S are familiar with our views on several factors that have turned the present international Communist movement into collaborators with imperialism. We have discussed the powerful position of US imperialism after World War II and its material capacity to pressure and intimidate potential opponents.

Specifically we have discussed the US H-bomb. The US H-bomb is a major weapon used to brain-wash postwar, and especially post-Stalin, Communists.

We have discussed both the bribes of the wheat and trade privileges given to Khrushchev, to Breshnev and to

Mao and the high standard of living given large sections of the US white population (and workers in other imperialist countries) to keep them from opposing the Rockefellers in Biafra, in southern Asia, in west Asia, in South America and in the Indonesian massacre.

Fear of the US and bribes from the US place most contemporary Communists, including those holding state power, on the side of US imperialism in its focal struggle against the right to self-determination for the weak and oppressed nations.

#### ANOTHER FACTOR

There is another factor which could be called the historical aspect of revisionist development. This aspect directly involves the role of the working class in those imperialist nations which attacked the USSR, i.e., Germany, Italy and Japan.

In 1940, when Hitler invaded, the USSR had existed for twenty-three years. In that period it was the leading force on the world scene around which workers of the west organized their struggles. The USSR was also the main force giving hope and strength to the anti-imperialist struggles in Asia, Africa and South and Central America.

The international Marxist-Leninist movement correctly recognized the interconnection between the rise of fascism and Nazism and the danger of an attack on the USSR. In 1934 the Comintern report by Dimitrov put forth the United Front concept to meet the fascist Nazi threat against the peoples of capitalist countries and to defend the USSR.

The United Front was based on unity of the USSR, the working class in the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggles in oppressed and semi-colonial nations. The United Front took advantage of contradictions in the imperialist camp and prepared the world's peoples for the titanic struggles led by Stalin and the USSR against the Axis led by Hitler Germany.

The weakest component of the United Front proved to be the working class in the capitalist countries, especially the proletariat in Germany. In a very short period Hitler was able to destroy the Communist Party in Germany and to mobilize almost the entire German working class for German imperialist aggression. Essentially the same process took place in Italy and Japan.

#### MORE ON THE GERMAN WORKING CLASS

In form, the German workers of the early thirties were class-conscious and well organized. It appeared they had a high opinion of the first Socialist state--the USSR. The large Socialist and Communist Parties in Germany seemed to confirm the revolutionary potential of the German workers and their middle-class allies.

In substance, we now know, the vast majority of German workers were corrupted with chauvinist and revanchist concepts. World War II proved that the contradiction between the German workers and the German imperialists was of far less import than their unity.

Why did Dimitrov and other leaders of the Comintern make such a serious error on Germany?

1) Dimitrov saw only the resentment of the German people against the Versailles treaty. He failed to see that, despite Versailles, the German imperialists had made a substantial comeback with the aid of the US, the English and the French who needed Germany as a buffer state to be used against the USSR. The German imperialists were able to bribe their working class with a standard of living far higher than that of eastern Europe, including the USSR, which had to make tremendous sacrifices for industrialization and defense against imperialist attack.

2) The Comintern leaders cleansed the Communist movement of Trotsky but did not completely cleanse it of Trotskyism. Trotsky's ideas of a continual revolution in western capitalist countries were not completely eradicated. Many Communist leaders felt that the proletarian revolution in England, the US, France, etc., was not taking place because of tactical errors by individual Communist Parties. Events have shown that as long as imperialism can bleed Asia, Africa, and South and Central America it can confuse and bribe the workers. This proved to be true even in the period of depression that began in 1929.

3) Despite substantial theoretical efforts by Stalin, many Communist Parties did not fully break ideologically or in practice with the Second International on the national question. Dimitrov's report and summary at the Seventh

World Congress of the Comintern contains only a page and a half on Asia, Africa, and South and Central America. The potential of the oppressed-nation sector of the United Front was almost ignored.

In World War I only a handful of western Social-Democrats took a stand against imperialism. The Comintern leaders from the west were the best of the Second International, but still heavily influenced by, and a part of, great-power chauvinist tendencies in the western countries.

4) The Russian revolution in 1917 had many universal lessons. It took place, as Lenin said, because Russia was the "weakest link" in the imperialist chain. Why was it the weakest link? One major reason has been underplayed or ignored. The Russian ruling class had lost its material capacity by 1917 to bribe its working class; while German imperialism, even after serious defeats in two world wars, has never lost its capacity to bribe its workers.

5) Lenin's glowing estimate of the revolutionary potential of the western workers after World War I, so clearly indicated in Left-Wing Communism, was absolutely wrong; and Lenin's view doubting the ability of the imperialists to achieve an important degree of stability in the twenties was also wrong. No Socialist revolution was possible in England, France or Germany.



LEFT-WING COMMUNISM REVISITED

Lenin's views in general, stated in Left-Wing Communism, on what Communists could achieve in parliament have also proven to be erroneous. Instead of being able to expose and help defeat the opportunists, elected Communist officials in the west have adopted the cry, "If you can't beat them, join them!" This error was also a product of Lenin's wrong evaluation of the west and especially his underestimation of great-power chauvinism as a major problem in the working class of imperialist countries and among the western Communist leaders including those who were later elected to office in France and other countries.

Hammer & Steel has upheld and will continue to uphold the main contributions of the great Lenin. As Leninists we point out that in Left-Wing Communism he lagged behind objective developments. Western capitalism had reached a high degree of stability at the moment that Lenin held it could not do so. And in the same book Lenin forgot what Lenin correctly wrote on the stake that the workers in imperialist countries had ( and still have ) in the oppression of other nations.

COMMUNIST SHOP STEWARDS?

