

ON RANADIVE'S THOUGHTS

BY BHUPESH GUPTA

B. T. Ranadive chose the first anniversary of the central organ of the Communist Party (Marxist) to pour out his venom against the 'revisionists' by which epithet he, of course, means the Communist Party of India. In his spite against the CPI Ranadive forgot that the anniversary of a journal is not really the occasion for hostile invectives of the kind he has indulged in in his article 'Debate of Revisionism' (*People's Democracy*, 26 June). But when subjectivism—usually a characteristic of dogmatism in ideology—runs away with one, there is little to be expected by way of either a sense of the occasion or a sense of proportion.

Once you invent in your imagination 'revisionism' in others you have of course no difficulty whatsoever in imagining also a debacle for it. That is what B. T. Ranadive has so wonderfully proved in his slanderous, abusive and altogether graceless and irresponsible article.

But then in the international communist movement such a performance would seem far from original. When the Soviet Communist Party and the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties have been denounced and maligned by some communist leaders, when it is being said that the US imperialists are bombing Hanoi and Haiphong in collaboration with the leadership of the CPSU, Ranadive's tirade against the Communist Party of India need not be taken too seriously; rather it should be treated as an expression of the very malady which Lenin once called an 'infantile disorder'.

Let us take some of the major political points Ranadive makes with so much of self-satisfying gusto but with so little regard to either facts or logic. But before coming to

the more basic things, a word or two about things not so important for our purpose here.

Ranadive pats *People's Democracy* on the back for keeping the flag flying 'in the midst of stupefying flames of sycophantic revisionism' and of 'national chauvinism'. What he exactly means by all this he does not elaborate in the belief that he has hit the bull's eye and needs no more than mere assertions.

SYCOPHANTIC DOGMATISM

But what about the 'sycophantic dogmatism' that would not in the name of Marxism-Leninism recognise that a communist leadership at the helm of the state power of a country can sometimes follow an adventurist course, depart from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and even go to the length of committing an act which amounts to aggression? And he should have also not shut his eyes to the fact that 'national chauvinism' on this side of the MacMahon line was in no small measure fanned by similar flames of big power national chauvinism on the other side of the line.

No one will deny that at the time of the India-China conflict or the Indo-Pakistani fighting chauvinism reared its ugly head in India's reactionary circles and that this for a while contaminated some others too. Nobody will quarrel with Ranadive if he wants to objectively pin down this harmful trend in our political life. But he is doing less than justice to his own erudition and common sense if he thinks that he can do so by ignoring the 'national chauvinism' exhibited by the leaders of India's two neighbours—China and Pakistan.

Does he expect that when a socialist country attacks a non-aligned neighbour and marches into the latter's territory that is not to be taken as narrow nationalism—a nationalism that would all the more fan chauvinism in a country under bourgeois rule? Does he expect that proletarian internationalists could fight flames of chauvinism or nationalism in a situation like this without at the same time

openly dissociating themselves from and condemning the nationalistic deviations on the part of those who, in the eyes of Ranadive, do not seem at all responsible for the outbursts of chauvinism in India?

Does Ranadive think that national chauvinism in India could be combated without taking a firm stand against Pakistani aggression of the last year or against the Chinese support and the stupid and senseless ultimatum that followed—all in order to keep the Indo-Pak war going?

We have to refer to all this because without getting Ranadive's views on these crucial issues, it is difficult to understand what he means by the parading of his phrases. Our position is clear: nationalist deviations in China which alone can explain the attack on India and the Chinese leaders' present attitude towards India have fed national chauvinism in this country as it has generally brought opportunities for the whole lot of anti-communists and domestic reaction.

On questions of facts Ranadive seems determined not to take a truthful or a dispassionate, objective view. For example, he accuses the 'revisionists' of identifying with die-hard communal elements like Jana Sangh but does not say exactly where and how. Certainly, the Communist Party of India stood for the defence of the country against the infiltrators and against open aggression by Pakistan.

Ranadive should tell us whether, according to him, this stand was a crime against Marxism-Leninism or was it necessary for us as communists and patriots to rally to the defence of the country against the US Patton tanks and Sabre jets with which the Pakistani troops were advancing into India. What should the Communist Party in Amritsar and other places in the Punjab have done when the bombs were dropping from the US planes under Pak use?

