

Letter to Iran: PBSP-2005

To, Central Committee, CPI(MLM). October, 05.

Comrades, Lal Salam.

We have read your letter sent to CoRIM & published in struggle No. 6 in Aug/'05. The letter was written to express your opinion regarding all the matters in connection with the proposed statement about MPP. In the last paragraph of your letter, your serious criticism has attracted our attention regarding the views & positions of our party and NB on above mentioned matter. Both of ours and NB's view position had been published in struggle/5. We have decided to send this letter for informing our opinion in connection with your criticism and anxiety. Our party is giving special emphasis for taking active participation in the new phase of debates and struggles which have been developed within RIM around many important line-questions.

In this regard, we welcome the mentioned open criticism of your party to ours. Because, this will be helpful for deepening the debate and all of us will be benefited by this to attain a correct and unified position. We will, at first, give answer of that question, which is thrown to us as your criticism. But giving this answer is not only the aim of our letter. Rather in connection with this answer, we want to express our opinion to some extent about how we see MPP-related line-problems and how those should be handled.

* You have raised the serious question, that, if any group does about the leadership of our own party the same things, what MPP is doing about RCP and their leader Com. Avakian [Affix picture of leadership with tag of CIA] or if does the same things [tell him the agent of the ruling class of Nepal and CIA by drawing ugly and humiliating cartoon] about Comrade Prachanda and if it is being done years after years, then, what we think, our movement should do? Well! we think that we should go much deeper for giving appropriate answer to this question. In this country there is no lack of the existence and activities of such groups and personals, who attack us and the leadership of our party dirtily. Our evaluation is also clear about most of them.

We openly fight and denounce against these type of activities of theirs who are distinctly reactionaries and revisionists. But it is not the beginning or end of our struggle to denounce these type of activities, or we do not centralize on it. In fact, we give a little importance on it. Mainly we struggle their inherent politics. Their slanders and mispropaganda against us are mere one of the expression of this. In fact, we mainly avoid the individualistic slander, mispropaganda and attack, we do not rebuked by all these reactionary and revisionist personal attacks so that political struggle can be brought in forefront. But, besides these types of attacks of branded reactionaries and revisionists, we have experiences of other types of situation also.

And that is more complex. These types of incidents occur as a part of the split also, which is created as a result of 2LS within the party or Maoist-camp. Specially from the part of irresponsible individuals/factions/groups. In these cases, there is no way without deepening the 2LS. Because we cannot reach to any final evaluation or conclusion without doing that; specially we cannot make our own ranks conscious and united on line. To convince, educate & unite the misguided, but sincere revolutionaries who are related with the opposite camp, is also important problem.

Certainly, to struggle against individualistic attack, slander, mispropaganda & specially rule out the dividing line with the enemy all these are also a part of this greater struggle. But struggle cannot be started in any way by this, or, this cannot be brought at the center of line struggle. If it is done, the basic ideological-political line-difference and struggle on that turned down and become weak. Remember, how Mao and Chinese party advanced when khrushchev clique had poured the poison against Stalin in 20th congress and thereafter. Then too, almost like this time, a group of problems was piled up which are also related with the sum up of Stalin also. In such a complicated situation, Chinese revolutionaries defended Stalin very firmly, and struggled this attack of Khrushchev as a part of development of the whole of 2LS. What you have mentioned in your question, we have gained a vast experience of that type during recent great 2LS and during party splitting in our party too.

All those important comrades of your party work in international front they definitely know the type of language and pose of many comrades and centres who were opposed to our leadership and the central committee. They not only called our leadership and centre as revisionist, but they even rebuked us by saying like all these reactionary, part of state machinery, agents of imperialism etc. during that time, a comrade from CoRIM gave us a valuable advice. He said to us, our skin should be made thick in this stage of 2LS, so that we can make 2LS deeper without becoming rebuked in reviling like all these. This advice was proved helpful to overcome some of our weakness in that period.

And we became able to centralize on the root of our line-differences with the dissentients. To save and hold high our leadership from all types of attacks and carrying out principled communistic struggle against nasty individualist attacks all these are our responsibilities certainly. But all these should be done within the orbit of greater 2LS and in the context of its development. We do not think it correct to simply hold high personal leadership against personal attacks. This can be a type of MPP's wrong line of Jefetura in a different manner. We want to be cautious about that. Both of our parties expressed opinion very clearly in the letter/opinion of NB and ours that, we do not think correct in any way, this type of attacks of MPP, and surely it is necessary to struggle that very firmly. But we said that, it should be conducted wisely and methodologically it should be advanced correctly. Because MPP is not of a group of a so simple type; or, historically it is not any reactionary or revisionist organization, who is attacking com. Avakian, RCP and CoRIM frantically. Firstly, all know that, MPP was a generated organization of PCP and that PCP is an important member of RIM.

