

THE STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON THE RECENT SPLIT IN THE PROLETARIAN PARTY OF PURBO BANGLA (PBSP)/BANGLADESH

Published: May 1999

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Paul Saba and Sam Richards.

Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the Creative Commons Common Deed. You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors and proof readers above.

All the party supporters and revolution-seeking progressive political activists-sympathizers are being informed that a tragic split has occurred in our beloved party and the leading force of the Maoist revolution in this country, the Proletarian Party of Purbo Bangla (PBSP). Three of the main leaders of the Party, who are known as Comrade A, B and C in the Party, have led that split. First, in November last year, Comrade B and C left Party along with their followers. Later, in March this year Comrade A and his followers also left the Party. According to the latest information, both these factions, after leaving party through totally denying the guidance of CC, have formed their own centers. Comrade A has declared a centre called “the Maoist Bolshevik Reorganization Movement” of Proletarian Party of Purbo Bangla (MBRM/PBSP), and Comrades B/C have named their center as “the Maoist Reorganizing Center” of Proletarian Party of Purbo Bangla (PBSP)(MPK). Thus despite the highest flexible efforts on the part of the Central Committee to preserve the party unity, through formally forming separate centers, these comrades have completely left the Party.

Why and how have these splits taken place?

For the last five years several serious existing dissents have acted as the basis behind this split. We, the Maoists call, the guideline that exists in party of the questions of ideology, program, path, and tactics for revolution, the Party Line. Any debate/struggle as a result of basic reversal disagreements and contradictions with different aspects of the line or any of its components, is called two-line struggle or 2LS. We, Maoists believe

that differences always exist within party, what can develop into major or minor two line struggles. It's very much natural and is a objective law. But these struggles don't always result in splits, nor it should be so. In party the definite policy-discipline exist to conduct struggle around disagreements, on which the 2LS can proceed while maintaining the party unity. Decisions adopted by the majority in the party's national congress or different conferences (like the expanded meeting) or by the meetings of different bodies (like the CC) have to be applied by the entire party. Even while internal disagreements continue to exist, the Maoist party can unitedly go forward through this method. As long as the central line of the party has not degenerated into a clear anti-revolutionary line or a revolution-rejecter line, defending of the party unity is of basic principle for the Maoists. Making split in a revolutionary party and among the masses is considered a serious crime for the Maoists. Such split helps the enemy and hinders the advance of the party, revolution and the masses.

Those comrades, who have left the party and formed separate centers, have violated the guide line of com. Mao and caused serious damage to the party, revolution and masses.

Comrades and friends,

You, All know that under the leadership of our party at the period of '89 there was a major nationwide outbreak of great-armed struggle that faced a setback in face of heavy suppression by the state machinery under the tutelage of Ershad government, which was in power at that period. After that setback, Party concentrated its efforts on the task of summing up that experience and in the year 1992 the Third Congress was held to finalize that summation. In that Congress and on the basis of the summation some basic changes were made to the party line, especially on the political and military line

On political line, the Congress put forward the class contradiction by correcting the nationalist deviation of the past 25 years. At the same time on socio-economic analysis, Congress adopted the evaluation of "Imperialist-dependent distorted and underdeveloped capitalism" instead of the evaluation "semi-feudal". And the principal contradiction was identified as the contradiction between imperialist lackey bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie versus workers peasants and the broad masses, though the land-distribution was maintained as a basic program.

On the other hand, on military line "the line of annihilation" of the past 20-years was changed. Instead of it, party adopted the line of keeping the state armed forces, and not the local enemy, as the main target from the beginning of the war to lead it forward from a position of total war, in which the selective annihilation was also considered an important form of action. At the same time the Congress continued upholding the line that developed in the post-SS ten years practice. The post-SS ten years achieve line development of RGU (Regular Guerilla Unit)-based defense & attack in face of enemy repression in mass-base depended concentrated region centering on program

implementation/establish of people's power instead of the SS period-followed line of secret work & irregular guerrilla based countrywide sporadic seizure of police station & out posts in the past (at SS-period), was continued.

These new positions on political and military line were adopted basically unanimously in the Congress.

⌘ After the Congress at the end of '92/beginning of '93, on the basis of these new lines, the Party again concentrated its attention in building up new struggle. But in the course of doing so, the problem of party's subjective weakness for preparation for a total war came to the fore. And the question of developing a concrete line for preparation has come up. The 2LS first started at the central level over the summation of this experience and answering new questions. It then gradually became related with the whole subject of the military line, as well as with the evaluation/ summation of the past party lines.

In the 4th session of the CC in '94. the problems of military line were very clearly expressed. During '95 and '96 that contradiction gradually sharpened and spread over aspects of the line and activities of the party. However, until the split in '98, the problems of the military line were the central point of the debate and the contradiction within the party.

