



# Postmodern Oppportunism

**North Coordination Committee (NCC)  
Communist Party of India  
(Maoist)**

# **Postmodern Opportunism**

**June, 2026**

**North Coordination Committee (NCC)  
Communist Party of India  
(Maoist)**

# Postmodern Opportunism

## **Introduction:- The confused petty bourgeoisie in Indian revolution**

Since the beginning of class society, crisis begins to find expression in several dimensions of human existence (social, political, economical, biological etc..). It got more frequent and worse when the reign of capital got institutionalized. In the present era of world capitalism crisis is a constant phenomenon, it is actually a result of the inherent contradiction of capitalism; capitalism is based on the model of individual appropriation (the products of human labor are confiscated by the capitalist) and public production (workers collectively do the production process). This basic contradiction causes all the modern crisis be it in share market, data market, extractive industries, land, industrial units, real-estate market and other such capital generating units crises drive the economy, society and the individuals, it shapes the mental and physical capacity of people. Resulting into alienation from the production process and reduction of an individual participatory role in the social and natural structures. This is termed Alienation. Comrade Marx said that alienation appears not only in the result, but also in the process of production and productive activity itself. The worker is not at home in his work which he views only as means of satisfying other needs. For the workers work is an activity directed against himself, that is independent of him and does not belong to him. This kind of alienated labor succeeds in alienating man from his species. Species life, productive life, life creating life, turns into a mere means of sustaining the worker's individual existence, and man is alienated from his fellow men. Finally, nature itself is alienated from man, who thus loses his own inorganic body.

Such groaning psychic crisis of individual involved in production process finds reflection among middle classes too. In India during the corona crisis millions of workers and middle class individuals migrated towards their villages. The pandemic laid open the inherent rift in the society which were otherwise covered up by the high towering highways, expressways and roads. The working classes along with a section of middle class migrated from their working places to their villages, many died in this process. What explains this migration? Is this not social alienation? Lack of a sense of belonging to a place made them feel vulnerable. Clearly cities are not for the workers, it is a site for gaining strength (money) in order to retreat to villages. But neither are the city a place to be associated with by the middle classes. For the middle class it is an idealization. Middle class craves for the city but the city never completely accepts it, the upper section of this class always remains reserve army of pretentious city-rulers. The vast number of the lower and middle section of the middle class who do not have jobs or are severely exploited by being at work for almost 20 hrs can not sustain themselves, they form a large strata of unemployed/meaninglessly-employed population. They stands alienated from the society and the family institutions; family expectation besides the need to exercise feudal supremacy in the society or villages strangulates the middle classes. Ultimately the individual blames one's own being, panics on ones incapacity to please the family and society. For all his failures, the individual put blames on oneself. The rationale to blame oneself for the distressful condition is the basic and most primitive logic of the capital. This diverts the peoples anger from the capital centric world order towards own self. The question of emptiness and meaningless in life becomes the subject of bourgeoisie self morality leading an individual to all kind mental and physical illness. The individual groans for help but nothing comes forward, the bourgeoisie individual morality is no answer for the distressed class.

The precarious nature of the middle classes is due to the political position which it held. What is there in economy finds reflection in the politics. One section of the middle class connect with the struggle of the working class and associate with its party and thereby this section remains intact and is moving towards its liberation. While its upper section is influenced by the liberal bourgeoisie propaganda finds solace with drugs, supermarket, sex etc.. It is so paralyzed by the propaganda of the ruling classes that it does not see hope in slow but steady gathering of proletariat momentum in the communist party and in the facade of being politically neutral it sides with the ruling class parties, while constantly swearing on being ideologically flexible it follow the ideology and politics of the ruling class and its parties but still finds something missing. He is chased by this missing link and never completely amalgamates with the ruling classes. Indecisiveness in all the sphere of existence is what defines this class. This malagation almost gets stronger after the capitalist reversal in China. Ever since the revisionist came to power in China a section of the middle class went very close to the ruling class and is propagating falsehood about Communism and its inevitability. This is typical to the character of the middle class which comrade Marx had marked in Lassale and against such trends comrade Lenin and comrade Mao struggled to build a true Bolshevik party. In dark times when our movement grew very weak it is the middle class that first flights away from the proletariat class ideology movement and becomes the slave of bourgeoisie ideology. This flight signifies a lack of revolutionary spirit and inability to lead a proletariat life. Intellectual honesty is also negated by the opportunist (petty bourgeoisie liberal intellectual) who instead of analyzing ones own failings starts doubting the theory and political line which they had been practicing some times ago. Finally they come out with some old redundant theories through which they attack the revolutionary theory of M-L-M and joins the reaction.