And before & after the arrest of Com. Gonzalo, and till a long time after the appearance of ROL too, MPP had represented PCP in international front. There was no any doubt about that representation at least up to 2000. So, seeing the problem of MPP like any of the reactionary groups will be seriously wrong. Secondly, for the above mentioned very cause, we think that, there lies a sect of well-organized, but wrong ideological-political positions and lines at the root of this attack of MPP. These lines have the main root in the historical lines of PCP in one way or other. Especially, it has relation with the 2LS arose within PCP. So, it will not be correct to see this role of MPP separately from PCP-related greater debate and 2LS in any way. It will be correct to mention here that, on the above mentioned line-questions RIM has not able to conduct any overall and broad 2LS within RIM till recent times [specially up to before 3rd plenum of CoRIM] too, [Here we are not discarding the bilateral struggles with PCP on some main questions from the part of CoRIM, and various evaluations and positions of different parties of RIM.]

Rather, this also can be told that specially up to '93, not a little amount of non-critical attitude about the lines of PCP was there firmly within RIM and RIM-supporter various groups. All these things had influenced a lot in the development of MPP-problems. And there have relations of these with MPP problems. Not only that, all these have serious negative impact over the whole of RIM because of huge amount of influence of the above mentioned non-critical attitude, and later on, for not conducting 2LS properly. So, the effort to solve the MPP-problem separately from the greater debate and 2LS within RIM cannot create good result. We have astonished with some comments in your letter, in which you have tried to see this just like a preplanned reactionary conspiracy by refusing this disgusting role of MPP as a part of 2LS.

We again expressing sorrow for saying that, the very style of MPP has been followed in a great extent in this case also who has been actually refusing the 2LS within PCP from the very beginning, and who has been trying to pose everything including ROL as a mere conspiracy of the enemy.

– Some opinions has been expressed very clearly in your letter about some historical lines of PCP. Even you have expressed some specific summed-up opinions about the connection of CG with ROL, and in its relation, about the millennium statement too. No doubt, all these evaluations are important, and demands for discussion. But what we have said earlier is to be repeated that, RIM never have reached to this type of evaluation as a whole. And it is matter of grief that, when MPP has drawn separation practically with RIM openly, only then these matters are being raised for discussion within RIM from the part of some member parties of RIM. It proves that, as a whole RIM has not been successful to deepen, develop and conduct this 2LS properly. Again we want to say that, we definitely are not discarding the debate and struggle of CoRIM with PCP since '94 and later on with MPP. But no over all discussion has been raised within RIM before the distribution of the copies of the letter of RCP and consultation of com. Avakian very recently. Certainly there were different observations of different parties.

As like as there were some positions and some observations of our party also on some important questions. We are not discarding any of these things. But, you cannot say that, the specific & clear opinions on so many basic questions you have said at present in your letter were raised previously within RIM as a whole, or discussed with importance, or any unified decision was taken about them. Rather, the opposite is true to a great extent, which has been expressed through the mistake in the millenium statement. Today, MPP has advanced a step forward in their way of wrong activities. In this situation, RIM cannot reach that place by a short run. It is not the reality of RIM. Rather, it is necessary to start from the previous works as a whole on the part of RIM. How much will it be methodologically correct to initiate the work through denouncing MPP openly without rectifying the previous mistakes on the line-basis?

-MPP has been described in your letter as a group of few persons in Europe, although you have given importance to their big bustle and clamour correctly. We do not have any idea about the size and status of MPP. We are not even interested about that in this discussion. Rather, we want to consider with importance that their line and activities are creating a lot of misunderstanding. All this misunderstanding is not happening owing to the size and contribution of MPP certainly. Rather, its cause is the prestige and historical role of PCP on line and on the other hand, since '93 onwards, the painful developments in the life of PCP. That PCP, which is an important member of RIM. You have told, MPP is using the prestige of PCP. There is no dissension that today MPP is using the prestige of PCP in its negative activities. But the big question is that, whether MPP itself is doing that, or today's PCP (or any part of that) is allowing to do that.

Question is that : what is the role of PCP about all of these things the PCP which is the member of RIM. Nobody knows it except the monotonous propaganda of MPP. It is you, who have told that there is none to represent PCP and its voice. If the reality is that, then such a party, which was a bright member of RIM in 80's and was giving leadership to a great people's war in the world Maoist movement what is the opinion and evaluation of RIM about that?

