

The out and out Revisionist Character of the Soviet Leadership Revealed

Recently, by the end of the month of June this year, the Soviet leader, Mr. Brezhnev visited U.S.A. and met President Nixon in a summit meeting. After the end of the summit a joint communique was issued by both the leaders.

It was stated that the agreement referred to various international problems like the avoidance of global war, relaxation in tension of the international relations, maintenance of peace in Indo-China, a quickest possible settlement in the Middle East etc.

Apart from this the other significant outcome of the said accord was the signing of a pact between the two countries intended to strengthen trade and commerce between them.

Reactions in different countries

For obvious reasons, the joint communique issued after the said summit meeting and the different comments and observations made by Mr. Brezhnev, the Soviet leader, created different reactions in different countries. While most of the imperialist powers of Europe expressed their satisfaction over the agreement and a spokesman of the British Government had even made the comment that 'the two sides seemed to take the interests of the other NATO countries fully into account'; (Statesman dated 26.6.73), most of the countries in African and Asian soils expressed their apprehension and strong feeling of dissatisfaction over the accord.

A large-scale public-expression of disappointment and bitterness was noted in the Arab world. A large number of countries expressed their apprehension over the danger of the growing super-power domination which they suspected might underlie this agreement between the two big powers.

The attitude of India was also not uncritical. The aspirant Indian bourgeoisie did not accept the said agreement in good humour. While a spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry on being asked, expressed the caution that "the Indian Government maintains that all countries big and small, should be safeguarded and no arrangements should be brought about which would be at the

expenses of the other countries, (Statesman dated 27.6.73). Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India while she was in Canada expressed her fear that the leaders of these two big powers might carve up the world into areas of super-power influence. The different news so far published also indicate that both Peking and Hanoi for justified reasons were apprehensive of the said agreement and would carefully observe the course of events that might follow the summit meeting held between the two big powers.

Policy of peaceful co-existence

Now, even if we refrain ourselves from accepting the observation made by many, that the Soviet Union along with the USA were attempting to carve up the world into areas of super power influence we cannot help but observe that the fighting people all over the world once again witness that the present revisionist leadership of the party of Lenin and Stalin, fully abandoning the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism in the name of peaceful co-existence, is pursuing the policy of peaceful capitulation and thereby giving worst type of undue concessions to the imperialist powers.

The policy of peaceful co-existence as understood by the revolutionaries is a complex revolutionary means to create conditions to make it possible for the people in all countries to determine

(Contd. to page 2)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
(Fortnightly)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL. 7

15th SEPTEMBER, '73

PRICE 15 P.

No. 3

SATURDAY

Air Surcharge 4. P.

Three Parties Observe Martyrs' Day

Martyrs' Day was observed under the joint auspices of SUC, RSP and FB through-out the State of West Bengal on August 31 last in memory of the more-than two hundred food-marchers who laid down their lives on this historic day in 1959.

On behalf of these three parties and various other democratic organisations, wreaths were placed at the Martyrs' column in Subodh Mallik Square at Calcutta in the morning.

Before the leaders placed the wreath, members of the Komsomol, the young communist organisation of SUC presented a *march past* before the martyrs' column. The two squadrons of young boys and girls, dressed in immaculate white, paraded round the column with the Red Flag half-mast, presented a moving scene.

Those who placed floral wreaths at the Martyrs' column included Com. Nihar Mukherjee, Secretary W B State Committee of the SUCI, the RSP leader Com. Makhan Pal, the FB leader Com. Nalini Guha, Com. Gayatri Das Gupta on behalf of SUC Calcutta District Committee, Com. Ganesh Das Gupta on behalf of UTUC (Lenin Sarani), Com. Gopal Kanjilal (DYO), Com. Chhaya Mukherjee (DSO), Com. Pranab Chakraborty (Pathikrit), Com. Renuka Roy Choudhury (Mahila Sans-

(Contd. to page 6)

The Central Committee Statement on the U.S-Backed Coup in Chile

The Central Committee of the SUCI in a statement to the Press, issued on 13th Sept. said "The recent heinous US-backed military coup in Chile, ousting democratically elected President Salvador Allende and his subsequent assassination is yet another glaring example of naked imperialist attack on the sovereignty of and interference in the internal affairs of weaker nations. It is also an eye-

opener to those who still bear the illusion that socialism can be achieved without revolution by capturing governmental or presidential power through bourgeois democratic parliamentary process and the ready-made bourgeois state machinery can be transformed into a socialist state through administrative cum state-structural reforms and constitutional changes."