'MARXIST' SUPPORT FOR DEFENCE

By the way, many leaders and workers of the Communist Party (Marxist) then in detention wrote from jails ex-

tending support to national defence and among them were at least some Politburo colleagues of Ranadive. Surely they are not 'revisionists' or 'national chauvinists' in Ranadive's evaluation of men and politics. Why then should he be so manifestly discriminatory against the Communist Party of India?

To say that the CPI's attitude, policy and pronouncements during the tragic Indo-Pakistani conflict had nothing to distinguish from the policy of the Jana Sangh is a plain defiance of known truth, to put it mildly. Evidently in his subjective temper, Ranadive has no time to look at facts because they would not suit his hymn of hate.

While supporting the defence of the country against aggression, the CPI demanded of the government, in its memorandum of 6 September for instance, that India's war aims be categorically defined as one of just defending her territorial integrity and not being in any manner directed against the people of Pakistan.

The party opposed the moves of Jana Sangh for the extension of war into East Bengal or into West Pakistan territory. The CPI never supported even the clamour for a thrust into Lahore.

The CPI held the Anglo-American imperialism mainly responsible for the conflict and was in the forefront of the campaign against the imperialist patrons of the Pakistani regime, thus exposing the imperialists as enemies of both India and Pakistan. The CPI took up the fight for the defence of civil liberties and democratic rights of the members of the minority community and stubbornly fought against all unjust actions against them.

WE FOUGHT JANA SANGH SLOGANS

All along the CPI popularised the idea of peaceful and good-neighbourly relations between the two countries, and was among the first to support the cease-fire and recommend the Soviet initiative for the Tashkent meet. On many of these questions not only did the CPI sharply demarcate

itself from the Jana Sangh but had actually to fight the latter's positions. But the trouble with Ranadive is that unless one is with him one must necessarily be with the devil!

After defying well-known facts to draw up his charge-sheet against the CPI Ranadive goes on to rely on hearsay. He says that 'some of their friends abroad' also expressed extreme abhorrence with their 'national chauvinist stand' and he adds that 'an international journal refused to print their article on the Indo-Pakistani war'.

One would like to know who these 'friends' are so that his contention can be verified from the witnesses who are unnamed. Or, is it because the bluff will be called that he dare not name any? By what rules or logic or evidence Ranadive takes it for granted that if an article is not printed in some journal, international or national, it must be the reasons Ranadive imagines and there may not be some other entirely different grounds for the exercise of the editor's discretion.

But before citing such an instance, real or imaginary, Ranadive should determine his own attitude to the journal which he has in mind and which is the journal of the overwhelming majority of the Communist Parties of the world. Does he agree with the stand taken by that journal or does he think that it is also a purveyor of the anarchy of 'revisionism'? If it is the latter, which is likely, why quote revisionists as prosecution witness?

On the India-China question Ranadive, not unexpectedly, simply lets himself loose and does not at all hesitate in trading in falsehoods, half-truths and crude distortions. He writes: 'Our revisionists who forgot American imperialism during the Indo-China conflict—and in fact treacherously supported acceptance of American military aid—are now rediscovering the American danger even in connection with the India-China differences.'

Never did the CPI support the acceptance of military aid from America. On the contrary it pointed to the danger of such aid both in Parliament and outside. Ranadive will

not, we hope, at least deny what is contained in the records of the proceedings of Parliament where face to face with the government the spokesmen of the CPI doggedly voiced their party's opposition to US military aid.

Of course, the CPI then stood for buying arms from any country on a commercial basis to meet the urgent defence requirements and this correct stand, among other things, enabled the CPI to resist the pressure in favour of US military aid, including the 'air umbrella'. It was the CPI again that vehemently advocated self-reliance in defence.

Ranadive does not like our criticism of 'systematic refusal by China to accept the Colombo proposals as the basis for starting talks' etc. between India and China for a peaceful settlement of the border question. And he quotes S. A. Dange's speech at the AITUC session to say that the 'revisionists' have changed the tune. Well, Ranadive need not exhibit such pontifical attitude on this question.

When the Colombo proposals first came in January 1963 from the six non-aligned friendly nations many thought that China would accept them while India would turn them down. But it happened the other way round. What was wrong at the time in insisting on China's acceptance of the Colombo proposals? Even now we do maintain that China should have accepted them and we are certainly not of the view that China's leaders can do no wrong. In fact, they are committing too many errors, some indeed of a Himalayan magnitude.

