Phony Communists Urge: Toughen Up!

Is the U.S. Really a Toothless Tiger?

Some so-called communists these days seem to have been carefully studying and copying Ronald Reagan’s “revolutionary” international line. Listen, for example, to this rather typical quote from the pages of The Call, newspaper of the Communist Party USA: “Appeasement is the revolutionary international line. Among U.S. ruling circles has and is gaining the Soviets to gain clear military advantages during negotiations. It is, thus, encouraging Soviet aggression and bringing the world closer to war.” This is hardly a communist condemnation of the war preparations of both imperialist superpowers; it is a naked appeal for the U.S. ruling class to stop “giving in” and start arm- ing to the teeth—or perhaps we should say “to the eyeballs”—since they have already armed to the teeth. Behavior like this is nothing new. It has long been condemned by real communists all the way back to the Russian revolutionary Lenin as “social-chauvinism.” This means “socialism in words, chauvinism in deeds”—that is, communists misguidedly falling behind their own ruling class in its war propaganda against “the foreign enemy.” The effect is to deceive the workers for work to fight worker in a war to see which bloodsucker will come out on top. Today, this is being played out in an endless and boring series of articles in The Call which pretend to contain a “war” story analysis of SALT II. And after wading through all the CPML’s official-sounding missile counts and graphs straight out of Time magazine, their message is inescapable: the U.S. rulers, poor fellows, are quite incapable of defending their world empire and are hell-bent on “appeasing” the Soviets by allowing them to get the military edge.

Just who are these “appeasers”? anyway? Are we honestly to believe that Carter, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and all who favor SALT II are soft on the Soviets, unable to look out for their own imperialist interests? Apparently so. On the other hand, there are the James Schlesingers and Henry Kissengers of the world, currently opposing the SALT treaty because it is “giving away” too much to the Soviet Union. And it is clearly the latter who are preferred by the CPML, since they have taken to glorifying them in the pages of The Call for their opposition to SALT II.

These “hardliners,” we are informed in a recent issue (July 23), “make a more realistic assessment of Soviet military strength. They have also targeted the appeasement policies which have marked the SALT negotiations.” We are even told that the U.S. rulers’ phony SALT “debate” can “be used to the people’s advantage because it spotlights appeasement, the most dangerous trend among the U.S. rulers”...

Come on, CPML—get serious! While condemning all imperialist war preparations, the CPML drones, “it is especially important to oppose the appeasers.” To this we can only answer—huh? This doubletalk roughly translates to: While condemning all imperialist war preparations, it is especially important to support even more blatant war preparations by the U.S. imperialists! The mind strains to comprehend such a totally illogical and contradictory statement, especially when it dribbles from the mouths of those who proclaim themselves to be “communists.” What, pray tell, behind this silly appeasement line and this unsubstantiated support for the basic policy of the U.S. ruling class, which is nothing but massive military build-up against the Soviets? U.S. Appeasers?

It is certainly not that the U.S. rulers are in fact soft on the Soviets. In today’s world this is utter nonsense. The two superpowers are smack up against each other, battling for hegemony in every corner of the globe. Far from pursuing a policy of placating or “giving in,” the political and military build-up of the U.S. rulers in the 70’s has been increasingly marked by heightened competition with their social-imperialist rivals, although the facade of “detente” is still of some value to both the U.S. and the U.S.R. in preserving the illusion that they are “lovers of peace.” Take Angola, for example—the CPML claims the U.S. “appeased” the Soviets there. Evidently, we are to believe the UNITA mercenaries and South African troops financed by the U.S. were using toy pistols and rubber bullets when they fought the Soviet-backed MPLA to see which superpower would dominate the area. After all, the U.S.-backed Portuguese colonialism bit the dust. Or look at Portugal, where the pro-Soviet Communist Party had a lot of influence in the government for a while. No one threatened Portugal to take it over. Did the U.S. stand aside? Hardly. Instead, the Portuguese CP was knocked back by some heavy moves by the U.S. together with its European allies. And what about Chile, where the CIA helped the military junta of Pinochet to drown in blood the Allende government, in which the pro-Soviet CP had a dominant influence? More recently, what are we to think of the thinly concealed U.S. sponsorship of the Chinese invasion of Vietnam only two weeks ago and the Yip-Yip Ha-Ha-Ha of the Hissao-ping? Wasn’t this military thrust to match the Soviet-backed Vietnamese invasion and occupation of Kampuchea (Cambodia) welcomed (and almost certainly approved in advance) by the U.S. rulers?

And what of SALT II itself, the CPML’s big “appeasement” bogeyman? Since SALT was signed, the U.S. has been flexing its muscles like an Olympic weightlifter. First came the U.S. “disagreement” announcement was the unveiling of Carter’s Tunis proposal to plant hundreds of new nuclear missiles in Western Europe (not covered by SALT) aimed directly for the Soviet Union and that preparations must be made for war—a war which will require vast reserves of energy to fuel the U.S. imperialists’ military machine.

“While we must deal with the energy problem on a war footing,” Carter said. He repeated his proposal to set up an Energy Mobilization Board, “much like the War Production Board in WWII,” which would give the government the power to ration gas and energy in a “time of crisis” (read war), as well as floating Energy Bonds similar to the old war bonds. The bottom line of Carter’s speech was his statement that “Our nation not only has the will, unity, strength, the commitment to protect freedom, our people, and our principles, but also the military power that if anybody should challenge us, they would be committing suicide.”

However, this war rally did not go unchallenged. During Carter’s speech, a member of the Revolutionary Communist Party and a member of the Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade began shouting down Carter’s speech and unfurled a banner reading: “U.S.-Soviets gear for war, that’s what we’re fighting for. Turn the guns around, tear the system apart.” Carter’s rap came to a dead halt. Unable to ignore the commotion as the Secret Service agents, Carter managed to get off the truly amazing and ironic statement: “It’s a free country.”

Realizing that the incident was receiving widespread local and national press coverage Carter felt compelled to add to this remark a short time later. As the two people who held up the banner were being hauled out for disorderly conduct and held on $1,000 bond, Carter said, “I think it’s very good even when people oppose themselves. They really embarrass me. I’m not embarrassed by it... I think it’s a proper place in our country for people to raise a banner or ask the president a difficult question or to shout out a criticism. I don’t have any quarrel with that. It’s a free country. I want to keep it.” How wonderful it is to be in this great country—why if a disruption like this would have happened in the Soviet Union the troublemakers would have gotten arrested for disorderly conduct and held on $1,000 bail.”
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the belligerent nature of U.S. imperialist
as it fiercely contends with the
Sox for world domination, the
CPPML's function as "appeasers" can be
ridiculous but no
mean funny.

Defense of a Socialist Country?

But today there is nothing reminding
of the U.S. ruling class. "Ruling class
criticism of SALI II," we are told in
the June 25 edition of "The
newspaper—"The Call." They show
a genuine revolutionary would be temp-
ated to ask—so what? Lenin's statement
(Above) a recent cartoon from the CPML newspaper—The Call. They show
"appeasers" may be ridiculous but by
getting the working class to stop the Nazi
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