From all of these, the main subject of discussion to us is PCP, not MPP at all. Whom we call PCP what is its condition of existence now? How it is active? And what is its relation with todays MPP ?

All of these are the matters of a great investigation and conclusion. We do not think that you also have completed that. Or, if you did, we do not know whether the whole of RIM has reached at a final conclusion about that. In this overall situation, we are not ready to see the MPP-problems isolated from PCP-problem still now (which has been expressed in your letter), and we want to judge and solve the MPP-problem in the context & within the PCP-related greater 2LS (which has been neglected in your letter practically). There is a proverb prevailing in our country, "to menace the daughter-in-law by beating the daughter." It is not a Marxist methodology, and we do not think that you are doing the same. But there are many people in the world, and the very MPP may be the leading in that case who can think and those who can make people understand that you are doing this type of work.

* Now we want to disclose some of our opinions on some line-questions of PCP-related greater problem. From this, correct understanding of others, as well as yours, will develop about our position in debate within RIM around this matter and through deepening this debate we will also be able to attain more correct position.

To evaluate & sum-up the 2LS in PCP, we will have to be conscious about the phases of development of PCP-line. PCP-line up to '92 (up to the historical cage-speech) can be marked as its historical-line whose leadership was com. G. There is no any doubt or misunderstanding about it. After cage-speech, especially, since '93 i.e., after the emergence of ROL, another phase started. This stage can be divided into two sub-phases again. One is the period of time when RIM had contact with PCP/CC when we could know the line of PCP/CC directly or via media although this contact and understanding was becoming gradually weak side by side with the setback of PCP and people's war intensified.

Practically, this contact was cut before EM of 2000, and we were compelled to know about PCP through MPP. It also was breaking down totally after 2000-EM through the increased sectarian activities and through the all-out open attacks on RIM-parties and leadership recently by MPP. PCP line was not completely the same during this total period of the above mentioned two main phases, and the two parts of the later phase after the emergence of 2LS. Specially, there was and has been many peculiarities in publicized line and activities of PCP/CC (and later of MPP) in new arising situation naturally, after '93. Those cannot be placed entirely upon historical line of PCP. But in spite of all this particularities there has been some fundamental identity of line during this total period also.

So, we should be conscious about the identity and particularities of PCP-line in different phases. Continuity of historical line of PCP cannot laid down upon MPP totally. Which is demanded by it. At the same time this cannot be isolated from that also. To-day to make a correct evaluation about MPP-role, specially PCP-2LS, the most important subject which will come forward, is probably the Jefetura-debate. Which is again related with GT also. There is difference in the question also between the above-mentioned two phases, and between the two sub-phases of the second phase. But the basic foundation of this line was within the historical line of PCP, although we think that MPP has developed this grossly and sinisterly in later period.

The debate of this question of Jefetura, and relatedly the question of Thought is urgent for the reason that, we think there has been serious or the most principal role of this ideology behind the disgusting role of MPP. So, we will cite below in brief, the position and the evaluation of our party on this subject. In this connection, we will present some other basic line questions, which, in our opinion, has worked as serious source behind MPP-role. We think that all these line-questions should be discussed now within RIM.

Firstly, Jefetura. It is a matter of outlook and ideological line. This establish leadership above the line & the party. This is compelled to think that a leadership on the level of Jefetura cannot do mistake of serious mistake. As a result, this deviates from dialectics. And it takes shelter in idealism, which do not start from the objective fact, but starts from and ends at subjective belief. This is very clearly non-Marxist. In reality, this brings a kind of Peer-ist (a metaphysician in Islamic religion) religious faith inside the party in the name of Marxism. This line is now working inside MPP in case of evaluation of PCP-2LS is : as CG is Jefetura, that's why he cannot produce the right line (ROL); so, the propaganda which is going on that ROL is given by him, is completely the conspiracy of the enemy. And to express any doubt about this means to echo the conspiracy of the enemy, and to bring the line of enemy.

In this way, they are not in agreement to investigate the PCP-2LS to carry out effort in search of truth from fact, even to give recognition this as a 2LS. In this way, during a complex period of 2LS, and in a period of coming disaster, this line make MPP completely unprepared & fail to know the actual situation, to evaluate it and in taking step accordingly. The problem is that, although serious coarseness and negative development of MPP in this question has occurred, the basis of this fundamental line existed inside the historical line of PCP. This means that, MPP has not present any new line regarding this, although probably a qualitative development has occurred by them of the former line, which fundamentally has been moved away from the view-point of Marxist dialectical materialism.

