

Distortion and Slander, the Trademark of Capitulation

K. Murali (ajith)

“Quantitative changes, as per dialectical philosophy, indicate qualitative change. Every quantitative shift reflects a transformation in quality. From that standpoint too, it is contradictory for our Party to argue that the capitalist relations that have significantly strengthened in the country over the past two hundred years have not produced, and cannot produce, any fundamental qualitative change. Even while the CC explains that capitalist relations have developed in certain regions of agriculture and has devised separate programmes for those areas, the CBB document itself states that these changes have since spread nationwide and become dominant. Yet, it insists that there is and will be no change in the principal contradiction. This is untenable - a clear contradiction. Therefore, as in the past, we cannot continue to pursue the path of protracted people’s war to seize power region by region. We must formulate an Indian revolutionary path suited to our country’s specific conditions - not the Chinese path, not the Russian model.”

This para from Mallojula Venugopal’s letter of August 22, accurately captures the ideology guiding him and the thrust of his capitulation. Moreover, it also reveals the method that inevitably accompanies them. Take a closer look at the first two sentences. Marxism teaches that quantitative changes ‘lead’ to qualitative change. Qualitative change takes place through a leap. This comes about at a certain juncture of the process of quantitative change. It doesn’t say quantitative change ‘indicates’ qualitative change. The capitulator surely knows this. So why is he carrying out this sleight with words? Is it an ‘innocent’ error? The next sentence gives the answer. “Every quantitative shift reflects a transformation in quality.” Note the words ‘indicates’ and ‘every’. They are deployed quite consciously. If *all* quantitative changes indicate that qualitative change has taken place, if *every* quantitative shift means qualitative change, what remains of leap? Nothing. It has no role. The capitulator’s philosophy thus eliminates the role of revolution in social transformation. It lays the groundwork for what follows.

The CPI (Maoist) document on Mode of Production (MOP), as seen in the public domain, does acknowledge the growth of capitalist relations in the country, of a particular type. Whatever that may be, does this growth indicate a ‘fundamental qualitative change’? Will this growth cause this sort of a change? The document clearly rules this out. And that upsets the capitulator. According to his philosophy such change must have taken place. It would be more accurate to say—he needs it to justify his shameful surrender, his abandoning the revolutionary path. Following his convoluted logic, he proceeds to demand that the understanding on principle contradiction should be changed. Further, the path of protracted people’s war itself should be abandoned. Thus he ends up with that worn out false thesis, ‘neither Chinese nor Russian’, touted by revisionists ever since the betrayal of the Telangana armed struggle.

Let us see what the MOP document says. While noting various changes that have taken place in the country’s economy, it stated:

“Semi-feudal relations are continuing in new forms... if we see how feudal hegemony yet continues in the economic, social and political sectors and superstructure we understand that it is a change in form but not content...During the globalisation period, the old and the new feudal forces of the dominant castes in the rural areas were the social prop in every step that the state took up in the interests of imperialism and comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie... These old and new feudal forces directly exploit the oppressed people in many ways through wage exploitation, exploitation of rent, high interests, maintenance of paddy go-downs, business and other such things...The landlords yet extract surplus in a large scale through rent, interest, bonded labour, semi-bonded labour, neo-bonded labour and other such forms. For the past three decades of globalisation, bonded labour did not

disappear in places of modern agricultural methods but is continuing in various forms...On the whole imperialism is unleashing control on social, economic, political, cultural and all the sectors on the semi-feudal base in the country historically and in the present phase of globalisation...All the modern agricultural methods said to be capitalist in several areas of our country are in fact dependent. Foreign MNCs and domestic comprador corporate companies that collaborated with the local new landlord forces constituted with the government and non-government systems possess hegemony on the modern agricultural methods and on the entire mode of production. Therefore those only serve the interests of the foreign MNCs, the domestic corporate companies and the big landlords that collaborated with them. Land question, tenancy, displacement and the question of related sectors of agriculture show the intensity of agrarian crisis in the country. As a result the forces of production are being destroyed. Growth in economy came to a standstill. This is the result of the old semi-feudal relations. Revolution means to break these chains...As per the changes in the past seven decades, it is undoubted that Indian economy is neither capitalist nor in the path of transformation into a capitalist society, that there is no such democratic trend in the country and that on the contrary semi-feudal relations relatively weakened. Land question is still the main question in the vast rural areas and revolutionary land reforms on the basis of land to the tiller is yet the most important and relevant issue.”

Evidently, the document does not suggest, even remotely, that capitalist relations have developed. It was pointing to distorted capitalist relations, associated with continuing semi-feudalism. The document on comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie (CBB) is not available in the public domain. Therefore we cannot directly verify the claim the capitulator makes about it. But certain things can be safely concluded. It must have been based on the analysis made about the mode of production as a whole in the MOP document. It would not have presented a view contradicting this analysis. After all, the character of a ruling class cannot be understood in separation from the mode of production existing in a society. As for the matter of the CBB being dominant, first of all that relates to the relation between the two ruling classes, the CBB and the big landlords. It does not mean that capitalist relations are dominating. Secondly, this assessment about the CBB is not something new. It was seen in the Strategy and Tactics document—“In the alliance of comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie and big landlord class, the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie plays the leading role.”

Now about the principal contradiction. Let us, for the sake of argument, accept the capitulator’s demand that the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses can no longer be considered principal. Let us assume that either the one between the CBB and the broad masses, or between the alliance of imperialism, CBB and feudalism and the broad masses is principal. But will this necessarily indicate “...we cannot continue to pursue the path of protracted people’s war to seize power region by region.” The answer is NO. This can be understood without going into all the factors that make the path of protracted people’s war (PPW) necessary in our conditions. Did the Chinese communist party leave the path of PPW when the principle contradiction changed during the Japanese imperialists’ invasion? During most of the Vietnamese national liberation war the principal contradiction was between imperialism and the broad masses. But was the path anything other than PPW? Obviously, one cannot make a simplistic equation between the path of revolution and the principal contradiction. There are many other important factors, the main force of revolution for example. No doubt the path of PPW must be developed in accordance with changes that have taken place—in society, in the capabilities of the ruling classes and imperialism, in technology and so on. But that is totally different from the plea made by the capitulators to abandon PPW altogether.

It can’t be the case that the capitulator is unaware of all these things. He must have been a key participant in the study and analysis, the drafting, of all the key documents. But he can’t be burdened by all of that now. He is in a hurry. Desperate to jump into the parliamentary pigsty, taking the lead from the betrayers of the Telangana armed struggle. Hence the show of giving up weapons won with the blood of martyrs and posing with the Constitution. Therefore, without the slightest hesitation, he

confounds 'initiating peace talks' with 'laying down arms'. With this sleight of words he stoops to the low of slandering comrade Basavaraj, claiming that he too had decided to lay down arms. Thus he seeks to reduce the martyrdom of the comrade and his companions to a meaningless, foolhardy, gesture. Contrary to his despicable bid, their heroic resistance against a vastly superior force, holding high the crimson banner of communism and setting a glorious example of self-sacrifice, will forever continue to inspire the people as they march forward along the path hewn by Naxalbari.
