

# Retrograde Journey of the UCPNM Leadership

– Mohan Vaidya ‘Kiran’

## 1. Introduction

The Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) had initiated the great people’s war in February 13, 1996. In the course of ten years’ period, the people’s war had developed from strategic defensive and equilibrium to strategic counter-offensive. In the meantime, king dissolved the parliament and took the power at his hand through a coup d’état on 2061 Magh 19. In that situation, the political parties like NC and UML, which were in the government, were banned. Many leaders were arrested and some stayed underground.

In the given situation, a united front was formed among parliamentarian forces and the Maoist party. The monarchy was forced to surrender under the pressure of great people’s war and the mass movement. The dissolved parliament was reinstated. NC and UML formed a government. The CPN (Maoist) entered into peace process. Both the Government and parliament were reconstituted with the participation of CPN (Maoist). Constituent Assembly (CA) election took place. The CPN (Maoist) acquired first position in the CA election and formed government under its leadership. In this process, the two-line struggle that was smouldering between the opportunist and revolutionary trends since before intensified further in the party. And in this course, UCPNM was formed by having unity with CPN (Unity Centre-Masal). Though the CA was constituted, it was not allowed to promulgate constitution. Finally, the CA was dissolved.

In the meantime, two-line struggle intensified further inside the UCPNM and it necessitated an organisational break from the right neo-revisionism prevailing in the party. In this very process, the CPN-Maoist was formed. And a drama of CA-2 ensued. Our party, the CPN-Maoist boycotted it. The UCPNM relegated to third position in CA-2 election. The CPN-Maoist organised its congress and re-adopted new democracy as its minimum program. The UCPNM also organised its seventh congress and adopted a policy of preparing for socialist revolution with a conclusion that the democratic revolution was basically over in Nepal. Thus, two Maoist parties adopted two different political lines. The CPN-Maoist concluded that UCPNM has turned into a right neo-revisionist group whereas the UCPNM termed the CPN-Maoist as a “dogmato-revisionist” and “left liquidationist” centre.

However, paying attention to the appeal from a huge section of the masses, cadres and the specific situation of party life, discussion for party unity begun. But it did not succeed. The UCPNM leadership reached an anti-national, anti-people and retrograde 16-point agreement with NC and UML for writing an anti-people constitution and then the unity process got disrupted. In this situation, it has been necessary to theoretically and politically elucidate the retrograde journey of UCPNM leadership and raise the struggle against right neo-revisionism to a newer height. This article is based on this purpose.

## 2. The process of retrograde journey

In the present era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, basically three reasons work from behind the origin and development of revisionism in a revolutionary communist party. They are: petty bourgeois class base, thinking based on it and unholy alliance with imperialism and expansionism. In a communist party, these reasons are reflected and also have been reflecting in building of political and military line, allocation of strategy and tactic, the dialectics between two-line struggle and class struggle, the outlook regarding party, army and the united front etc. While talking about right neo-revisionism, it is necessary to pay attention on such reasons and their manifestations.

The political report adopted in the national convention of the CPN-Maoist held in Asadh 2069 and its documents adopted in the Seventh National Congress held in Poush 2069 elaborately shed light on how did the right neo-revisionism originate in the CPN (Maoist). It has been necessary to mention about the retrograde journey of the right neo-revisionism stated in those documents and the issues developed after these political events.

The course of retrograde journey of right neo-revisionism can concisely be presented in points as mentioned under.

**First: so-called development of democracy.** In the course of revolution, it is necessary to develop democracy in both internal and external domain but the party must not be trapped in any deviation nor should it betray revolution. The events like the qualitative development of electronic media, imperialist globalisation, setback of revolution in the countries including in Peru and Philippines and the dissolution

of socialist states have been witnessed in the history of entire world and the International Communist Movement (ICM). In this backdrop, the CC meeting held in Jeth 2060 adopted a draft proposal named “Democracy in the Twenty-first century” in the pretext of accomplishing revolution and preventing counter-revolution. It was not wrong to talk about the development of democracy in party, army and the state, but in essence its objective was to create a loophole for pursuing a retrograde journey. Finally it has been justified now.