In our country, and in Indian sub-continent, though not exactly like this, but a similar type of ideological stream is familiar to us for a long time. We have to struggle for a long period this type of ideological stream in case of evaluating the party founder com. Siraj Sikdar with in our party. This had been a big problem during the last 2LS in our party. Outside ours party, similar type of ideological stream on the question of com. Charu Mazumdar (CM) is still a big problem in Maoist movement of our country. Here, the language is used differently other than "Jefe". It is called "authoritative leadership", in which "authority" is separated from 'leadership'. In fact, fundamental origin of this type of individualistic-line was in Lin-Piao line. Our idea is that, there has been serious relation with not for struggling and realizing Lin-Pioism very correctly. This deviate towards a view-point and consciousness like religious faith instead of science.

It is a fact that the role of leadership may be or is different. There is a principal leadership in any party. But leadership like that, and the leadership who create the correct line of revolution & who leads a successful revolution is not of similar level. And it is also fact that, though the type of line and revolution are built up by people, proletarian class & party and the combined contribution of many important leaders within the party, the recognition and establishment of the special role of the most principal leadership is important. Such a leadership represents the role and unity of line, party, revolution and masses also. For this reason, line is introduced by the name of leadership; and the task of popularizing and protecting the leadership emerge as a distinct responsibility. But, in spite of all this, all kinds of leadership is the result of party, people, class and revolution. So, it is subordinate to all of those. And all kinds of leadership, even line, party and revolution is active under the law of dialectical materialism. Practically Jefetura-line rejects it.

All kinds of leadership is under the law of "one divides into two". Jefetura line rejects this. A serious root of all the wrong activities of MPP lies in this Jefetura line which still is not discussed in world communist movement properly.

So, it is necessary to discuss and clear this question properly within whole of RIM. And it is necessary to evaluate very deeply how this has appeared as a serious problem in the second phase of PCP. We cannot say with certainty that whether sincere comrades related to MPP are at all able to come back in this discussion and debate constructively. But responsibility has to be taken surely by RIM to struggle the negative existence and influence of such a line among the innumerable revolutionary and masses in that country and over the world, whom PCP had educated. And for this, an all-round debate should be conducted on this question and related other questions. MPP-problem will have to be solved through all of these.

The subject regarding the role of com. G is bound to come during summing up and evaluation of the 2LS in PCP. After long 12 years, RIM must be able now to say something very clearly on this question. In which case, enemy and ROL has been telling one kind of thing and MPP is telling totally opposite kind. Still we are not confirm according to information that Com. G himself had given the leadership in ROL what you have told, or RCP want to tell. Probably, more information and their analysis and synthesis are in your hand which we do not have. Whatever may be the role of Com. G, we want to give emphasis on view-point and line in case of observing this problem, not upon individual.

But we think that, personal role of such historical important leadership like Com. G can make important influence in Peru and international Maoist-movement. So, there will have to investigate and review with importance specially in the context of such contradictory claims and propaganda. And RIM should be careful & conscious in facing this problem correctly in principle & tactics. In line question, the matter in this case is that, Com. G is the exponent of ROL whether we will reject this demand totally from Jefetura-line, or will investigate and review that. Surely we cannot take under serious consideration just after something negative propagation about revolution. Revolutionary party and leadership from the part of enemy. Because our cunning and strong enemy side is very expert in false, slander, distortion and mispropaganda. But during the past long period, all such information have come in the fore with very certainty among which specially important is that, a large part of central and historical leaders of PCP has taken position on the side of ROL specially after their arrest which prove that, this is not absolutely an enemy slander or conspiracy, but a big 2LS has emerged within PCP from the very beginning.

This is normal that enemy is bound to take role in this according to its own interest and plan. But, for that, one cannot deny the 2LS emerged from within PCP. And it has been proved that such bunch of leaders are related to ROL in this 2LS, even MPP also is accepting this fact, and related other facts, the role of Com. G is bound to come under serious questions. But MPP is denying all these things from Jefetura-line, not from any facts and findings. This positions of MPP should be rejected very definitively.

Our idea is that, Jefetura-line is also closely related with MPP-line about "Thought". This also is basically a line of PCP, not a line only of MPP. Our class is international and its ideology is internationalist. So, our class ideology cannot be developed nationally, and cannot be applicable only nationally. Although, successful revolutions of different countries keep important contributions in the development of our ideology. But this contribution keep role in the development ideology just when that has international applicability. And this is so because the successful proletarian revolution of any country is occurred as a part of world revolution. PCP, during all the phases of its development, before '93 and later on, and during the MPP-era, has raised GT in manners of various trends and self-contradictory trends On the one side they raised Com. G as the fourth sword, greatest living Maoist etc. Here it seems that they had wanted to bring the international sense of GT.

