PERVERTED BRAINS OF THE SPLITTERS

For the last one year, the dissidents and the splitters inside the party have been doing everything in their capacity to form factions in the party, running paralled centres and finally split the party to pursue their line of class collaboration. They have openly allied with the Janata Party during the last elections, in opposition to the party line, in the name of "fighting the pro-Soviet forces".

After the elections, even this pose of "fighting the pro-Soviet forcess" was abandoned by the splitters and they openly came out supporting the CPM candidates in Sreerampur Constituency of West Bengal in the name of 'fighting the authoritarianism of Indira Gandhi'. Now they have openly and shamelessly condemned the whole Assam people's movement as anti-national and fully supporting the demand of the CPM on the Assam question. In the coming bye-elections in the 9 states, their leaders every where are campaigning to support the CPI-CPM combine to oppose "Indira's authoritarianism" and they are even propagating the idea that they will build one United Front against Soviet social-imperialism and its allies and another United Front with the CPM against 'Indira's authoritarianism'.

In pursuance of this, they have already written a letter to the CPM for discussing United Front programme with them, and not getting a reply from them. the splitters have already gone to the press criticising the CPM for being "lukewarm" towards their United Front efforts.

Now one can see that their claim of fighting Soviet social imperialism is nothing but bogus, their political line of uniting with the CPM against Indira's Fascism is becoming in essence crawling before the CPM leadership ideologically and politically and thus convert into a legal election party. This fully exposes the splitters as nothing but political degenerates.

To cover up their ideological and political surrender to the CPM, the splitters have come out with a new document, opposing the PCC political resolution "our tasks in the present situation".

What is the main attack of the splitters on the PCC resolutions ?

— That the PCC document is 'basically rightist',

— That it "denies the distinction between parliamentary democracy and fascism".

— That it "denies the strategy of indetifying and isolating the main enemy".

— That it "represents a breed of capitulation to Soviet hegemony and fascism".

If one really cares to read to political resolutions of the PCC on the present situation and on Afghanistan, one can easily see that the splitters have now completely lost their capacity to identify the differences, find out the ideological and political roots of these differences. They have proved themselves incapable of conductiong a political debate based on reason; instead they have resorted to utter lies and slander one can discuss these lies and slander as nothing but mad ravings of political degenerates.

Let us look at the perverted thinking of these splitters on some of the questions.

1. International

The splitters' main criticism is that the PCC document "pays lip-service to differentiation but in actuality denies it"

Their main 'cry' is that the PCC document equates both US imperialism and Soviet social - imperialism without identifying the greater danger among them. Is there any truth in this slander ?

Here is what the PCC resolution says :

"Taking the world situation as a whole, Soviet Union is on the offensive and United States is on the defensive".

"Soviet social imperialism is the chief source of war danger today of the two super powers. Soviet Union is more ferocious, more reckless, more treacherous and the most serious source of world war and therefore Soviet Union is the greater danger to the world people including the Indian people than the US imperialism".

Is this not differentiating between US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism ? Is there any hesitancy on our part to say that Soviet Union is

a greater danger, both nationally and internationally ? Can the splitters suggest a better language to identify Soviet Union as the greater danger ?

In the face of this fact, the splitters rush to the conclusion that this is mere lip-service, but in practice, the PCC denies it. Is there any truth in this second slander ?

"For the Preservation of World Peace".

— "Mobilise the people in support of all people's struggles against colonialism, semi-colonialism, neo-colonialism, against imperialism and social-imperialism, in particular the hegemonism of the two Super Powers, Soviet Union and USA - the commom enemies of the world people, taking Soviet Union as the greater danger to the Indian people, both nationally and internationally".

— "Taking Soviet Union as the chief source of war danger today, mobilise all the forces that could be united, including the forces of USA and second world countries and their allies in India, to defeat specific acts of Soviet aggression whereever and whenever it raises its head".

— "Combine these two struggles, advance the revolutionary movement step by step and bring about an international United Front against the Soviet Union, by uniting all the forces that could be united including the forces of USA and the Second world countries and their allies in India and defeat Soviet social-imperialism if it dares to start a Third World War".

This is our programme for building the international United Front against Soviet-Social imperialism and defeat its plans for World War. Can the splitters specifically spell out what exactly is their programme against Soviet social imperialism ? Has any international Marxist-Leninist Party put forward a programme of international United Front against Soviet social imperialism more specifically than our Party ? We challange the splitters to show one such statement from the official statements of any Marxist-Leninist Party.

Even such a clear cut programme does not satisfy the splitters ; why ?

Their whole anger against the PCC is that it still calls the "Two Super Powers aggressive and expansionist".