It will be remembered that in India it was the Jane Sangh, the pro-imperialists and other anti-communists that came out against the Colombo proposals and on this point, strange as it may seem, their positions coincided with that of the Chinese leaders. All were against the Colombo proposals.

What is wrong or inconsistent if Dange now points out that 'the Colombo proposals are dead and gone' and asks the Indian government to go in for direct talks without insisting on China's acceptance of the old proposals? Ranadive should understand that the Colombo proposals could not

be treated as 'dead and gone' the day they were born. He completely misses the fact that by supporting the Colombo proposals the CPI was in fact pressing the line of negotiations and peaceful settlement as against those who attacked the proposals to keep tension and conflict alive and thus drive India closer to the West.

DOGMA BECOMES GUIDING STAR

For Ranadive a dogma may be the guiding star, no matter how much it is belied by practice. But to others the actual reality is important for formulating slogans and proposals.

Incidentally, one strong ground of the CPI's criticism of the Chinese position in regard to India-China conflict is that by their attitudes and policies the Chinese leaders are providing opportunities for Americans in India, including their penetration in economic, political and other spheres. Still, Ranadive says that the CPI has ignored American imperialism. Does Ranadive's comprehension of Marxist-Leninist theory permit him to see that the stand of the Chinese leaders on the India-China question has brought grist to the mill of US imperialism?

It is rather interesting that in accusing the CPI over the India-China and Indo-Pakistan questions Ranadive has taken care not to tell us exactly where he himself stands. After all, we would like to hear him on the Pakistani infiltration and aggression as well as on the Chinese attitude to the Colombo proposals, the Chinese opposition to Indo-Pak cease-fire and the Chinese ultimatum over so serious an issue as some yaks.

WHERE IS THE DEVIATION?

The Sixth Party Congress at Vijayawada was the last occasion before the split when the party's line was decided by the highest organ of the party, namely the Party Congress, and that line was adopted unanimously, Ranadive among

others supporting it. Before flinging accusations at the CPI now after the split, Ranadive should at least point out wherein fundamentally the present stand of the CPI in regard to US imperialism, Congress government, etc., has deviated from the Vijayawada line. Perhaps he finds this comparison somewhat inconvenient for his polemical misadventure but then why should he assume others will shut their eyes to this very relevant aspect of the matter.

After the split in 1964 the CPI continued before the gaze of the whole country relentless exposure of all US machinations in India as well as the Indian government's capitulatory policies. Has there been a single occasion when the CPI evaded this struggle? Let Ranadive point out a single instance instead of claiming the monopoly of anti-imperialism for himself and for his party.

When did the CPI support American penetration in India in the name of defence or looked upon the US penetration as nothing more than setting up of a factory producing Johnson's baby powder? Can he quote any resolution of the party to prove his innuendo and charge? He knows he cannot. So, he makes sweeping statements *ex cathedra*, leaving it to the faithful to take his word as revelation. But this is not how reasonable debate in politics is conducted.

Ranadive would not deny that the Indian government's foreign policy has been 'within the broad framework of non-alignment and opposition to world war' but then he accuses the CPI of glorifying the foreign policy.

The policy of non-alignment is the gain of the Indian people as of the larger worldwide anti-imperialist upsurge. There was a time when even the Chinese communist leaders paid wholesome tributes to the Indian government for pursuing this policy. One has only to recall numerous speeches of Premier Chou En-lai and others before the tragic border conflict arose. The world communist movement highly appraised the policy of non-alignment as the documents of the international conferences of the movement would show.

What crimes has the CPI committed by a positive evalua-

tion of the policy of non-alignment while at the same time pointing out and combating lapses and deviations on concrete issues? Ranadive passes over the principal points of criticism the CPI Programme makes of vacillations, inconsistencies, capitulations on issues on the part of the Indian government.

Is it not a fact that the India-China conflict offered a great opportunity to the enemies of non-alignment to scuttle this policy and push India into the arms of the Western camp? To say this is not to offer an alibi to the government as Ranadive imagines but only to recognise a grim fact. What was wrong if the CPI then upheld non-alignment and sought to rally all those who stood for loyal adherence to it?