In Indian context the revolutionary movement against feudalism and Imperialism particularity against the Brahmanical feudal order of the Indian society inspired the petty bourgeoisie in the movement they saw a liberation from the orthodox hold of the patriarchal family, of the superior being, of the blind faith, of the caste and kin. This marked a period when vast masses of petty bourgeoisie from the colleges and universities joined the anti feudal anti imperialist movement throughout the country. The petty bourgeoisie could connect their own desire of freedom from the bondage of feudalism and the freedom to pursue art and politics of their own choice with the proletariat need to accomplish NDR in order to move toward Socialism and finally to Communism resulting into a huge influx of middle class in the revolutionary movement. But when the revolutionary movement got weakened, its members got martyred and the area under its control diminished then these petty bourgeoisie were the first to claim that the path which we are to follow is tiresome and lengthy, the future is gloomy and all I can see is destruction. They base their judgment on experience and that too on personal lived experiences.

The theoretical aspect is muzzled off and forgotten what they have now with them is an experience of defeat on which basis they tend to stop anyone who is attempting to rebuild the old. They leave the camp of the revolutionaries. Theory as a guide to action and as a science to understand the further development and success of the movement or phenomenon is left aside. Finally we are left with a class which on one end is alienated by the present ruling class order while at the other end have deserted the revolutionary movement in order to find solace. What would be the conscious part of this life? On which ideology their solace will be founded upon? The answer obviously is such ideology which negates both the end but very subtly gives space for the dominance of the ruling classes ideology. These theories varies according to the given time and space, it becomes Machist at some place Ambedkrite at the other developing further into post modernism. At present Indian situation and the world political condition it is the post modernist ideology that guides and strengthen the reactionary section of petty bourgeoisie. Opportunist argues from the saying of the post modern scholars and reactionaries like Foucault and others. Opportunist of the Lenin and Mao times were the followers of

the Machist/Confuscious school. It would be no exaggeration to say that all the opportunist of our time are the followers of post modern thoughts and ideas.

The indecisiveness of the opportunists and the denial of objective truth, meta-narrative by the post modern theoreticians provides the best tenant for unity between opportunism and post modern thoughts. The imperialist finance capital has developed a very good ally in form of the post modern thoughts and ideas. The firmness of this ally huge, within the party too, the two line struggle revolves around the struggle against post modern ideas and thoughts. PB resolution of Aug 2024 considers post modernism as one of the factor leading to the setback in movement. Making it urgent for us to mark the influence of post modernism within the party and how opportunists derive their theoretical and political power from it. Our party in PW-20 issue had brought an article on post modernism, in this several trends of post modernism within the structure and comrade were highlighted. The article showed how the assault of post modernism on our party is a part of the large psychological offensive of the state. The article further stated that apart from the ideological role, post modernism is a political tool of the ruling classes to rob the proletariat of its party. Presently when our party is waging a sharp political ideological struggle against opportunism-liquidationism-revisionism it becomes very important to identify major ruling class ideologies which help sustain opportunism.

### **Lenin`s struggle against Empirio-Criticism and opportunists**

The 20th century begins with struggle against opportunism in philosophy. Early in 1908 serious disagreements arose among the Bolsheviks on philosophical questions. Lenin had been opposing the philosophical views of A. Bogdanov since 1906 and even earlier, and he took up an uncompromising position towards those Bolsheviks, A. Bogdanov, A. Lunacharsky, V. Bazarov, who preached idealistic views in their symposium, 'Essays on the Philosophy idealism and of revisionism in philosophy' was one of the reflections of that decadence which began to manifest itself in political "society" and in political parties as a result of the defeat of the revolution of 1906. Lenin, who always attached considerable importance to the purity of Marxist ideology, carried on a sharp struggle against the empirio-critics, in defense of dialectical materialism, in defense of the philosophical principles of Marxism. In 1908 Lenin finished an important philosophical book, Materialism and Empirio-Criticism: Critical Notes Concerning a Reactionary Philosophy, the book second to comrade Engels Anti-Durring, became a tool in further struggle against opportunism particularly against Liquidationism.