Dimitrov's erroneous evaluation of the German workers led him to serious programmatic errors. Instead of concentrating on the protracted, difficult struggle against

great-power chauvinism he emphasized the struggle for higher wages, etc.--immediate demands.

According to Dimitrov, the German workers should have recognized the Communists as the most loyal, consistent leaders in the shop and then have accepted their proposals on international policy and form of government, i.e., democracy over Naziism and then eventually Socialism.

When it came to immediate demands, Hitler had his own proposals. He offered the German workers agricultural products from Holland, Denmark and the Ukraine. He promised perfumes and fancy clothes from Paris, housemaids and farm laborers from Poland plus the property and positions of the European Jews. Hitler's offers were attractive just as Nixon's promises of unlimited gasoline, automobiles and color TV's are popular in the US today.

#### THE UNITED STATES

The reader may question why we devote all this space to the lessons of Germany, and to events which took place thirty to forty years ago. "And what," you may ask, "if the German workers were 'accessories to the fact' in the crimes of German imperialism?"

You may well ask, "Haven't the US workers learned the lessons of Germany?" We reply that the Communists haven't learned them yet--partly because the Comintern was liquidated during World War II in the mistaken belief that this would

strengthen the war effort. Actually it facilitated the spread of Browderism and Titoism which weakened the war effort and in turn later aided Khrushchev's revisionism.

Most US Communists are great ones for talk about the Russian revolution of 1917. They back away from or skip over the German counterrevolution of 1933. Why?

Most self-styled Communists in the US uphold the doctrine of the working class-imperialist partnership's right to divide the loot from oppressed nations. Some of these Communists cover up this doctrine with the claim that there's a revolutionary situation in the US and the "bosses" are ready to collapse--PL, the Guardian, Workers' World, Revolutionary Union, etc. Others, like the CPUSA, beg the imperialists for a little more of the spoils and "threaten" that if they're not forthcoming the workers will elect a different representative of imperialism in the next election.

#### THROUGH ROSE-COLORED GLASSES

None of these alleged Communists will face the fact that the US working class supported US imperialism in Korea and Vietnam. They will not admit that the vast majority of US workers are in favor of aggression against the Arabs so that we can get "our" oil back. They will not admit that instead of "Black and white unite and fight", the average US white worker is ready for pogroms against any Afro-American demanding a share of the gasoline, let

alone the Gulf Coast oil wells which are part of his Black Belt homeland.

Nor will the US revisionists tell the truth about the young worker and the middle-class youth. Do not the US youth, badly infected with drugs, marijuana and nihilism, pose the same threat that German youth posed just before Hitler took power?

Most US organizations calling themselves Communist work openly. By their practice, they objectively support US imperialism's democratic pretenses. The few exceptions, those who work underground, are mainly substituting adventurism and terror for program and clarity. And all this is done in the name of Leninism.

#### IMMEDIATE DEMANDS

Would Lenin, if alive today, ignore the lessons of Germany? Would Lenin prettify the US working class? Would Lenin, like Mao, cover up US atrocities in South Asia with praise for "The Great American People"? Would Lenin, like Gus Hall (CPUSA) and Milt Rosen (PL) demand more cars and gasoline for US workers even though it means death for 20 million Africans?

A Leninist recognizes that there are secondary contradictions in the US over the spoils. A Leninist is involved in such struggles not because another house or car for a US truck driver is anti-imperialist or a step

toward Socialism. A Leninist is involved in such struggles to show that in the long run, the US worker is headed up a blind alley in his General Motors car unless he reverses his present course, rejects his imperialist leaders and partners and supports his long-term allies--the oppressed peoples.

Such a course is difficult and dangerous. It offers few quick organizational results. It is based on the view that wars between the oppressed peoples and the US will continue; that wars between the US and other capitalist nations are probable. Such a course is based on the certainty that before the US worker changes, his class will suffer great losses in land, in lives, in possessions; and very possibly will experience occupation by other powers. In short, US imperialism is not exceptional, but subject to contradictions, to setbacks, to blows similar to those suffered by German imperialism.

#### THE DIFFERENCE

The revisionists treasure every error in judgment that Lenin and Dimitrov made. We want to correct them.

When Lenin updated Marxism (developed when capitalism was in its rising stage) to the dying stage of capitalism which is imperialism, he said Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action. If Lenin were alive he would be the first to ridicule the mechanical, dogmatic, opportunist application of much that he wrote in Left-Wing Communism.

Dimitrov and Stalin made great ideological and organizational contributions to the anti-imperialist revolutionary cause. But we cannot simply parrot their views of 1934 without criticism of their mistakes, without examining changes in the objective situation.

It is timely hindsight to recognize that 150 German Communists in 1930 who understood the problem of chauvinism, who were prepared for a long struggle, who were not fooled by the democratic pretenses of German imperialism could have warned the world's people about developing Hitlerism; while hundreds of thousands of German Communists, who didn't face up to great-power chauvinism, failed in that revolutionary task.

We must keep what is useful from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and apply it in the present focal contradiction. Now that the main struggles are taking place in Asia, Africa and South America, we cannot mechanically utilize that which applied mainly to Europe and North America in a previous period. We must ruthlessly throw out that which does not apply and develop that which is essential in today's time, conditions and place. In other words, we must follow Lenin's and Stalin's example of how to develop Marxism in our epoch.

If we can learn from past errors we can contribute to the struggles in Africa, in the US and in the rest of the world. We can and must learn and practice what is correct and principled if the nightmare of US dominance in the world is to be ended by a series of anti-imperialist victories.

ISSUED BY HAMMER & STEEL, BOX 101, MATTAPAN, MASS. 02126, USA.  
SUBSCRIPTIONS: \$2.00 per year (cash or money order).