Was it heresy to note the positive role of the congressmen who raised their voice against the enemies of non-alignment and played their part in defending the policy? Is it Ranadive's contention that the fight to defend this policy in the face of terrific pressure from imperialism and domestic reaction does not need a helping hand from the masses of congressmen including congress leaders like K. D. Malaviya, Krishna Menon?

No movement can be built, no great cause can be served by a high and mighty attitude and by disdain or minimising the role of those who broadly stand for the cause. On the contrary, the gains of the people when attacked needs to be upheld and defended with support from every quarter. Not to do so would be tantamount to abandoning the role of the class and the party—and objectively facilitating the game of imperialism and reaction.

It is sheer abuse and calumny on the part of Ranadive to say that the CPI 'contributed to the growing surrender to American imperialism by openly supporting American penetration.' This is a howling untruth unworthy of any attention. But if we have at all to answer Ranadive's article we cannot ignore what should ordinarily be ignored.

At every step the CPI has fought the government's surrenders to American imperialism not by mere words but in actual deeds. However, we are grateful that Ranadive has

at least not held the CPI responsible for the devaluation of the rupee. He might have as well done that since he suffers from such an obsession when it comes to maligning the CPI.

SHUTTING EYES TO REALITY

Ranadive takes no note of the CPI's strong criticism of the joint communique issued on the Indira Gandhi-Johnson talks in which an Indian Prime Minister for the first time nibbled at the so-called 'containment of China' policy. No earlier Indo-US joint communique of this high level had given any quarter to such a preposterous policy.

But we still do not think that the Indira government has yet joined 'the imperialist world front against communism' as Ranadive puts it. Once that happens, there would not remain even that 'broad frame work of non-alignment and opposition to war'—the words Ranadive quotes from their own party programme.

As far as we understand from their latest resolutions (Tenali meeting of the Central Committee, June 1966), the CP(M) leadership does not seem to have taken this view of the present Indian government's position vis-a-vis the imperialist world front against communism. We do not underestimate the gravity of the current trends and shifts in India's ruling circles but Marxism-Leninism forbids—and Ranadive surely knows it—confusing 'becoming' with 'being'. Our task is to prevent the Indian government from being drilled into this imperialist front.

Ranadive accuses the CPI of bemoaning the US danger now as if the CPI had now all of a sudden woken up. On the basis of this utterly baseless allegation he discovers 'bankruptcy' and 'dishonesty' in the CPI. We do not propose to enter into any competition with Ranadive in name calling and abuse but we would only ask him, for goodness sake, to be sure of his facts. Nothing could be a blacker falsehood than to say the CPI had not earlier seen the danger of American imperialism.

Ranadive writes: 'Very good, gentlemen! But neither your programme nor the political resolution that you passed on the basis of your programme by a word mentions the danger of American imperialism'. And having said this, he goes on with his unchecked barrage of vituperations and slanders. But then Ranadive forgets that these two documents of the CPI are public property for all to verify whether what our calumniator says is correct.

SLANDER UNLIMITED

Chapters two and three of the CPI Programme deal at length with US imperialism in India in all its aspects including penetration through 'government to government aid' and does not at all 'virtually gloss over such loans as Ranadive would have his readers believe. To refresh his memory, if he has at all read the Programme, is there not scathing exposure and criticism of PL 480 loans which are transactions between the two governments?

Ranadive argues that the political resolution which the CPI passed at the Bombay Party Congress 'hardly mentions American danger'. And this falsehood is repeated in several places. Yet, that resolution which he assails on the basis of his imagination reads: 'Increased reliance on PL 480 and other forms of western imperialist "aid" is a menacing feature of the situation'. The resolution further emphasises the 'renewed danger of Anglo-US imperialist pressure and interference', etc. It seems Ranadive has thought fit, for reasons best known to himself, to purposefully gloss over all that is sharply said in the Programme and the political resolution of the CPI about imperialism in general and US imperialism is particular.

However these are not the only two documents to be taken into account to understand the CPI's stand on imperialism and imperialist danger especially arising from American imperialism. There are several other authentic resolutions of the National Council, the Central Executive Committee and the Central Secretariat of the party all of which

Ranadive has discreetly chosen to just brush aside.

