

Future of the CPM-Model

THEY TALK ABOUT DEMOCRACY, NOT PARLIAMENTARY democracy, and yet all their high-sounding 'tactical-line' appears poised to use every bit of electoral space to bolster their presence in the heaven called Parliament. Not that the 59-page draft political resolution of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), as reported in a section of press, is something unique, deviating from its oft-repeated rhetoric of maintaining equi-distance from two mainstream parties—Congress and Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)—while seeking alliance with any party proclaiming itself as democratic and 'secular', ranging from Indian Muslim League to Lalu Yadav's casteist outfit—Rashtriya Janata Dal. The resolution they are going to adopt at the party's forthcoming 20th Congress at Khozikode in Kerala is essentially an election manifesto, couched with ideological and political niceties, to maintain sustainable growth in Parliament.

Incidentally it is the 20th Congress of the Soviet Party that made unity in international communist movement impossible because of great ideological debates between the East and the West. Those who are pondering over whether CPM, the darling in social democratic circles, abandoning the Soviet model or the Chinese model, are in reality chasing a wild goose. The point at issue is they never followed any model. Their secret agenda was not about any brand of revolution—Russian or Chinese. What all they did during their long journey since their inception in the sixties was to promote Soviet foreign policy interests, running the risk of being dubbed anti-national, while playing a somewhat passive role in discouraging the so-called Chinese line in every possible way. That they are still talking about socialism is something puzzling because social revolution has long gone from their discourse. Maybe, it is a dirty word for them! They are advocating the existing parliamentary democracy, in so many voices, only to fine-tune their approach to market as the Chinese 'communists' do in the garb of 'market socialism'—a utopia—with Chinese characteristics. If there is any specific feature in the Chinese syndrome, it is rabid nationalism. They are nationalist to the core and it is more pronounced today when they have no moral compulsion to air communist internationalism.

The CPM-model that is now gaining currency contains, so it seems, elements of both a market and a controlled economy and it may evolve in either way. They are against neo-liberalism in their document but their resolution emphasises the very idea that the non-state economy is an indispensable instrument to further development of productive forces. So there is no problem to get united with the motley crowd that parade themselves as champions of democracy and social justice, whatever it means in real life.

Buoyed by the parliamentary success of the left in Latin America and the dazzling miracle of China's market economy, they can hardly talk of any revolutionary model other than their very own model of election-all politics. What they don't highlight is the negative side of the so-called Chinese model of economic prosperity. Some 250 million people became surplus in villages in the yester years and they had no option but to migrate to cities. And around 70,000 sq km of rural land, equal to the area of Ireland, have been used for urban construction. As if

this is not enough, the advocates of 'more reforms and opening-up' demand further liberalisation and de-control of the economy, to make China, a superpower in every sense, hopefully in another 20 years or so. But they—orthodox market economists of China—are not free from worries as they see rural surplus labour starts disappearing. And the trend seems irreversible. Also, resource intensive growth pattern has brought about rapid resource depletion, incurred damage to the environment beyond repair and some common but disturbing ills like wasteful consumption, income stagnation and a widening income gap. In China the government's 'slow action' to push forward market-oriented reform is being criticised by the hard-liners, day in and day out. In other words the disciples of Deng want a totally de-controlled regime to build a better market friendly atmosphere. All this is happening under one party's authoritarian rule. What the CPM-model envisages is to follow market rules under a multi-party dispensation. Ideological differences which they dish out at every critical juncture are sham. Multi-party or one party, in either case they can hardly impact positively or negatively, the country's development.

They may derive comfort from the fact that they have no reason to get alarmed by the emerging trends of social unrest which may lead to economic catastrophe not in the distant future. Their role model demands an efficient market supervisor and they look too eager to offer themselves as a reliable candidate for the post, even by discarding minimum pretension of communist tag.

India is already a liberalised and market-driven economy. In the coming years the ruling elites are likely to further reduce state intervention to allow the forward march of market. They are all in favour of fair market environment and CPM-model is basically aimed at adjusting with 'Indian Drama'. In the ultimate analysis it is all about to make them partners in the state syndicate that solely survives on loot of the exchequer. □□□