The philosophy of empirio-criticism was propounded in 1890-1910, the time when finance capital was in the process of being established world over, it was the period when capitalism was developing into imperialism. The reactionary nature of finance capital got established in the political scenario leading to workers unrest and massive protests in Moscow and elsewhere, after which there was huge repression on the revolutionary movement, party and people. This caused many petty bourgeoisie intellectual to desert the party. In philosophy this desertion was identified as that of the reactionary empirio-criticism. At that time comrade Lenin opened two front one was the political front in which we know that during 1908 to 1917 comrade Lenin wrote several articles exposing the liquidators and opportunist who wanted to make the party an open and legal amorphous unit. While the another front, of remarkable necessity was in philosophy where he had to defeat the empirio-critical school. The logic of empirio-critical school was the substance of opportunism. Having understood this comrade Lenin almost annihilated it in his book. We present below a the comparison between opportunism and emirio-criticism, this will help us understand the philosophical drive within the political question raised by the then opportunist, many of this will find analogy with the present day opportunist against whom our party is struggling.

	Empirio-Criticism	Opportunism
On experience	Subjective idealist :- sensation of an individual is primary	Subjective idealism:- due to which they give importance to one's own experience in the movement and denies the importance of theory as guiding light. They place the individual's role and feelings at the center of politics.
On objective truth	There is no objective truth. Truth is organizing form of human experience	Truth is always relative hence has to be conditional. There can not be an absolute truth.
Non partisan	Tries to project oneself as neutral. That is neither idealist nor materialist, while in essence being subjective idealist.	Never declares one's political line with clarity. Always keep on bending to end and the other like a spineless reptile. Two stool theory
On cause and effect	There is no cause and order within the nature it is all our subjective experience that gets reflected in our language.	There are many factors responsible for an effect hence it would be wrong to find cause in one factor.

The opportunist and the empirio-criticist both deny the presence of absolute truth. For it is in their class interest to keep the truth vague and undefined so that they may follow the dictum that suits them the most, this is the basic trait of opportunism, they sit on two stools, this relativity is explained in the empirio-criticism. Comrade Lenin explains how a communist should approach this question. He says "In a word, every ideology is historically conditioned, but it is unconditionally true that to every scientific ideology (as distinct, for instance, from religious ideology), there corresponds an objective truth, absolute nature. You will say that this distinction between relative and absolute truth is indefinite. And I shall reply: Yes, it is sufficiently "indefinite" to prevent science from becoming a dogma in the bad sense of the term, from becoming something dead, frozen, ossified; but it is at the same time sufficiently "definite" to enable us to dissociate ourselves in the most emphatic and irrevocable manner from fideism and agnosticism, from philosophical idealism and the sophistry of the followers of Hume and Kant." The deniability of absolute truth remains the trait of opportunists to the present time. When every question or issue is framed in relativity opportunism finds the best way to evade and embrace selectively. Being open or closed is a relative concept for them, forming a disciplined party is again a relative concept. With relativity there comes excuse for not doing what was expected of besides when something is relative no one can charge you of being deviated from the line. Such dear was the concept of denial of absolute truth for the opportunist. It was as if the empirio-critical school provided the opportunist with an oxygen cylinder at times of pandemic like attack from Bolsheviks.

Another disturbing trait of Empirio-criticism as a philosophy is that it makes individual both the subject and the object of analysis, this sort of hyper individualism leads to subjective and non scientific emotions and speculations in practice. The petty bourgeoisie who got frightened by the failed proletarian upsurge could not muster courage to follow the ideology that calls for patience and courage finally finds solace in a philosophy that denies the need to be partisan, that encourages one to be evasive. It promotes individualism by claiming that individual emotion is more important constituent of truth than