Coming to the economic situation, Ranadive again distorts the positions of the CPI, outright suppresses (while quoting the Programme and the political resolution of the party) what does not suit his campaign of calumny and then as usual proceeds to hurl his slanderous accusations. A Communist Party Programme is expected to be based on all-sided objective assessment of the socio-economic conditions of the country concerned, on a correct comprehension of the stage of the revolution.

In Ranadive's judgment the CPI seems to have committed a great act of heresy by referring to 'certain schemes of industrialisation'. It is his contention that the industrial progress, especially the growth of certain basic and key industries in the public sector with the assistance from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, has no positive content at all vis-a-vis imperialism? Even the programme of the CP(M) cannot altogether ignore it.

Those who belittle the economic cooperation of newly-free underdeveloped countries with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to build industries, etc., only betray their ignorance of the contemporary world developments in general and newly-free people's struggles for overcoming the legacies of the colonial past and for gaining economic independence.

It is in line with his subjectivism and prejudice that Ranadive does not see—and even if he does, would not admit—that the CPI Programme is a forceful indictment of the capitalist path of development which the congress rulers are pursuing. And the Programme is a call to struggle for the non-capitalist path leading to the road to socialism. Ranadive drags in Bernstein presumably to look a bit profound in his grotesque distortions of truth just to accuse the CPI of the embellishing capitalism. Equally he ignores the CPI's basic criticism of the capitalist planning in the Party Programme and in other documents.

Let Ranadive be assured that the CPI has not given up its fundamental characterisation in regard to Indian economy

under the bourgeoisie although it does take note of the growing negative developments and indeed works for stopping them. Accents change with changing realities. It does not seem that even Ranadive's party has come to the conclusion that it is all a puppet economy now. So, why all this needless fuss and mud-slinging against the CPI?

CPI PROGRAMME CORRECT

The recent developments have confirmed the fundamental understanding of the CPI Programme which proves more and more a reliable guide to action and it will be of no avail for Ranadive to attempt to make out that the CPI Programme is different from the Party's current line.

Ranadive remembers Union Home Minister Nanda's notorious statement of 19 February 1965 on the arrests of the comrades belonging to the Communist Party (Marxist) but he, writing perhaps for the first time on the subject, has no anger against the Home Minister. He is angry against the CPI and relishes in using Nanda's malicious and politically motivated observations not to expose him but to attack the CPI. This is rather strange.

Ranadive knows as well as any one else that it was the CPI which from the very first day Nanda made his statement, fought the Home Minister over his sinister, provocative manoeuvre, exposed his rotten statement and tore it to pieces. Among other things, the records of India's Parliament and state legislatures bear testimony to that stubborn fight of the CPI members.

Does not Ranadive know that the CPI members took the fight even to courts and several lawyers among CPI members went round the country in connection with the legal fight. It is the CPI members including the leading ones that filed affidavits in the Supreme Court and High Courts in favour of the detenu comrades and against Nanda. Let Ranadive ask former Attorney General M. C. Setalvad and he will get better information.

All India knows that it is the CPI which organised the

great constitutional, legal and political battles in the country over the DIR arrests and the statement (of Nanda) but Ranadive would still dare to berate the CPI even on this score. He goes to the length of making a nasty innuendo that the government consults 'them' (meaning the CPI), about the release of 'our comrades' (meaning the CP (M) comrades). According to him, this is an instance of the government's cultivating the CPI.

'MARXIST' REPRESENTATIONS

May we inform Ranadive that the government never consulted the CPI about the release but it did happen that sometimes on the specific requests of the leaders and workers of the CP (M) in detention, the CPI representatives met the authorities to represent the cases of the detenus concerned. The CPI only did its very elementary duty by fighting for the release of the detained. The CPI does not seek any kudos for that. But public morality demands that Ranadive does at least refrain from making such ungracious, filthy, slanderous remarks in return for what the CPI has done.

It should be noted that Nanda and his intelligence men produced the statement not only to malign and persecute the comrades of the CP (M), but also to discredit the CPI and, above all, to embitter the relations between the two parties. This is a familiar line with the bourgeois intelligence services. One would feel sorry that Ranadive prefers to play into the hands of those who are interested in sowing dissensions in the ranks of the communist and leftist movement.