Either the Soviet Leadership are Befeared by Peace Manoeuvring Tactics of Nixon or They are Hand-in-Glove with the U.S. Imperialists

(Contd. from page 1)

their own destiny without being interfered and intervened by any foreign country under whatsoever pretext and help accelerating the course of revolutionary struggles in capitalist countries and national liberation struggles in colonies and semi-colonies which in the present situation are part and parcel of world proletarian revolution. The objects of pursuance of the policy of peaceful co-existence are the preservation of world peace and the putting up of an effective check so that the imperialists cannot interfere into the internal affairs of any country under any pretext. These are the two main purposes of the policy of peaceful co-existence. Hence it is neither a political manoeuvre nor a means for concluding peace treaties or non-aggression pacts which the imperialists and capitalist countries often make.

We have repeatedly noted that the present revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union totally failed to realise the revolutionary significance of the policy of peaceful co-existence. All the international treaties and agreements that the leadership of the Soviet Union concluded with the imperialists and capitalist countries and the way they are behaving with them on all international issues, since the twentieth party Congress, i.e., since Mr. Khrushchev came to power, have clearly testified their out and out anti-Marxist-Leninist revisionist character and their total failure in correctly handling the contradictions of the international politics.

Not only that. Also it might appear to any sensible man that with days passing on, all the events that happened since the twentieth party congress including this latest summit have revealed that solely with the motive of increasing their respective spheres of influence, the

leadership of Soviet Union are hand-in-glove with the US imperialists to enter into nefarious agreements and mutual understandings, detrimental to the cause of revolutionary struggles in capitalist countries and liberation struggles in colonies and semi-colonies.

In this connection some relevant portions of the present communique may be cited once more in support of our contention.

In the said communique it was stated that 'the agreement pledged that the two countries would refrain from using or threatening the use of force against any country, while reserving the right of military action for self-defense or to honour obligations to allies.' (Stateman—23-6-73)

Any sensible man would understand that such an agreement would never check the imperialists from pursuing the heinous criminal policy of creating local and partial wars here and there in the interests of themselves and their stooges. For after this agreement, how would one blame them in their endeavour to honour obligations to their puppets posed as allies and thereby nakedly interfere into the internal affairs of any country, endangering its freedom and sovereignty?

For obvious reasons, we firmly hold the view that the Soviet leadership have not only utterly violated the basic principle of non-interference of any country into the internal affairs of any other country, on the contrary they have given their stamp on the imperialist policy of continuous interference and aggression under the garb of honouring 'obligations to allies' a language the imperialists use at the time of peace manoeuvre. Shameless indeed for the leadership of Soviet Union who still claim themselves to be the rightful inheritors of Lenin and Stalin.

Brezhnev policy of appeasement and peace manoeuvring tactics of Nixon

Again in the said communique, it was noted with satisfaction that 'positive trends are developing in international relations towards the further relaxation of tensions and strengthening of co-operative relations in the interests of peace' (Statesman dated 25-6-73.)

In this regard Mr. Brezhnev was said to have made the comment that the cold war was virtually over. He further stated that 'the mankind had outgrown the rigid armour of the cold war, although some of its dismal influences could still be felt' (Statesman dated 25.6.73).

It is astonishing that by all these means Mr. Brezhnev is trying in vain to make us believe that the character of the imperialists has fundamentally changed and they sincerely desire world peace! But the people who are engaged in revolutionary struggles in capitalist countries and in anti-imperialist struggles in colonies and semi-colonies, who have bitterly experienced and are still experiencing all the sinister designs and criminal activities of the imperialists—will they be befooled by Mr. Brezhnev?