logic. Through logic one associated with proletariat for liberation but when if someone gives more importance to emotion then one finds methods to be confined at ones own need and necessities. This ia bourgeoisie morality of emirio-critical school. Empirio-critical thoughts created and strengthened opportunism within the communist movement. But the earth shaking October Revolution in Russia shattered all the hopes of the empirio-criticism and established Leninism. After the revolution in Russia, China too followed the path laid down by Marxism-Leninism and under the leadership of comrade Mao, revolution was successful in China in 1949 and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as new and advanced form of Marxism-Leninism also got established. Thus half of the world turned red. This was a shattering blow to the imperialist powers. To reconstruct themselves they need re-adjustment at two front one was on the political economy while the other on the ideological front. The political economy adjustment was in form of Regan Thatcher plan that came to be known as Neo-liberal policy. At the ideological level post modernism became a new tool, this too was neo; neo-emirio-criticism. This they did with the strategy of blocking the communist influence in universities by promoting the non-communist left which in fact were the empirio-criticist of the present time, they were basically post modern scholars fashioned in and around Marxism. Sometimes calling themselves new left or radical left or Neo-Marxist.

Seeing the huge influence of Marxism-Leninism in European campuses, US imperialist power assigned CIA the task to ensure that communist propaganda does not reach the European universities and in order to achieve this a special team of CIA was formed with experts from different academia and different countries. They planned a strategy, the idea of which was to unite all the non communist left intellectuals who would replace the communist intellectuals. These non communist left intellectuals were funded by the CIA and were assigned responsibilities to write and spread abusive articles and thesis on Communism and Marxism particularly on the ongoing practices in USSR and China. The thesis which animated all this mobilization of the Non-Communist Left was one which Chip Bohlen, Isaiah Berlin, Nicolas Nabokov, Averell Harriman and George Kennan ardently supported. This team was assigned the task to fight against totalitarianism. The team was supposed to be secret and its members were assigned individual as well as collective tasks.

At the political economy front Imperialist power again got stuck in crisis. The finance capital got more and consolidated in few hands. Banks got more powerful while the consumer barely had money to pay back the loan. As the crisis grew within the economy, political unrest and peoples movement sprang up throughout the world, 1960s became the decade of revolution throughout the world. The world socialist revolution seemed nearer at that time. But the series of betrayal by the revisionist leaderships in Russia by Khrushchev after comrade Stalin and in China by Deng after comrade Mao, world proletariat got stuck in deep grief. The petty bourgeoisie too lost its hope. At such times when the world proletariat power did not have any state power, the imperialist bourgeoisie promoted the so called non communist left ideologies which basically were the neo-empirio-criticism, this ideology came to be known as post modernism. The petty bourgeoisie which was grief laden got romantically attracted to the ruling class ideology of post modernism. Post-modernism appears everywhere from art, literature, architecture to sex and food everything around us have its imprint. Such strong was the propaganda machine of the imperialist powers against Communism. The team of the anti-communist left intellectual along with their boss CIA performed extremely well and got results by establishing the concrete hold of post modernism in the campus spaces.

### **Post modern-opportunists and the communist party**

Comrade Mao said that party is the most important and primary weapon which would wield the peoples army and united front in order to liberate the people. He further said that party unity can be build only

with an ideological clarity. Comrade Mao said “Our Party will be better united on this basis, that is, on the basis of our common understanding of ideology, politics and various policies.” Without ideological centralism within the party there can not be a party to be called communist party. Such should be the spirit of any organizer who wants to build a party. For a party organizer ideology should always come first. A party organizer is the one who gives first preference to ideological work over all other work. In context of our party, the work at ideological front have gained yet more importance. Because on one hand we are facing the most severe deadliest assault on our party leadership while on the other hand the opportunist-liquidation-revisionist elements are trying to turn the party into a meaningless organ suitable for the ruling class. If we want to revive the party, if we want to liberate the oppressed and exploited people from the murderous comprador feudal fascist onslaught then the only thing to cling upon is M-L-M. We have to root out all the non-Marxist ideology and practices among us. If we cling to our ideology then tomorrow if not today we will be victorious but if we for a moment became lazy on the ideological front of our struggle then we will invite destruction of all that which our martyrs had achieved through their bloods.