⌘ An expanded Meeting (EM) was held in '96 to take a decision on the contradiction over the military line, as well as on this 2LS as a whole. (In our party, if congress is not able to be organized then EM can be held instead, where decision on different line positions as well as organizational matters such as formation/reorganizations of the central forum are taken. This is established by the party Constitution). The Secretary Comrade Anawar Kabir was endorsed by an absolute majority (this line got 70% vote). The other dissident positions altogether got the remaining 30%.

At the same EM all the dissident comrades pledged implement the line adopted by the congress and the EM and to maintain the Party unity.

⌘ But only few days after the EM, especially in '97 and '98 the main dissidents started to create obstacle to the implementation of the adopted line very aggressively, they violated the Central guide and directions, formed factions against the center and started extensive activities to split the party. And finally through leaving party, they violated the very commitment they had taken in the EM.

⌘ In the long 5 years of 2LS, no dissident comrade has offered a firm-settled, consolidated and comprehensive line on military line. (Though com. A had submitted an overall document in '95, but it was an amalgam of several line positions and few days after being defeated by the side of Secretary-line he declared the suspension of his concluding chapter on proposed tasks). Despite that, whenever and whatever opposition/logic/partial-position was raised by them, was distributed among different levels of the party according to the constitutional law, especially those were discussed in the CC and each and every time those were refuted by the CC in Written form.

Apart from political and military line question, all their different opinions on other questions, including on mass-origination, on front, on international activities, on democratic-centralism have analyzed, answered and refuted by the CC in written form. Every time after being refuted the stepped backward, and took shelter by raising opposition over newer subjects.

In the last period, they were requested to submit their overall line, including on political and military questions in written form to be circulated among different levels of party six months before the Congress according to the Party Constitution. Even though the main dissidents had been demoted from CC membership in different periods because of their serious opposition on line question, but in the whole period of five years nobody was demoted from the policy-maker forum. But now instead of continuing the 2LS by submitting documents representing their overall line, they have left party even despite having enough scope in the party to continue the struggle. This the proof of their weakness on line questions and it exposes their defeat in the partial 2LS.

▫ After leaving party, they are now offering new statement/analysis/views on several questions of line (which is good). In the past 5 years also they have raised several positions in different times and after being defeated in debate they have raised newer questions.

— The “Bolshevik Movement” is now saying that the party line is revisionist. Their main logic is that any kind of armed or unarmed preparation for the People’s War means rejection of war and rejection of revolution. According to revolutionary politics, this view is very much vulgar mechanical, one-sided and non-Maoist— and it is already been refuted by the CC with clear analysis. Their accusation against the CC for violating the Constitution absurd. But they themselves have rejected the line of the Third Congress and the Expanded Meeting on both fields of military and political lines. And therefore the themselves are violating the Constitution very clearly.

Not only that, this faction and its leader Com. A are branding one of the party’s glorious periods, the ten years (eighties) period as non-revolutionary. So, in this way they are not only violating the Constitution but they are rejecting the very party through opposing one of the main chapters of the history.

— On the other hand MPK has not said that the Party CC is revisionist, even after leaving the party. But they formed a separate center after breaking away from the party. Thus they have been nakedly violating Com. Mao’s guide : “Be united and don’t split”. To cover-up that crime they are slandering that as if CC has throw them out of the Party.

In their evaluation of the Party and the CC, the MPK resorted to dirty opportunism and deceit. On the one hand they are saying they don’t consider the CC to be revisionist, but they are trying create divisions in the mass organization by attacking the party line calling it “revisionist politics”. On the one hand they are saying that the party line is non-revolutionary, but on the other had they consider the CC to be a revolutionary center.

By this way this faction are exposing their degenerated ideology and self-contradictory line-position every day.

After breaking up the party and forming a separate center, the MPK is calling on all the splinters of the party to unite. This is nothing but a sly tactic on the question of party unity— first breaking the party and later raising empty slogans for unity. Id really they want unity then why did they split? It nothing but the bourgeois ideology of sharing post and power. Otherwise without a minimum solution to the differences in line, this unity-line is eclectic and anti-Maoist.

Before the split the B/C's position and criticism against the CC on revolutionary politics, on the matter of abandoning war, revolution, SS, and Mao was the same as A's position. Practically, they were all united against the CC in opposing the task of revolutionary preparation, or the task of gaining material strength for a real Maoist people's war, on the basis of their one-sided and non-Maoist understanding of the point "Guerrilla war from zero". But after split, MPK took a 180° turn and in the name of preparation they made the working in open mass-organization as their principle task. In this way this faction once again expressed their degraded and unprincipled position and right line in essence.

— By raising the flag of Com. SS, both these fractions are trying to pretend that the CC has abandoned SS. It is nothing but an absolute lie, because the Third Congress had evaluated Com. SS as a great Maoist revolutionary leader and the CC wholeheartedly agrees with this. In fact, they were the ones who abandoned the unanimous position of dialectical summation of Com. SS line (adopted in the Third Congress). Even though they also consider many aspects of Com. SS to be wrong, but are not saying those openly and are trying to dishonestly use the image of Com. SS.