**Second: CC meeting in Chunwang.** With the development of great people’s war, the state of class struggle and line struggle came to be very complex. The king seized government and the state power in Nepal through a coup d’état. Right in this course, a serious deviation originated in the party. The course of this deviation concluded on the one hand by adopting a strategy of democratic republic and on the other by drawing a conclusion that the analysis made by Lenin and Mao on imperialism and other concepts vis-à-vis the strategy of the proletariat based on it have lagged behind.

**Third: twelve-point understanding.** In Mangsir 2062, a twelve-point understanding was reached between the CPN (Maoist) and seven political parties. And the issues like restructuring of state, complete democracy, end of the armed conflict and the lasting peace were agreed upon in this understanding. (Comprehensive Peace Accord and other relevant documents, 2064, Government of Nepal, peace and reconstruction ministry). But a strange, the question of concern for the proletarian revolutionaries is not to restructure the old state, but to destroy it.

**Fourth: dissolution of the people’s government.** Seven political parties and the CPN (Maoist) on 2063/03/02 reached many other accords including dissolution of the people’s governments organised by the CPN (Maoist). (Comprehensive Peace Accord and other relevant documents, 2064, government of Nepal, peace and reconstruction ministry). In essence, it was one of the strides of capitulation.

**Fifth: declaration of ending people’s war.** Comprehensive peace accord was reached between the Government of Nepal and the CPN (Maoist). The accord states, “Perpetuating the on-going ceasefire between the government and Maoists, we hereby declare that the armed war being waged from 2052 has been brought to an end.” (Ibid page 18). It is a very clumsy and an ugly model of capitulation before the reactionaries.

**Sixth: dissolution and liquidation of the PLA.** With the declaration of ending great people's war, the People's Liberation Army was confined in the cantonment. Finally, the PLA was disarmed, dissolved and liquidated by using Nepali army when UCPNM was leading the government. This is a very upsetting and despicable event in the world history.

**Seventh: Role in the CA and government.** When the UCPNM was in the CA and government it did not take any necessary stand in favour of the country and people and, maintaining an unholy alliance with parliamentarian, retrograde and the status quo forces, it favoured the democratic republic against new democracy. In addition to the anti-national and anti-people acts, the UCPNM leadership even presented a despicable model of class and national capitulation when it was in the CA and the government.

**Eighth: unity between CPN (Maoist) and CPN (UC-Masal).** Party unity took place between CPN (Maoist) and CPN (Unity Centre-Masal) on Poush 30, 2065. In the history, there had been many unities among various communist parties and there were revolutionary comrades too in the CPN (UC-Masal). But this unity, which took place when a serious two-line struggle was on between revolutionary and opportunist streams, helped mainly the opportunist stream. And the party entirely changed its colour through this process.

**Ninth: the class capitulationism.** The political resolution adopted by the CPN-Maoist in Bouddha Convention writes, “It is class capitulationism to go on kneeling down before the reactions and abandon proletarian ideology, principle, politics and class stand on the issues related with the interest of workers, peasants and the oppressed communities. This kind of class capitulationism is based not in the concept of ‘one divides into two’ but of ‘two combine into one’”. (Political resolution, 2069, page 33).

**Tenth: national capitulationism.** Shedding light on the national capitulationism of neo-revisionist group, the political resolution adopted by the CPN-Maoist in Bouddha Convention writes, “This group on the one hand has brought about ordinances in favour of the multinational companies, foreign investment and comprador and bureaucratic capital and has reached antinational agreements like BIPPA and on the other has not paid attention to develop national and independent agricultural and industrial economy in

the country. They have surrendered export-oriented hydropower projects like Upper Karnali and Arun III to the Indian expansionism". (Ibid. p. 34)

**Eleventh: Hetauda Congress of UCPNM.** The UCPNM organised its Seventh Congress at Hetauda on Magh 20-26, 2069. This congress on the one hand decided that the bourgeois democratic revolution has been completed in Nepal and on the other it decided to institutionalise federal democratic republic. In this way, the UCPNM pursued a retrograde direction from Hetauda Congress and now is going to write anti-people constitution as agreed in sixteen-point agreement.