We have to remember that right opportunism is the main danger before us. Our CC-PB too had recognized the right deviation as one of the reason for the setback. But some among the opportunist section are parroting that left opportunism too is equally dangerous for the party. This emphasis on left opportunism is basically a cover to hide their attack on the genuine Marxist line. For they have shifted rightward to such an extent that correct Marxist path appears left to them. Regarding this comrade Mao in an pamphlet titled ‘Things are beginning to change’ said “There are also a number of people whose thinking errs on the side of revisionism or Right opportunism. They pose the bigger danger because their ideas are a reflection of bourgeois ideology inside the Party, and because they yearn for bourgeois liberalism, negate everything and are tied in a hundred and one ways to bourgeois intellectuals outside the Party. Over the last few months, people have been criticizing dogmatism but have allowed revisionism to go unchallenged. Dogmatism should be criticized, or else many mistakes cannot be rectified. Now it’s time to direct our attention to criticizing revisionism.” Dogmatism is the reflection of petty bourgeoisie ideology inside the party while the right opportunism is out and out bourgeoisie ideology. Though left opportunism or dogmatic is dangerous and needs to be corrected immediately but in the present condition when there is no left deviated political force in the country or at the world level, its influence is minimal. The talk of left dogmatism comes up largely from the right opportunist who wish to attack the correct Marxist line. The real enemy before us is the opportunist-liquidationist-revisionist ideology. After having recognized the main danger, we must then mark its manifestation in our party. The right opportunist trends/deviations finds their reflection in following manner:-

1. Attempt to make the party legal and open by deserting the ug life and the path of armed struggle this they do by raising doubts on ug practice, they say that may be open work too is very important and equally important to the ug work. They say that situation has changed, state has become stronger therefore we must reflect seriously on our old form of work. (Here it is important to note that they have neither said that one should desert the ug life nor have they said that due to changed situation ug life and armed struggle is not possible)
2. Give importance to democracy at the cost of begetting the more important role of centralism in the party method of democratic centralism. In the name of democracy they want to rob the power of the higher committee to get the party line implemented at the local committee level. They say that we will follow the HC but the HC should ask us before taking any decision framing this as a pretext they will stop coordinating with the HC. They will swear on the name of the martyred comrades that they are with the party and are only against the high handedness of the HC. They say I follow the CC but the HC here is unfit to be followed.

3. They put more emphasis on the language, words, symbols, letters, inverted commas etc.. in order to find the power gaps between the higher committee and the comrades/lower committees. They say that the content wise the letter or whatever have been said is okay but the form of the the language is highly problematic, that it is subjective, bureaucratic and authoritarian. Thus the whole discussion is wished to be shifted toward the form of power in the language and the bureaucracy inherent in it.
4. They despise any structure, they do not form a structure or if there is one then they deliberately keep it authority-less and spineless by not linking it up with the HC. When confronted on this question they say that when casually an issue can be resolved then what is the need for formal meetings and reportings to the HC. They say that it is important to get the work done, structure or no structure is a secondary aspect.
5. They oppose the party stand on gender and sexuality; they are for free love and free sex. They are for sexual anarchism. They say that party's stand on sexual opportunism and LGBT question is feudal and patriarchal.

After having noted the right opportunist positions on the above mentioned issues, now let us look at what the post modern theoreticians have to say on these issues.

The first point which right opportunists raises has to do with the Butler`s idea of flux which she borrowed from Foucault; many post modern theoreticians have written on this. Perhaps it is the cornerstone of post modernism. Higher the mobility greater is the difficulty to locate the object, and greater is the inability to define and fixate it. Such condition will weaken the concrete structure like feature, it will create haphazard and randomness. The change for the post modern philosophy is always a constant flux. It knows no stage and no leaps or bounds. Change means randomness and constant. Driven by this logic of understanding a change, the right opportunist say that since the society has changed the state has become more powerful we need to change accordingly and give up armed struggle. This is an understanding based on randomness of change. This is what the idea of flux is in Butler`s theory, change is a flow and is constant, but for a Maoist change comes from quantitative to qualitative and that too through a stage and in leaps. All sorts of changes do not invite change in strategy of Indian revolution. Mere quantitative change will not lead to qualitative shift in the society. There has to be a leap. This leap is marked by stages. Without studying the leap and stage to keep on parroting the change is nothing other than post modernist philosophy of change. One should not be bewildered at the idea of change, any change what so ever has to be understood in terms of dialectical and historical materialism which comrade Marx, comrade Lenin and comrade Mao had taught us; a process will have stages in it, the study of these stages will determine the nature of the change and its possible form and content in the future. Do these opportunists ever dared theorizing the leap and the stage which they claim to have been reached by the society? No, they have not done any analysis to back their claims all they have done is to be driven away by the wild influx of rubbish imperialist post-modern philosophy.