Mr. Brezhnev stated that the cold war was virtually over. Even if for the moment one keeps aside the past activities of the imperialists still then anyone might ask, what about the arms aid that recently USA provided to Iran and thereby took into cognisance the latter's plea that she would have to fortify her defence to frustrate any possible attack on her sovereignty by Soviet Union, no possible indication of which was however suspected in reality by anyone other than US-dictated Iran?

What role the Seventh Fleet in Indian Ocean would

have to play other than from keeping constant watch on the countries in the adjoining region including Soviet Union and thereby keeping alive tension in this region? What about these old and new, more subtle, sinister designs and nefarious tactics that are still being pursued by the US imperialists in different parts of the world and particularly in Indo-China and Vietnam even after Vietnam treaty? Do all these incidents prove that the imperialists have given up the pursuance of their old path of gansterism, constant interference and naked aggression?

We would not have taken any serious note of what Mr. Brezhnev stated had we not the apprehension that this would only help to create confusion about the attitude and activities of the imperialists among the people and unarm them in their fight against the imperialists.

The hobnobbing between the two leaders went so far that Mr. Brezhnev completely forgot the heinous role played by the US gangsters and their NATO allies in the arena of international politics for safeguarding their imperialistic interests and even certified them by stating that the USA and its NATO allies were not solely responsible for the cold war and blamed both sides (meaning thereby USA and its allies on the one hand and the socialist countries along with the people fighting the imperialists on the other—Ed. board. Prol. Era) for the 'poisoned' relations.

Now, if anyone would have thought that the policy of appeasement pursued by the Soviet leaders towards the US imperialists would at least have a limit, then he might become astonished to note that it knew no bound. For, it might appear to him that with a view to keep the U.S. imperialists in good humour like their faithful

(Contd. to page 3)

Setting up of Offices of the American Monopoly Corporation Would Help Restoration of Capitalism in USSR

(Contd. from page 2)

friend, Mr Brezhnev not only tried to shield them by putting defensive arguments in their favour, but even attempted to release the heavy burden of heinous criminal activities off their shoulder and squarely put the responsibility of the same on the socialist countries and the freedom loving people of different countries fighting against the imperialists and capitalist forces for the cause of world revolution. How shameless it is on the part of the leader of the party once led by Lenin and Stalin.

Moreover, Mr. Brezhnev strongly certified Mr. Nixon by stating that the present peaceful policies pursued by the President would be supported by the people. (Statesman 26. 6. 73).

We wonder that Mr. Brezhnev in his frantic attempt to appease Mr. Nixon started just the reverse of what actually happened and tried to pose the chief architect of imperialist designs and tactics as a champion of peace before the world people. We are confident that not only that the world people would not be befooled by Mr. Brezhnev's observation, even a section of the people of America who knew Nixon no less better than Mr. Brezhnev would least hesitate to regard these comments of Mr. Brezhnev as glaring example of worst type of revisionist game. For, how could anyone forget that the other day, it was the desire of peace of a section of the American people that promoted vigorous and mighty anti-Vietnam war demonstration in America and thereby gave a strong blow to Mr. Nixon and his Government pursuing the heinous policy of worst type of gangsterism in Vietnam.

Now, from all these, one

thing appears as clear as daylight. Either the present revisionist leadership of Soviet Union, since they have become victims of U. S. nuclear blackmailing and thereby suffering from the fear complex of nuclear war, have been unconsciously befooled by the peace manoeuvring tactics of Mr. Nixon or they are hand-in-glove with the US imperialists to increase their respective spheres of influence.

It is known to all that a situation of acute economic crisis in America, intensified world public opinion against America's naked offensive war policy, the defeat of U.S. policy of containing China, the sign of victory of the consistently tough anti-imperialist policy of the Peoples' Republic of China, powerful peace movement within the soil of America directed against Nixon Administration for stopping war and withdrawing all its troops from Vietnam, and above all major military debacles one after another of US imperialists suffered at the hands of the freedom fighters of Vietnam—all these factors forced President Nixon to shift over from war manoeuvres to peace manoeuvres.