**Twelfth: sixteen-point agreement and draft constitution.** The NC, UML and UCPNM reached a sixteen-point agreement on Jeth 25, 2072 and decided to write a retrograde constitution. The UCPNM has made it a very glorious issue because the political journey that had started in their initiative from twelve-point understanding has been concluded now in sixteen-point agreement.

**Thirteenth: search of a so-called new force.** The symptoms of right revisionism, reformism and neo-Marxism were noticed since long in the party. In this backdrop, the post-Marxist thinking seriously started raising its head from the article "Today's Marxism" written in ... by Baburam Bhattarai. Right in this process, the journey for search of a new force has started. In fact, it is nothing but a retrograde journey to unite with the old forces.

In the course of retrograde journey of UCPNM leadership, the revolutionary stream of the party too committed several mistakes and had weaknesses and limitations. To name the concepts developing in party as Prachanda Path, to concentrate power in an individual in the name of centralisation of leadership, not to understand and oppose anti-revolutionary activities of some of the major leaders were the mistakes, weaknesses and limitations on the part of revolutionary stream in the CPN (Maoist). The political resolution adopted by the Seventh Congress held in Poush 2069 has clearly mentioned about them.

### 3. Main theoretical and political issues

- **Democracy of the twenty-first century**

The chairman of the erstwhile CPN (Maoist) had presented a proposal "On the experiences of history and the development of democracy in the twenty-first century" in a CC meeting held in Jeth 2060 and it was adopted as a draft proposal for discussion. Aimed at accomplishing revolution and preventing counter-revolution, the said proposal was brought as to develop democracy in party, army and state by taking note of the development of science and technology mainly the information technology on the one hand and the experience of revolution and counter-revolution in the twenty-first century on the other.

After mentioning about democratisation, revolutionisation and proletarianisation in party and army the proposal had, on the democratisation of state, said, "Emphasis should be laid not on the mechanical relation of providing help to the communist party but on the dialectical relation of communist party's democratic political competition with other anti-feudal and anti-imperialist parties that support the legitimate system of the democratic state." [Historical documents of CPN (Maoist) page 256]

Mao had presented the patriotic, democratic and left parties opposing feudalism and imperialism as the forces that provide supporting role to the state. But, in the draft proposal it is said that those parties should be provided with competitive role not the supporting role only. It means not only the communist party that provides leading role in the state power but also other parties formed by patriotic and democratic forces and even the national bourgeois can entertain political right to compete in the election and run the state if they emerge victorious in it. Now what does it mean? If it is so, it is evident that this concept will impart negative impact in running the state power based on people's democratic dictatorship led by the party of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a serious question. In fact, the concept of development of democracy in the twenty-first century is a revision of and a serious attack upon the people's democratic dictatorship or dictatorship of the proletariat. In this way, the democracy of the twenty-first century and the people's multi-party democracy advocated by UML do not seem to have any difference in their content.

On democracy of the twenty-first century, Baburam Bhattarai, in his article - 'Ten years of people's war: development of new state and the question of democracy' - writes, "The CC plenum held in Jeth 2060 adopted a resolution vis-à-vis the 'development of democracy in the twenty-first century' presented by Prachanda. It was a historical milestone in the development of Prachanda Path, a set of new ideas."

(Ten years of people's war, Janadhvani prakashan, Kathmandu, 3063, page 62). Bhattarai is very happy with the party to have adopted this document and therefore he says it is a milestone in the development of Prachanda Path.