But in spite of this, they have marked GT as principally the application of MLM in the particular context of Peru. And the important matter is that, when they had raised their Thought in Peru, they side by side said about the separate Thoughts for different countries too. In this way they have given a national shape to GT in one hand, but has raised this as the principal aspect of ideology side by side. In this way, internationalism has been cut to short in case of ideology. International work like, such as in the question of RIM, their cold and distance keeping relation all the way was not an isolated problem from their nationalist deviation attached to their Thought-question. If we do not consider it, we will make mistake. Although at the later period CG's time, activeness of PCP in RIM was somewhat increased, he calls for unity with RIM in his cage-speech but the role of PCP in making development of line and organization (international) through internationalist unity & developing 2LS in it cannot be told ideal and should not be followed.

This influence and tendencies linked to the serious deviation in later period. Our idea is that, even these are connected with their basic ideological line of realization about Thought. Certainly there is a relation of today's factional & sectarian activities and anti-RIM activities of MPP with this nationalist tendency and deviation. Though this deviation has been developed now qualitatively, and has become a serious threat to the whole RIM-spirit. So, we think that, very deep review and debate are necessary upon the historical position of PCP-question and in later period MPP-line on Thought-question. Because, our idea is that, it has also serious influence with in the whole of RIM.

Here we want to mention two more subjects from the important lines, which are active behind to-days disgusting role of MPP. The evaluation of world situation, such as, crisis of imperialism & revolutionary situation and people's war these two are two fundamental subjects. Here we will not discuss elaborately about this. But what is necessary to mention is in spite of the basis of some unanimity among Maoists world over on these two fundamental subjects, there has been widespread diversity within the whole Maoist movement. This is going on since long ago continuously. RCP leader com. Avakian has raised some fundamental summed-up opinion on these questions. Very deep debate & review is necessary on these matters. MPP has adopted irresponsible split, antagonism and slander instead of conducting healthy debate. We oppose it seriously. But we think that, this has not arisen simply from a well-planned effort of blaming CoRIM, RCP or com. Avakian, as you have mentioned, although someone or other may advance in that manner from within or outside of MPP and can take chance of this situation.

However, we are not unconscious about that. We see in Maoist movement in our country also that, by making war or armed struggle the basic criteria to evaluate every thing. Some line were active for a long time which branded those who are not engaged in war just now, as anti-PW, anti-Maoism, anti-revolution, even telling them agent of imperialism. Still now, these lines has strong existence. This is not Maoism. But still many Maoists think in this manner which has very deep ideological-political basis and continuity of the past.

Under this whole situation, we think that RIM should stress special emphasis on debate and review on a series of serious line questions & should not run behind the tail of MPP's serious negative role of today. And for the sake of this task, we should not give any chance for more destructive works to organizations like MPP. Because, RIM has not still reach to any unified position upon all these questions. The fact is that, no profound debate has been conducted on these subjects within RIM except recent few months. There is a secret relation of MPP-problem with this weakness. We are saying this because RIM not only represents the advance line of world Maoists, it represents the unity of all sincere Maoists also.

Our responsibility is to make development to research, review, debate and 2LS on various basic questions which are not solved. Evaluation and summation of PCP-2LS is an important part of that. To accomplish this task on a world scale is a complex and hard work within world arena. But we are to do that. In the meantime CoRIM has initiated that too. In such a situation very simplistic solution of the problem by banishing with the irresponsible activities like MPP, is not at all wise. We do not think that, there is no influence of existence with in RIM of those which MPP tells on different lines. Rather, our idea is that there is widespread existence of those in different form in vivid fields.

There are more than one RIM-supporter groups in our country who represent many things of MPP-line. Its main reason is that MPP tells many such things which are the continuity of historical lines of PCP. At least those are not against that. And many other subjects such as these, which have not been solved for a long time in communist movement. On the other side, some important members of RIM have presented or is presenting such lines and summations, which may appear unexpectedly new to many. And which, in fact, are even contradictory to previous experiences also. In this situation, if RIM becomes able to advance unitedly towards the solution of these fundamental line-questions by taking them in hand one by one. Then we will be able to solve the MPP-type problems also correctly. And that will be real act of responsibility and help to our comrades in Peru and sincere Maoists world-over.

RIM should be surely freed from the serious splitist and irresponsible odd-activities through the process of development of this basic task step by step. We are not telling to deduct that. Surely we will not allow to downgrade the dignity of our international leaders. But for that sake, our steps should be well considered and wise. We hope that, your struggling and hard-bitten party will understand our positions from this letter and will be able to be free from any panic for nothing.

Yours sincerely— International Department, Central Committee, PBSP/CC October/05 *****