The second issue has to do with the Foucauldian notion of power. Foucault said that power is inherently oppressive and is everywhere. Hence in order to subvert the power any form of difference is celebrated. This is usually in form of counter discourse, even though it may be illogical, baseless and meaningless it has to be celebrated and uphold. Thus the right opportunist who do not accept the HC as an authority for what so ever reason is actually driven by the Foucault logic that all power is inherently oppressive, the comrades who instead of taking note of such indiscipline celebrates the difference of the right opportunist with the HC are also driven by the same anti-authority trend, they believe that it is progressive to subvert the power above oneself. The problem in this; is the anti authority concept that comes directly from the post modern understanding on power. The claim that one accepts CC is

nominal because it is known that CC will not be the direct dealing organ hence the opportunist language is used to masquerade the authority. In cases where CC became the direct dealing body these opportunists claim that CC too has followed the path of HC or has become more rigid than the HC. The philosophy of phenomenology and existentialism is the guiding light of our opportunists, they are basically empiricist and struggles for radical bourgeoisie freedom and freedom to choose. Under the pretext of being communist they struggle for bourgeoisie autonomy and right to practice one's political line. Ultra democracy of the liberal bourgeoisie is radical freedom of the post modern era.

While the ultra democracy was the trait of anarchy, radical freedom is based on the concept of subversion of power held within or without a structure. The subversion of the proletariat power is what is intended when the right opportunist do not accept the authority of HC. But will this opportunist dare subvert the feudal bourgeoisie power held by the state authority?

Post modernism has large impact in our society, as the middle class population rises so will the hold of the post modernism on the masses. In post modernism the enemy has got its most efficient weapon. Earlier their weapon was bourgeoisie welfarism but the magic stick which post modernism has waved can not be done by any other ideology. The imperialist Neo-liberal world order needs mass consumption. Mass consumption is facilitated by credit system and digitization of market economy. This makes consumption more and more an individual exercise based on individual choice, individual likes and dislikes. Post modernism has completely found itself in conjunction with the Neo-liberal world order. The sort of fluidity and randomness which their in the finance capital market is in their philosophy. The material condition of today's market promotes hyper-individualism. Individual is provided private market spaces (in form of amazon, flip-kart etc..), private wish list, money limitation is also tempted to be set aside when one is asked to take loan or use credit card or play games or download an app etc... But behind this facade in actual practice nothing remains private, everything is constructed by the logic of imperial capital and its neoliberal needs. The fiction of freedom and choice drives the ideological machines of market. This fictitious freedom and right to choice finds resemblance in politics too.

The materiality of right opportunist denial of the authority of HC rests in the digital market economy which the imperialist finance capital has produced. This market creates a fiction of individual choice and radical freedom but to the imagination of petty bourgeoisie the concept of democratic centralism appears as slavery because this calls for a commitment toward ideology and collective. Therefore they start their attack on the centralist part of democratic centralism, they distort the concept of democratic centralism to imply that democracy is the essence in this and has to be primary in all aspects and time. They view centralism as a power and their concept of power is same as that of the Foucault who believes that all sorts of power are inherently oppressive. Here it is important to be reminded of comrade Mao's in the pamphlet titled Rectify the party style of work placed a concrete position on the question Democratic Centralism, speaking against the independence seekers, he said "They do not understand the Party's system of democratic centralism; they do not realize that the Communist Party not only needs democracy but needs centralization even more. They forget the system of democratic centralism in which the minority is subordinate to the majority, the lower level to the higher level, the part to the whole and the entire membership to the Central Committee. Chang Kuo-tao asserted his "independence" of the Central Committee of the Party and as a result "asserted" himself into betraying the Party and became a Kuomintang agent."