Also, what is necessary to pay attention here is that the main pioneer of "Socialism of the twenty-first century" was an advisor of the Venezuelan government and a German thinker, Heinz Dietrich. The South America is said to have accepted this concept and Hugo Chavez is said to be influenced by it. The democracy of the twenty-first century is also known as participatory democracy. This concept is said to differ from imperialism and Marxism both. From this point of view, the democracy of the twenty-first century is nothing other than a mechanical and clumsy replication of socialism of the twenty-first century pioneered by Heinz Dietrich.

- **Democratic republic**

Our party had launched the great people's war to go forward towards socialism and communism by establishing new democratic republic against feudalism and imperialism/expansionism. But, party took on a strategy of democratic republic against new democracy in the CC meeting at Chunwang. It was a very serious retrograde step.

On this type of democratic republic, Baburam Bhattarai in his article, which is entitled 'Ten years of great people's war: the development of new state and the question of democracy', says, "The minimum content of the democratic republic proposed by our party will be: first, monarchy will be completely eliminated and the sovereignty and sovereign power will be fully transferred into people. It will be put into effect from the constitution written by CA which is so elected that it properly represents the entire classes, nations, women, Dalits, and minorities and oppressed communities." (Ibid, page 58-59). Here the 'complete elimination of monarchy' is kept at par with transfer of power into people. Only by eliminating monarchy in a semi-feudal and semi-colonial country that is without eliminating feudal, comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie, the power does not transfer into the people. Here, Bhattarai is in favour of the elimination of monarchy but he is not in favour of eliminating the feudal, comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie. Second, it is talked here about writing a 'new constitution', which represents 'all classes'. It emits a very bad smell of class collaborationism.

Kharipati National Convention tried to correct it and finally it decided to adopt a tactic of people's federal republic. However, the main leadership defied it and ultimately we had to dissociate from the party. The UCPNM has been emphasizing to institutionalise the democratic republic against People's democratic Republic.

The document of Hetauda Congress writes, "In today's concrete condition, party should place the question of ensuring the constitution of federal democratic republic from the CA as the main agenda. The constitution will have a policy that brings feudalism to an end, regulates and controls the comprador and bureaucratic capitalism, ensures right, identity and approach of all classes, nations, regions and gender by ending neo-colonial condition and emphasizes to institutionalise the federal democratic republic with the provision of full proportional representation and right to self-determination." (New synthesis of Nepalese revolution: a historical necessity, page 57). In this excerpt, we have to focus our attention into two points. First, it has been emphasised to guarantee the democratic republic from the CA and institutionalise it. From this it is clear that they have opened the path of class capitulation by accepting the reactionary state power of the comprador and bureaucratic capitalism and feudalism. Second, here the class character of democracy has been completely ignored. There is no clarity on the leadership of democratic republic and the role of oppressed class and community in the state power.

Let us see, what was said in the document adopted in the Chunwang CC meeting. The document writes, "Being clear on the objective that tactic serves the strategy, party regards the democratic republic neither as a bourgeois parliamentary republic nor directly as a new democratic one. This republic with broad restructuring of the state as to solve the problems related to class, nation, region and gender present in the country will play a role of the transitional multiparty republic. Undoubtedly, the reactionary classes and their parties will try to change this republic into bourgeois parliamentary republic whereas our party of the proletariat will try to change it to a new democratic republic." [The historical documents of the CPN (Maoist) page 312]

The expressions like "Extensive restructuring of the state power", 'this republic will play a role of transitional multiparty republic' and attempting to "change it into new democratic republic" remain in the excerpt above. Where have these utterances vanished now? How did the talk of transforming transitional multiparty republic into new democratic republic disappear? When the UCPNM leadership did not pay attention to transform the transitional multiparty republic into new democratic republic and took "a policy of emphasizing to institutionalise" democratic republic then it led to commit another mistake to cover up this right opportunist trend. This mistake or deviation made them to reach a conclusion that the new democratic revolution has been accomplished in Nepal.