Our party has of course made a correct assessment of this peace manoeuvring tactics of Mr. Nixon and stated 'We are observing a phase, though a very temporary phase, when the US imperialist rulers are trying to switch over from war manoeuvres to peace manoeuvres, the two edges of the same American imperialist policy' (Prol. era. dt. 15.8.71). This imperialist policy of continuous interference and aggression is sometimes expressed in the form of war manoeuvres and at other times in the form of peace

manoeuvres. The phase of war manoeuvres is marked by continuous indulgence in localised wars while the phase of peace manoeuvres is marked by attempts to come out of war impasse and gain a temporary respite from the adverse effects of war.

Middle East and Vietnam

In the said summit meeting held between USA and USSR, other than making some mutual arrangements best known to them, no current international problem was correctly tackled by the leadership of Soviet Union. In regard to the problem of Middle East no advancement was noted. Mr. Brezhnev himself too recognised his failure in arriving at a settlement of the Middle East problem and described the Arab-Israeli conflict as "dark cloud" overshadowing his "successful" (?) summit with President Nixon. For obvious reasons, the Cairo daily *Al Gomhouriya* commented that Mr. Brezhnev achieved 'no progress at all' on Middle East in his talks with Mr. Nixon. Moreover, an editorial chided the Soviet side for allegedly accepting American terminology in regard to "balance of forces" in Middle East.

We have already mentioned before that Hanoi was apprehensive of the possible consequences of the said accord. For obvious reasons she has her own reasons to be concerned over the outcome of the Nixon-Brezhnev summit.

We have repeatedly reiterated in the past that it is the weak-kneed policy of the leadership of Soviet Union that was mostly responsible for providing grists to US war designs in Vietnam.

It was due to the out and out revisionist and hackneyed policy of the leadership of

Soviet Union who are victims of US Nuclear blackmailing that Soviet Union not only failed to take any measured step to stick and enforce the policy of peaceful coexistence and thereby check the interference of the US imperialists in Vietnam which as the mighty socialist country in the world was her bounden duty and obligation, moreover she aided the patriotic fighters of Vietnam with only conventional weapons but the type of military help required to smash the attempts of US gangsterism and drive the US death merchants out of South East Asia and the adjoining Pacific region was never made available to them.

We hold the view that it was the revisionist policy pursued by the Soviet leadership since the time of Khrushchev to the present day leading to their capitulation to US Nuclear blackmailing that is basically responsible for the absence of effective military aid to combat US offensives; otherwise the patriotic fighters of Vietnam would have liberated their motherland long before.

Very recently, the East European sources reported a significant drop in Soviet arms supply to Vietnam. To the freedom loving people all over the World this would appear as something alarming, causing their anxiety as it might endanger the freedom of the people of Vietnam surrounded by the countries under the control of US puppets and naval bases controlled by the US imperialists.

Economic Co-operation

Now we would like to draw the attention of our readers to one of the important aspects of the present summit—the issue of economic co-operation between USA and USSR. This time the matter of economic co-operation was given more emphasis than that was given to the same in the past and as the report goes 'with fiftytwo top American businessmen looking on, US and Soviet

(Contd. to page 4)

Possibility of Anti-China Design Cannot be Altogether Ruled Out in Nixon-Brezhnev Accord

(Contd. from page 3)

officials ratified agreements to lay plans for establishing a joint chamber of commerce.' (Statesman—23.6.73). What is that Mr. Brezhnev best knows! Moreover, it was stated that 'the Soviet Government announced that it would permit ten top American monopoly corporations to establish offices in Moscow, and further stated that it was considering accrediting still more US firms'. (Statesman dated 23.6.73).

Both the leaders agreed that the relations between the two countries would be strengthened by the creation of a permanent foundation of economic relationships. It was further decided that the two countries should aim at a total of two to three billion dollars of trade over the next three years.