According to the reasoning of the splitters, US imperialism is no more 'aggressive and expansionist', that only Soviet Union is 'agressive and ex-

pansionist' and that since U.S. imperialism is on the defence, it is no more "aggressive and expansionist".

As stated above, the PCC document has clearly stated that the "Soviet Union is on the offensive and the United States is on the defensive".

When compared with the Soviet Union, no doubt USA is on the defensive. Does this mean that USA is not a Super Power ? Can there be a Super Power without being 'aggressive and expansionist'? Isn't USA seriously contending with the Soviet Union for world hegemony ? Isn't USA aggressive and expansionist towards the Second and Third World countries ? Can any body deny these facts ?

Why is USA stationing armies in South Korea, if not for aggression against North Korea ?

Why is USA keeping its Naval forces in the Middle East except for aggression against the Arab countries and Palsetinian people ? Is not USA being aggressive and expansionist against the Latin American countries ? Is not USA today being aggressive against Iran ?

In their slavish attitude towards USA, the splitters don't want to see that "both the Super Powers are engaged in a fierce arms race in air, sea, and land in all parts of the world for hegemony over the world and are therefore common enemies of the world people, including the Indian people".

Inspite of it being on the defensive when compared with the Soviet Union, USA is still in possession of the greater part of the world markets, in control of the greater number of countries in the world, and the people of the Third World countries are fighting US imperialism and Second World countries in greater number of places than against Soviet Social imperialism. It is the duty of Marxist-Leninists to support these National liberation struggles, against US imperialism or Second World countries while warning them about the growing danger from the Soviet Union to all the Third World countries. Only with such an approach can one advance the revolutionary movement today.

But for the splitters, any criticism of USA tantamounts to refusal to build a international United Front against the Soviet Union. They think that if we attack USA as one of the common enemies of the world people, USA will not join the international United Front against the Soviet Union. This is nothing but perverted thinking of our splitters. USA will join the interna-

onal United Front against Soviet Social imperialism not because of the ractice appeals of our splitters, but only when it is convinced that it can not efend itself against the Soviet Union and that it has to unite with others to sist Soviet aggression. Only then the international United Front against oviet aggression will become a reality.

— Another grouse of the splitters against the PCC is that it still consids USA and other Second World countries to be pursuing a policy of apeasement towards Soviet aggression.

For our splitters, to say that US imperialism and Second World counies are pursuing a policy of appeasement towards Soviet aggression is othing but a crime against 'international United Front against Soviet agression'.

But what are the facts ?

In the recent time, USA and Second World countries have certainly aken certain steps to strengthen their own defence capabilities. No doubt JSA is concentrating in strengthening its defences in the gulf region, in the Middle East and the Indian Ocean. The USA has announced its decision to ncrease its defence expenditure in the coming years. On the political plane, JSA is trying to bring about closer ties between Egypt and some other Arab ountries on one side and Israel on the other. It is trying to improve its elations with the gulf countries.

It is trying to convince Japan to increase its defence expenditure and onvince the West European countries to join USA in its struggle against Soviet aggression.

These are all steps that strategically strengthen USA's defences against Soviet aggression that is why the PCC resolution has welcomed those steps. But does this mean that the West has abandoned the policy of appeasement owards Soviet aggression ? The splitters have tried their best to quote from Newsweek and Times to show how 'Cold War' has already started and 'appeasment' is a policy of the past.

While taking certain steps to strengthen themselves strategically, the Western Powers, including the USA have been careful enough not to take a single step which would force the Soviet Union to withdraw from Afghanistan.

Do the splitters really believe that the stoppage of transfer of technical know-how to the Soviet Union, stopping of food grains exports to the Soviet Union and boycott of Olympic games in Moscow will force the Soviet Union to withdrraw from Afghanistan ? If this is not 'appeasement' what would you call this ?

After the PCC resolution the British Government came out with a proposal for the so-called 'neutralisation' of Afghanistan which all the EEC countries supported. Is this plan not inspired by the USA ? Is this not a policy of appeasement ?

Is not USA again and again stressing that it has not abandoned the SALT II talks on arms control ? Is this not appeasement ?

Not seeing these as signs of appeasment and exposing them in time, will never help in building the international United Front against Soviet social-imperialism.

What we have to notice is that as Soviet Union begins to threaten the very nerve centres of the west including the USA, it will become more and more difficult for the west to appease Soviet Union. In the coming period contention is bound to become fiercer and fiercer while appeasement will become weaker and weaker.

But to say that 'appeasment' is over is nothing but becoming apologists for USA which no self-respecting Marxist-Leninist would do.