Then what is democratic republic? Published in 2063, Baburam Bhattarai, in his article 'Ten years of great people's war: development of new state and the question of democracy', says, "In this democratic republic, which has anti-feudal and anti-imperialist character, the party of the proletariat will constantly intervene upon the state through a legitimate political competition and will attempt to transform it into socialism through new democracy." (Ten years of people's war, Janadhwani Prakashan, Kathmandu, page 59). There are two things that draw attention. First, in today's era, the character of democratic republic cannot at all be anti-feudal and anti-imperialist. Second, he says that new democracy will be achieved through a political completion i.e. election after establishing democratic republic. It makes clear that the Khrushchev's path of peaceful transition has been pursued here against the theory of violence.

Theoretically what we have understood is that the constitutional monarchy is progressive compared to absolute monarchy and the democratic republic is progressive compared to constitutional monarchy. However, the democratic republic can never be progressive in comparison to new democratic republic and proletarian socialist republic as well. Here the question is not of the ruling power only; main question is the state power. We should pay attention in the class form of state power and republic.

Where, how and what kinds of changes have taken place in the situation? Mao, in his famous work 'On new democracy', writes, "A change, however, occurred in China's bourgeois-democratic revolution after the outbreak of the first imperialist world war in 1914 and the founding of a socialist state on one-sixth of the globe as a result of the Russian October Revolution of 1917. Before these events, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution came within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, of which it was a part. Since these events, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution has changed, it has come within the new category of bourgeois democratic revolutions and, as far as the alignment of revolutionary forces is concerned, forms part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution." (Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung, Vol.-II, Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1965, P.343). Here Mao has clarified that the situation has changed after the First World War and Soviet Socialist Revolution, and the bourgeois democratic revolution has changed from old to new and that kind of new bourgeois democratic revolution has been a part not of old bourgeois revolution but of proletarian socialist revolution.

Mao in his work, "On new democracy" has mentioned about three kinds of republics. They are: "(1) republics under the bourgeois dictatorship; (2) republics under the dictatorship of the proletariat; and (3) republics under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes." (Ibid, P. 350). Of the republics mentioned here, Mao has said that "the first kind comprises the old democratic states". In Mao's point of view, after the outbreak of the second imperialist war, there is hardly a 'trace of democracy' in many of the capitalist countries and they come under the "bloody militarist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie". (Ibid P. 350).

The second kind of republic is the one that is based on leadership and dictatorship of the proletariat and this kind of republic was established after the success of socialist revolution in Russia. The third kind of republic is the one that is based on the leadership of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the entire oppressed classes and oppressed communities. This kind of republic was established after the revolution in China, in 1949. Mao favours the third kind of republic for semi-feudal, semi-colonial and neo-colonial countries. This very third kind of republic is known as New Democratic Republic.

The great people's war waged by the CPN (Maoist) was based on the objective of establishing new democratic republic in Nepal. However, the UCPNM leadership has now pursued old type of bourgeois republic by abandoning the new democratic republic. In this type of republic, traces of democracy are hardly seen according to Mao and they fall under the 'bloody militarist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie'. Thus, the democratic republic which is talked about in Nepal falls under the old bourgeois democratic

revolution. And it cannot be anything other than the leadership and dictatorship of the comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and feudalism that is stifled under the imperialist and expansionist interference and oppression.

- **Has the democratic revolution been realised?**

According to UCPNM, the democratic revolution in Nepal has been basically realised. That is, the new democratic revolution in Nepal has been accomplished according to them. Is it true? To answer these questions, the following issues draw attention:

a) The most primary and very important condition for the completion of revolution is: handover of the state power from one class to another. Lenin had said, "The transfer of state power from one class to another is the first, major and the basic characteristics of revolution." (Letters on tactic, Lenin Collected works 10/6, p 327). Has the state power transferred from one class to another in Nepal? No, not at all. At the time of initiation of great people's war, the state power was at the hands of feudal, comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and even now it is at their hand. Although monarchy is over and the republic has been instated, but this much does not mean that the feudal class and feudalism has ended. Apart from monarchy, there are a few such political forces that represent feudal class and feudalism in Nepal and they represent even now.