Opportunist have a very shrewd logic of playing with the two aspects of a contradiction, this they have done right from the days of Bernstein to Larin, Martov times and presently the likes of Devji, Venugopal are mastering this in our context. They say that "any contradiction have two aspects in it;

therefore one must consider both these aspects and while reaching to a judgment on the development of the object/process/phenomenon one must not privilege one aspect over the other.” Comrade Lenin termed this ‘sitting on two stools’. Considering the text per-se to some it might appear correct but here is the shrewdness which we were talking about, this shrewdness got sharpened by empirio-criticism that denies objectivity and partisan position and at the present times it got even more entrenched in the opportunist philosophy by the post-modern logic of the likes of Foucault, Derrida, Butler and others who say that fixation and determination of the identity of an object is an exercise of discursive power and is oppressive in nature hence the opportunist learn not to fixate the dominant aspect within a contradiction. The above quotation of the opportunist denies the concept of identity and places us at the randomness and fluid post modern imaginary world; it denies dialectical and historical materialism process in development of a thing. For it is true that a contradiction will have two aspects in each but what leads to development of the thing is the question that which among these two aspect is principal, this is what comrade Mao termed the ‘principal aspect of principal contradiction’.

Comrade Mao said “In any contradiction the development of the contradictory aspects is uneven. Sometimes they seem to be in equilibrium, which is however only temporary and relative, while unevenness is basic. Of the two contradictory aspects, one must be principal and the other secondary. The principal aspect is the one playing the leading role in the contradiction. The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principal aspect of a contradiction, the aspect which has gained the dominant position”. The opportunists have drifted right from this line of philosophy, Martin Heidegger is their teacher. It was he who said that being is nothing but an exercise in language. Derrida said that being is a fiction which language has created. With this sort of understanding where is the room left for the contradiction within a being, the development of stages in the process of developing the being.

After having discussed the philosophy of contradiction which the opportunist propounds now let us come to the third issue before us, the question of language, signs, words etc.. Let us look at Lyotard, the post modernist who says that language becomes the game where the person with more resource often dictates the truth. Derrida says language is a tool to control and terms it violent hierarchy to come out of this Derrida suggest deconstruction that is reading in the text what the author may or may not have implied this he says can be done without inquiring about the intention of the writer because according to Derrida the author is dead. This theory provided support to the opportunist politics.

They started deconstructing the language of the HC. Without caring to understand the intention/motive behind the language they went after the symbolic expressions. This satisfies their opportunist needs. None other than Foucault himself termed Derrida writing as “terrorist obscurantism.” Foucault said of Derrida, “he writes so obscurely you can’t tell what he’s saying, that’s the obscurantism part, and then when you criticize him, he can always say, “You didn’t understand me; you’re an idiot.” That is the terrorism part.” Derrida employs the oldest trick of Sophist school of philosophy. This explain the love for Derrida in opportunist camp. Using Derrida one can subvert any logic and lead it to a meaningless jugglery of words and symbols. Opportunist use this for their own end. They attack the correct political line in the party through this weapon, they say that the language is dictatorial and hence content of whatever is being said losses its meaning.

Since several of the communications with these opportunist happened to be through letters, some of our comrades develop this understanding that the practice of letter writing had in fact complicated the issue. They think that communication through letters created confusions and miscommunications which can be settled only by personal meetings. Such an understanding too has some traits of post modernism in it. The problem is not in the letters, for we all know that the history of communist movement throughout the world has recorded the best use of letters to guide the movement and comrades involved

in it. The problem is in the political line of the opportunist, in the service of which they use post-modern language to target the party's political line and leadership.

Another very serious issue which the opportunists of our time raises is on the question of structure. Their stand on this is nothing but post structuralism in disguise of Marxism. Post structuralist believe that in the traditional society power was centralized and arranged within the structure. They consider structure as inherently powerful, exclusive and hence oppressive. Against which they plead individual choice and radical freedom. Therefore they do not build any structure let alone attack them to deconstruct it. When applied to communist practice we get opportunist who do not hold party meetings, who do not form any new structures, who deliberately keeps structure amorphous. By this they ensure that power does not get centralized inside the party structure and the only power which keeps on centralizing and become ubiquitous will be the state power the ruling class power while the proletariat power which is with the communist party is allowed to decay. What remains in place of the communist party is an individual dictatorial stand, the bureaucracy vested in an individual without any accountability or responsibility who claims to be all correct; in such a process an individual replaces the collective. Thus we see how post modernism strengthen the bourgeoisie political line within communist movement.