Before we conclude their subject let us remind the splitters that once in the past they proposed to remove 'chief' from 'Soviet Union is the chief source of war danger'. After the China-Vietnam border clashes, you again predicted that the world war has become 'imminent'. After some time, you again asserted that a pro-Soviet govt., in the centre in India means 'immenent world war'

Events have again and again proved all their 'original' thinking as nothing but lies. Now we are glad to know that you are also saying that world war could still be prevented or postponed. But does not honesty require an explanation why and when you have changed your opinions, if the change is genuine ?

2. National

What is the position of the PCC on the urgent present national issues?

Analysing the respective strengths of the two super powers in India, and analysing the mid-term poll election results the PCC resolution has declared :

— Both the super powers are intensifying their rivalry for hegemony over India.

— That both super Powers are trying to convert our country into their respective bases against other countries in Asia.

— That the danger is greater today from the Soviet Union with the pro-Soviet Indira Congress coming into power in the centre in the mid-term poll.

— That Soviet Union is in a better position to influence the internal and external policies of our country.

— That Soviet Union has gained an upper hand in its contention with the USA in India.

— That the Soviet Union and its allies, the present Indira Congress govt. the revisionist leaderships of the CPI and CPM and the pro-Soviet elements in other parties who support Soviet Union should be taken as the greater danger and are greater enemies of the Indian people.

— That we should build powerful people's movements, here and now, uniting with all those who can be united for civil liberties and to defeat the repressive acts of the Indira Congress govt. and block the road towards fascism again.

Can anybody find any political concession to Soviet social imperialism or the pro-Soviet Indira Congress government in the above formulations ? Can anybody find any 'Capitulation' in these formulations ? Can any body find any 'pro-Soviet Naxalism' in these formulations ? Only political scoundrels can find such tendencies in our resolution.

Has the PCC resolution refused to build a United Front against these greater enemies with all those that can be united ? Here is what the PCC resolution says :

"In conducting these immediate struggles of the people, both eco-

nomic and political, we must utilise the present contradictions and conflicts among the pro-Soviet, pro-USA and pro-Second World countries who are now in opposition on such issues as civil liberties, on the immediate economic and political issues and above all against the predominance of the Soviet Union in India ; Soviet aggression wherever and whenever it raises its head, now particulalry in Afghanistan, against all concessions to Soviet Union its efforts to convert our country into its neo-colony and Indira Congress government's connivance at these efforts and its plans for world war. On such issues, the possibilities of united front with pro-USA and pro-Second world countries against Soviet Union's aggressive policies and its domination in India have grown and we should utilise these possibilities to advance the revolutionary movement in the country".

Can anybody say that this is not a programme of United Front ? Is this not a stirring call to build the United Front on all possible issues on the question of war and peace, on the question of Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, on the question of Soviet Union's efforts to convert our country into its neo-colony etc.?

Then why are the splitters so blind as not to see this open call for United Front ? Because the supersonic brains of the 'American trained' professors have developed certain perverted thinking on the issue of United Front which has nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Where exactly are our differences ?

(1) The PCC, while recognising the possibility of building a United Front with the pro-United and pro-Second World forces on certain issues at the same time is of the opinion that there is no objective political situation in the country to build a general political United Front with the pro-USA and pro-Second World lobbies because these sections, because of their expansionist ambitions are for maintaining good and friendly relations with the Soviet Union. But for the splitters, when we once identify Soviet Union as the greater enemy, we should always and on all issues-build a general political United Front with the pro-USA lobby. Which amounts to nothing but political surrender to pro-USA lobbies.

(2) For the PCC building United Front with pro-USA lobby from issue to issue, economic and political, actually lays the general political United Front with the pro-USA sections when the objective conditions mature for it. Without building United Front struggles on all the immediate issues of the people, one can never build a general political United Front with sections of the ruling classes. But for the splitters, building United Front

through struggles, is no United Front, but hobnobbing with ministers of the Janata, joint statements with them on certain issues and joint appearances with these leaders in certain well-advertised public meetings-tantamounts to building United Front.

(3) For the PCC, building a United Front in the struggles against the landlords, in the struggles against the capitalists or the struggle of the students, i.e. United Front in action, with the main edge of these struggles being directed against Soviet Union and its allies-particularly the Indira Congress government both in the centre and the states, the leadership of the CPI and CPM who are mainly serving the interests of Soviet social imperialism, is the correct method of building the United Front in action. But for our splitters, United Front can be built only by unconditionally supporting the pro-US lobbies in elections. For the splitters, United Front could be built only through elections.

(4) The splitters are raising hue and cry that the PCC does not make a distinction between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism. This is an utter lie on the part of the splitters.

If that is what is troubling our splitters, the PCC is always ready to say that bourgeois democracy is preferable to bourgeois fascism, and what tactics of struggle the party adopted showed during the period of bourgeois democracy or during the period of bourgeois fascism. This is not the centre of controversy with the splitters on the question of fascism.