The UCPNM has not heeded on the oppressive form of state in Nepal. They have not understood that state power in Nepal is at the hands of feudal, bureaucrat and comprador bourgeoisie or they have made other believe so even though they understand it. In fact, they are happy with the democratic republic. Does the achievement of democratic republic mean the completion of bourgeois democratic revolution in the semi-feudal and semi/neo-colonial country? No, it cannot be so. The republic was established in China with the end of monarchy in 1911. But, the Communist Party of China had adopted the programme of democratic revolution against feudalism and imperialism after it was established in 1921.

b) The revolution, which has to be accomplished in a semi-feudal and semi/neo-colonial country, is targeted against feudalism and imperialism/expansionism. Even if we assume feudalism has ended with the end of monarchy, as they advocate, the imperialist and expansionist oppression still exists. In a semi-feudal and neo-colonial country like Nepal, there is no question that feudalism is eliminated at one step and the imperialist and expansionist oppression at the next. The democratic revolution and national revolution cannot go consecutively in Nepal. Mao has said, "It is wrong to regard the national revolution and the democratic revolution as two entirely different stages of the revolution." (Mao Vol. II, Page 318). This concept by Mao is linked with the question of basic contradictions. Before the initiation of people's war we had mentioned that there are two basic contradictions in Nepal, one, the contradiction between feudalism and the Nepalese people and two, the contradiction between imperialism/expansionism and the Nepalese nation. And we had said that new democratic revolution will solve both of these contradictions simultaneously. But now, none of these two contradictions has been resolved. As Mao said, these two contradictions cannot be solved at two stages but at one.

c) One of the important questions of new democratic revolution is that of leadership. Although, it is a bourgeois democratic revolution, it is not an old bourgeois democratic revolution but a new one. The difference between the old and new bourgeois democratic revolution is related with the question of leadership. The leader of old bourgeois revolution was bourgeoisie. On account of the facts that the bourgeois has become a lackey of imperialism by losing its progressive character, the occurrence of inter-imperialist First World War and the accomplishment of socialist revolution in Russia under the leadership of the proletariat, the situation has undergone a change. In this circumstance, the bourgeois revolution that is accomplished in a semi-feudal and semi/neo-colonial country becomes a part not of old bourgeois revolution but of socialist revolution and the proletariat becomes the leader of this revolution. But, was the Maoist force able to lead the state power after it entered into peace process in Nepal? Does not the leadership of the state power still exit at the hands of status quo, parliamentarian or the political forces representing the old classes?

d) It is true; there have been some changes in the semi-feudal condition in Nepal. The capitalism has developed to an extent. However, Nepal is basically in a semi-feudal and neo-colonial socio-economic condition even now and there has been no qualitative change in it. The development of capitalism, which has been taking place in our country, is not that of national capitalism and industrial capitalism. The comprador and bureaucratic capitalism prevails in the country. Had the bourgeois democratic revolution

succeeded, the socio-economic condition of the country would have undergone a qualitative change. But, that has not happened yet.

e) Culturally, the country is basically in a semi-feudal and neo-colonial condition even now. Here, on the one hand, feudal cultural oppression and superstition still exist in the Nepalese society and on the other the imperialist and expansionist cultural domination and intervention also are in the rise.

Hence in total, from the political, economic and cultural point of view, the state power is still at the hands of the comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the feudal class in Nepal. Workers, peasants, women, nationalities, Dalits, Madheshis, Muslims and the people from the oppressed region have not yet been liberated from the feudal and imperialist/expansionist oppression. The question of the defence of national independence has been serious and complex further. The neo-colonial and neo-liberal oppression and intervention has been intensively growing. All these facts prove that the bourgeois democratic revolution has not yet completed in Nepal.