Now, in normal peace time a socialist country may always enter into relations of trade and commerce even with capitalist countries and as such there is nothing wrong in it. But the existing state of affairs in Soviet Union is quite different. Though the state is still now Socialist in character, but since the revisionists usurped the leadership of the party and the state power, and as a result of the revisionist process of so called liberalisation and democratisation started by the said leadership, signs of decline are gradually becoming more evident in social, cultural, political and economic fields. More and more degradations of moral, ethical and cultural values are being sharply revealed.

In the economic field, degradation being more and more intensified, the socialist economy is gradually becoming endangered by the growing tendencies of restoration of capitalism.

Failing to realise the real significance of the basic economic law of socialism

i.e. of demand running ahead of production which was followed till the Stalin period, and the advantage of the said law over capitalism the Khrushchevite leadership, adopted certain measures in the most unplanned and adventurous manner that only helped in creating ugly symptoms of restoration of capitalism and thereby gave birth to speculation, incentives, anarchy in production and other similar types of evils of the capitalist economy. The system of profit was introduced to give incentive to the workers and the spheres of commodity production and commodity circulation were extended to provide incentive to the collective farmers.

In such a state of affairs, what purpose would the setting up of the offices of the American monopoly corporations in Soviet Union, permanent economic foundation and the joint Chamber of Commerce serve? Would they help strengthen socialist economy or accentuate the process of restoration of capitalism in the country where once the freedom loving workers and people all over the world experienced the emergence of their much cherished first socialist state in the history of mankind?

We urge upon the world people in general and the people of Soviet Union in particular to immediately put an effective check to the nefarious activities of the revisionist leadership of Soviet Union, for, if they are allowed to continue their revisionist game, then it might ultimately lead to restoration of capitalism in Soviet Union and thereby transform a socialist state into a social fascist state.

Lastly, before concluding, we would like to draw the attention of our readers to certain significant bearings of the said summit. There

was a widespread speculation as to the possibility of directing the Nixon-Brezhnev accord against the interest of People's Republic of China and on being asked as to what extent was the said agreement conceived to play role on the face of any possible Soviet military action against China, Dr. Kissinger, the Presidential adviser of USA, diplomatically avoided from making any direct reply by stating that *the said agreement was a bilateral US-Soviet accord but its practical consequences would apply to the situation* (our italics).

Attitude towards People's Republic of China

Now, in this connection, we could not refrain ourselves from making some observations on certain aspects of the attitude of the Soviet leadership towards Peoples' Republic of China that might well have significant bearings in former's endeavour to enter into agreements or treaties with different countries. The present hostile attitude of Soviet leadership to China is known to all. The hostility has developed to such an extent that the Soviet leadership is nakedly trying utmost to isolate China from the scene of international politics and attempting to obstruct China's effort to develop friendly relationship with all countries including India. In spite of all efforts on the part of the Soviet leadership to corner China in the international politics, the Peoples' Republic of China has successfully come out of isolation from world affairs from which she was suffering in the past and is gradually playing a growing important role in the international politics. Many European, African and Asian nations and even USA have already established relations of friendship with China and many

other countries including India have expressed their desire to establish good relations with her.

All these things were observed by the Soviet leadership with much agony and anxiety. Being worried, and with a view to obstruct China's endeavour to create friendship with other countries including India, they began hectic diplomatic moves to different capitals and attempted to make those countries closer to herself against China.

In this background, the comment made by Mr. Kissinger is no doubt significant and the possibility of an anti-China design in subsistence cannot be altogether ruled out.

HSL COAL WASHNERIES EMPLOYEES' UNION VICTORIOUS

The Santaldih HSL Coal Washeries Employees' Union, affiliated to the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) achieved great victory in the recent Works Committee election. Out of six seats the Employees' Union captured five. On the contrary though the INTUC controlled union, supported by the authority contested all the six seats, it can manage to get one seat only.

Under the present situation when the Congress and its Government have let loose a fascist terror, this victory is quite significant and it has helped to boost up the morale of the worker, peasants and other people of the adjoining areas. The authority have not yet recognised the employees' union and so the workers are demanding the recognition of this union immediately.