The last issue in this series has to do with theory on 'gender' and sexuality by post-modernists. The famous slogan of the post modernist in this regard is "more sex more freedom". Nothing explains their stand more clearly than this. Post modernist particularly Foucault attacked the Victorian modern notion of 'gender' and sexuality. He defined 'gender' as social construct later on another post modernist known for the infamous queer theory held that 'gender' is a performance and it can take any shape depending on personal experiences. The use of the word 'gender' instead of the biological word sex was considered progressive. While the use of sex was considered biological determinism and modernist. 'Gender' stood for the fluidity and randomness in post modern philosophical outlook, it provided room to the Neo-liberal market logic. Changing gender according to the choice of an individual became a common sense. Here too the focus was individual choice and radical freedom to exercise it.

This explains why Butler keeps saying that one should always question ones gender identity, doubt it and redefine it. Material reality was completely negated; what one is left with is fiction and abstraction. The most critical aspect of post modernism is its attack on logic, rationality and reasoning while simultaneously privileging emotions, feelings, desires and pleasures. Butler in troubling gender uses the concept of queer to define anything that subvert the prevailing power matrix. The word queer is an ambiguous term to place in it anything that the market can imagine or that can be bought in the market. But some section of right opportunist have no problems with it. They consider queer theory as an adjunct of Marxism. Many of the opportunist intellectuals like Hardt and Negri have started saying that pleasure is the part of productive force and hence the definition of queer and the concept around it will be a liberating concept for the productive forces. Such vulgarization of Marxism was never done before. Perhaps never before was the hold of Marxism on the people was so weak as it is now.

Quite contrary to the prevailing post-modern understanding on sex and sexuality, our party held that the word gender or queer is post modern imperialist sponsored pro market bourgeoisie concept and hence must be opposed instead the word sex which in itself is used as a depiction for the biological as well as the social aspects of sex should be used. Besides, it also held that sex change will be considered only when there is some material biological conditions leading to the desire for sex change in the absence of which the desire for sex change is basically a market driven imperialist sponsored post modern ideological trends.(Considering the lack of a clinched position on the question of sex change our party

does not give permission to its member to change their sex but the position which we have just stated is a general position for the the people and cadre alike, for this will remain our guiding principle even if the right to change sex is granted by the CC). Besides this firm stand, the party moved ahead in its struggle against imperialist anarchic sexual practices. It defined sexual opportunism. Sexual opportunism was defined as opportunism in the field of sexual practices; sexual intercourse devoid of proletarian ideology. A sexual opportunist is driven by spontaneous, petty bourgeoisie, imperialist driven, post-modern logic of pleasure and joy. The post modernists intellectuals promote such sexual practices while the opportunist clinches to such practices, for when the politics is twisted life's every aspect follows the twist. And in every twist the ideology of post-modernism hold the opportunist. United they march and united shall they fall. The post-modern opportunist have no place inside the party of comrade Marx, comrade Lenin and comrade Mao's legacy. They have to be purged for the party to revive its work.

## **Conclusion**

Opportunism as a political trend/deviation/line inside a communist party is the reflection of the ruling class ideology. It is more dangerous than the enemy's bullet and the method to root it out from our party is active ideological struggle. We need to reconsider our thoughts on class struggle. Many of our comrades had this illusion that armed struggle is the only form of class struggle. It is correct that armed struggle is the highest form of class struggle but if we become liberal at ideological front and do not consider the struggle at this front as part of class struggle then we are bond to lose the struggle at armed front. No one knows this truth better than the ruling class therefore it is most active at the psychological level. The ruling class in their desperation to attack the proletariat ideology has found a new weapon in form of post-modernism. This is a weapon sharper than that of the empirio-criticism of 20<sup>th</sup> century. To defeat it we need to sharpen our understanding on M-L-M. If we are able to locate the post-modern trends within our party structures then we will weaken the opportunists and trends of opportunism. Only active ideological class struggle will help us in this struggle to root out post modern opportunist trends within the communist movement. The enemy is on a massive campaign to wipe us out both physically and ideologically. At such times we remember comrade Lenin who said that "Against us, against the tiny groups of socialists hidden in the expanses of the Russian 'underground,' there stands the huge machine of a most powerful modern state that is exerting all its forces to crush socialism and democracy. We are convinced that we shall, in the end, smash that police state, because all the sound and developing sections of our society are in favor of democracy and socialism; but in order to conduct a systematic struggle against the government, we must raise revolutionary organization, discipline, and the technique of underground work to the highest degree of perfection." These words of comrade Lenin explain our central task at the present time, with firm conviction on M-L-M let us march ahead toward the bright future before us.