CANARD ABOUT PEACE ENVOYS

Ranadive says that government 'sends them (the CPI members) as its ambassadors of peace abroad'. Let him name one comrade who had been so sent abroad. Certainly, some leading members of the CPI have been abroad on

different delegations but all that had nothing to do with the government. Ranadive and his party may cut adrift from the international communist movement but the CPI is very much a part of it and as such it sends delegations for exchange of opinion with fraternal parties. We can understand Ranadive's discomfiture on account of his party's isolation from the world communist movement, but that is no reason why he should run down in this manner the CPI's contacts with fraternal parties.

Since Ranadive does not recognise the CPI as communist at all and claims for himself and his party the monopoly of Marxist-Leninist wisdom, we are not surprised when he proclaims that their differences with the CPI 'are not differences between two wings of Marxism-Leninism'.

We have of course our view on the subject but we do not wish to go into them here except to say that the CPI's differences with the CP (M) are essentially the differences between the ideological and political positions and the line of the international communist movement, which the CPI fully shares, and certain alternative leftwing revisionist positions usually expressed in dogmatism in theory and sectarian and subjective approach to problems facing the movement in practice.

Anyhow, Ranadive should know that days of the King Canute are long past. Whether a party is communist or not or whether differences are among communists or not does not depend on his decree.

Ranadive finds it difficult to distort the current line of the CPI as elaborated, for instance, by the recent resolution of the National Council. So, he makes yet another invention and writes: 'the revisionists are forced to sing a different tune, to manoeuvre for a position, as the crude formulations of their programme can no longer cheat the ranks, much less the masses'.

He goes on to say that the CPI has been forced to do so 'under pressure of the mass movement, international deve-

lopments, etc.,' and in this connection he refers to the Kerala and Bengal *bandhs*. He would not of course see the positive part the CPI played in organising these *bandhs* but on the contrary accuses the CPI of imposing on the masses 'hunger strikes and petitions, great and small.' What a wonderful way of looking at mass movements of the day!

BIHAR BANDH JUST FORGOTTEN

He has not a word to say about the great movement in Bihar and the *bandhs* of last year perhaps because his party due to its negligible strength in that state was not much in the picture. For Ranadive, the great mass struggles do not seem to be worthy of any attention unless he can claim all the credit for them for his party. What does it matter if the members of the CPI went to jail by the hundreds for organising the *bandhs* and mass struggles? For Ranadive it is all a manoeuvre because 'they (meaning the CPI) dare not oppose the initiative of the masses'.

What he says is an affront to the intelligence of the working people who have known the CPI in the recent months, as in the past, in militant mass struggles and other forms of mass actions. If Ranadive had any regard for truth, he would have had no difficulty in acknowledging the fact that it is the CPI which is today playing the most active role in organising mass struggles and mass movements.

He calls the industrial truce agreement in the wake of the Chinese attack as 'treacherous' and he is not deterred by the fact that this slander on his part has been rebuffed both by the workers and by their organised trade-union movement. Moreover the truce was entered into by the trade unions of the country. Ranadive discreetly overlooks the fact that it was his 'revisionists'—and not his 'genuine Marxist-Leninists'—who organised and led the strikes of the Barauni oil refinery workers in March and June 1963, the latter even leading to police firing.

As for *bandhs* in Bombay and elsewhere the entire working class in India knows that no other person has perhaps done more to popularise the idea than S. A. Dange. But then, if the British crown can do no wrong in the eyes of law, neither can Dange do any right thing in the eyes of people like Ranadive! It is of course wholly irrelevant for thinkers like him if the General Secretary of the AITUC happens to occupy a place of unique distinction in India's working-class movement.

Incidentally, there was a time only a few years ago when, as the Editor of *New Age* (Monthly), Ranadive himself wrote in that journal on the occasion of Dange's 60th birthday to pay glowing tributes to this veteran leader of India's working-class movement. We assume that it was not but a manoeuvre on the part of Ranadive.

Many in the democratic movement will wonder why the CP(M) leaders and Ranadive should have chosen this moment of all times to write this slanderous, provocative article when the leftist forces are in the midst of united mass struggles, when in view of the coming struggles and general elections the need for unity of the left in general and of all communists in particular would seem all the more urgent. Could not this revolting essay in sheer disruption be avoided, at least for the sake of the masses who so ardently desire unity in action to fight back the offensive of US imperialism and of the capitulationist congress government?