— On the field of military line both the factions in the last 5 long years have established a history of several shameful somersaults. Com. A once said that he was the developer of the Third Congress line and the Third Congress line and the SS-line were basically the same. Then he said that SS did not uphold any "annihilation" line, that he (A) is the follower of the '73-'74 line, and blamed the CC for following a "reformist" "annihilation-line". Now with a full tumble his "Bolshevik Movement" is saying that the "tactics" of annihilation of SS was correct. Through this he not only express the unsteadiness of his line, but also expressed the inability to understand the differentiation between accepting annihilation as a form of action in the total war and the annihilation-line followed by the party in the past 20-years.

On the other hand Com. B first said that he wanted the armed struggle of the 20 years no mor, and we have to apologize to the masses for this, thus he has rejected the 20-years. But now B/C's MPK is saying that 20-years has been rejected that by the CC and they are in favor of the 20-years and the annihilation-line.

Specially, neither group has been able to present an overall summation of the pre '90 struggle of 20-years. They some times upholds SS-line, some times ten years, some

times Pyarabagan, some times '73-'74 and lately they are upholding the annihilation-line. In this process they have fallen in an anarchic situation over one of the main line question of revolution— i.e. the military line.

— In the field of political line both the factions in socio economic analysis are saying “semi-feudalism”. But on the question of the principal contradiction they are totally silent. By this way they abandon the unanimous line of the Third Congress. And they are avoiding Party’s established heritage of determining the principal contradiction and the contributions of Com. SS. But on this question at the time when they were in the party, during all of last 5 years they did not conduct even a minimum of 2LS through making any explanatory-analytical document. Only Com. A raised some opinions against the Third Congress line on this question in '98 in the course of criticizing the activities in one region in relation to one particular incident. To refute that opinion the CC responded in writing and called on Com. A to present his debate-analysis. But instead of doing so he has divided the party.

Besides exposing refuting and struggling against serious wrong position of dissidents and denouncing the serious sin of splitting the party, we are saying that, as much as we know about their line, we still don't consider them to be totally revisionist or non-revolutionary. On MLM, stage of revolution, enemy-ally-principal force, the path of rural area based protracted people's war, support to RIM— etc., that is, on basic ideological-political questions we have unity with them. So, we consider this split a serious mistake.

That's why from the beginning we have proposed to them, that if they accept the Maoist character of the party, if they dismantle their factional centers and seek unity with party, party will certainly consider it. We believe that being united in party, the existing disagreements under the above mentioned line-frame should be solved through internal 2LS, and party unity should be maintained through the implementation of the majority-line.

But the dissidents have not listened to this call by the CC and have heightened their splittist activities.

This will have a negative effect upon the revolution and the masses of Purbo Bangla. It would damage the Maoist revolution. And the enemies of revolution and the revisionists will gain profit. Under the leadership of the CC, the party cadres-sympathizers of all levels very clearly and firmly believe that party can advance forward by defeating this type of splitting acts. The Party certainly overcome the damages caused by this split by developing the party-line further through this 2LS, by more dynamically guiding the party as a disciplined centralized party and most importantly through advancing the revolutionary struggle on basis of Party's Maoist line.

Through the dissidents have left the party but the party is continuing and will continue the 2LS against their wrong line. In this way on each and every line question the CC will struggle, will defeat the wrong line and through will also develop its own line. The party is firmly promised in its position to defeat their factional splitting line.

At the same time the party will maintain the united-front line with them. In the mean time we have made this call to them through a written document, though still they have not responded to that.

We want to inform to the class conscious working class, politically advanced people and progressive political activists of this country that, in the past whenever anybody has tried to split our party, they have eventually failed. The splitter forces including Fazlu-Sultan in '72, Ziauddin-Rana-Arif in '75, "Sotta" faction in '76 succeeded to create complex situation for the party but ultimately they were all defeated. We are sure, this time, it will be the same. In the mean time the majority of the leaders, cadres and sympathizers are firmly united under the leadership of the Central Committee and they sharply denounce the sinful activities of these few splitter forces. We firmly believed that, by learning from Maoist teachings through the complex 2LS and in process of practical revolutionary struggle the miss-guided sincere revolutionaries certainly will come-back to the Party and those who are incorrigible will be thrown in the garbage—this the teaching of the history.

We are calling on all levels of well-wishers of party & revolution : maintain firm confidence on the genuine Maoist revolutionary party in this country, the Proletarian Party of Purbo Bangla (PBSP), under the leadership of the party's Central Committee guided by Comrade Anwar kabir, and continue your assistance to the party. To understand the on going 2Ls in a better way, study the circulated party documents. Please help our Party by giving your suggestions.

The victory of the Party, revolution and the masses is inevitable.!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

Long live Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM)!

Long live martyr Comrade Shiraj Sikdar!

Long live Proletarian Party of Purbo Bangla (PBSP)/Bangladesh!