The PCC holds that either pro-Soviet lobby or pro-USA lobby will resort to fascism if the situation so demands. The three years of the Janata and its repressive measures is a demonstration of this truth. But for the splitters, only the pro-Soviet lobby, and that too only Indira Gandhi is capable of bringing fascism and the pro USA lobby is permanently anti-fascist. the PCC holds that such an analysis is nothing but selling the party to the pro-USA lobby.

— The PCC holds that fascism, or monopoly of power, or authoritarianism could be defeated only through a protracted Agrarian Revolution and to say that these social and political evils could be defeated through the present election process is nothing but increasing the illusions of the people on the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution, is nothing but adopting parliamentary path of struggle.

But for our splitters parliamentary form of struggle, and that too United Front with pro-USA and CPI-CPM in the elections is the only method of

defeating Indira's fascism.

The perverted thinking of the splitters takes one to the conclusion that Indira Gandhi is permanently a fascist. Either in power or in opposition, Indira Gandhi is a danger to bourgeois democracy, and as long as Indira Gandhi is active in politics we should always support the pro-USA sections and CPI-CPM combine because bourgeois democracy is in danger in every election and that the revolutionary party should always fight for the preservation of bourgeois democracy as long as Indira Gandhi is active in politics. The PCC holds that only those who have sold themselves completely to the pro-USA lobby or the CPI and CPM combine could pass such rubbish as Marxism-Leninism.

For the PCC, building of pockets of resistance in the rural areas and building of revolutionary trade union movement in the industrial centres are the most important tasks of the present period, and it has asked the party units to see that the immediate struggles of the people should help us in accomplishing these key tasks. Taking the strength of the party today, election should be used as a platform for propagating revolutionary politics to the people. But for our splitters election front is the only front on which the party should concentrate now.

Open Surrender to CPM Politics :

The splitters know quite well that their political line is in shambles today. They themselves are not in a position today to defend their pet theory that India in under the exclusive hegemony of the Soviet Union or that Indira Gandhi is a puppet of the Soviet Union. They themselves have begun to write "if one agress with it or not"? Then what has become of their principal contradiction, "Soviet Union Vs the Indian Nation" - Their programme of united front with the Janata is in shambles, because the Janata itself is divided into 5 parts and our splitters do not know which of them is pro-USA or pro-Soviet.

Having no one worth while to have a united front in the pro-USA lobby, our splitters have now abandoned all pretences of fighting against Soviet social imperialism as the main enemy, have abandoned all sense of shame and have now come forward with the wonderful theory of building a general political united front with CPI-CPM combine against Indira's authoritarianism. With this theory they have already supported the CPM in certain constituencies in the last general elections. They are trying to conduct "negotiations" with the CPI-CPM to build such a front against Indira

Gandhi. In pursuance of winning the favour of CPM in West Bengal, they have openly condemned the whole Assam people's struggle against economic backwardness as anti-national, shamelessly supporting the CPM line on the Assam question, and even supporting Indira Gandhi regine's barbarous repression in Assam.

We will discuss more on this new theory of the splitters in the next issue. Here we only raise certain questions to expose the absurdity of their theories.

— Is the CPM a revisionist party or not ?

— Is the Contradiction between revisionism and the ruling classes antagonistic or non-antagonistic contradiction ?

— Indira Congress government and CPI-CPM combine - do they both belong to the pro-Soviet camp or not ? Is the contradiction among them antagonistic or non-antagonistic ?

— Can any one build a united front entirely basing themselves on non-antagonistic contradictions ?

— Strengthening the position of the CPI-CPM combine - does it not still further increase the position of the Soviet Union in India ?

These questions themselves will completely expose the new fallacies of the splitters. Who has now turned our to be the 'pro-Soviet Naxalites" ? Who surrendered to Soviet social-imperialism ? The splitters have revealed themselves in their true character.

It is to cover up their shameless surrender to CPM politics they have concocted the story about the "talks with Bhuta Singh". It is to cover up this shameful political surrender, they have ficticiously tried to find 'political' surrender on the part of the PCC, when it demands the release of the communist revolutionaries. And that too to come from a person who accepted the shameful demands of Charan Singh for the release of the communist revolutionaries without the knowledge of the CC, for which he was made to openly apologise to the public.

It is to cover up this open surrender to CPM politics, that the splitters have tried to find 'capitulation' of the PCC to Indira Gandhi, when they noted the change inthe govt's attitude on the Afghanistan question. Will the splitter be honest eneough to publish February 18 "Peking Review" article

on Indo-Pakistan relations, even with their comments on it ?.

If the splitter have the guts, let them publish it, as we are doing in this journal in other pages.

New Democracy bulletein 1 (May, 80)