### ● **Sixteen-point agreement and the draft constitution**

A sixteen-point agreement was reached among NC, UML, UCPNM and Madheshi People's Right Forum on Jeth 25, 2072. Expressions like, "Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal", two-third majority of provincial assembly will 'name the provincial assembly', 'Government of Nepal will constitute a federal commission to recommend the provincial border' and "two-third majority of the parliament will take final decision" can be seen in that accord. In addition, the agreement states that the "representative council will be elected through a mixed election system". On the form of governance, the agreement says, "multi-party competitive federal democratic republican parliamentary system will be pursued to rule the country". Also, the agreement has made a provision of "constitutional president".

The sixteen-point agreement has opened the door to write a constitution based on the old reactionary state power of the comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and feudal class against the oppressed classes, regions and communities including workers, peasants, women, Dalits, indigenous nationalities and the Muslims. This is the manifestation of regression in the Nepalese politics.

In this course, the agreement inside a bracket writes, "The UCPNM has dissented on parliamentary governing system and on the provision of constitutional president".

*(Agreement among four major parties of the CA regarding constitution writing, 2072/02/25, Baluwatar Kathmandu)*

This dissension is very much ridiculous. Here, on the one hand, the ministerial governing system has been regarded as parliamentary system and the presidential system as non-parliamentary system. On the other, here the retrograde and status quo constitution has been happily agreed with.

In this course, UCPNM chairman Prachanda has submitted an eight-point note of dissent to Baburam Bhattarai, the chairman of the Political Discussion and Consensus Committee in the CA. The first point in that note of dissent writes, "Guaranteeing the proportional inclusive representation of all the classes, nations, regions, genders and minority communities, socialism-oriented people's democratic republican governing system will be pursued instead of parliamentary system." (Note of dissent of UCPNM, 2072, 20 Jeth.)

First of all, the note of dissent talks about representation of "all classes in the state". It means that the UCPNM is in favour of building a state power comprising of both oppressor and oppressed classes. Here, a concept of democracy for all and a non-class concept have been embraced. It is class collaborationism and class capitulationism. It means the UCPNM wishes to establish the old reactionary state power, not the people's democratic one. Second, here the governing system of people's federal democratic republic also has been mentioned. From this, the UCPNM is trying to create a confusion that it is in favour of "people's federal democratic republic". What does the "people's federal democratic republic" mean when a state power comprising of all classes has been accepted? The UML also is still taking about "people's multiparty democracy". Where does the difference lie?

When the unity process was going on, the sixteen-point agreement of UCPNM has been not only a trivial model of anti-national and anti-people act but also a retrograde event. Although a note of dissent has been placed regarding the agreement, it does not carry any sense when reactionary state power and

the governing system are agreed with. From this perspective, the sixteen-point agreement is a serious betrayal towards the country, people and revolution and the on-going dialogue for unity as well.

- **Fusion of post-Marxism and imperialism**

One of the leaders of neo-revisionist group, Baburam Bhattarai, has been working hard since long to revise Marxism with the backing of neo-Marxism and post-Marxism. A few years back, he had stepped in to that direction by writing a long article entitled “Today's Marxism” in Naya Jhilko. In that article he had revised and distorted the basic concepts of Marxism like class struggle, armed struggle and dictatorship of the proletariat. In his very article, by producing Mao's saying, “Marxism also takes birth, develops and dies”, out of context, he favours post-Marxism, which argues that Marxism is over. In this way he serves the reaction.

Talking a lot about new application of Marxism, creativity and originality, he has been launching a woeful campaign to reject Marxism itself. In this context, he has raised questions on Marxist theory and new model of Nepalese revolution. So, it is necessary to have in-depth study of the issues mentioned in “Today's Marxism” and his other articles.

First: the question of re-establishment of Marxism. In that article he has said that “Marxism should be re-established in a new way”. Marxism is already established, to talk of “emphasizing to re-establish” Marxism means to make further revision of Marxism or even replace it.

Second: the question of democracy in the twenty-first century. Bhattarai appreciates democracy in the twenty-first century very much. Pointing towards that he says, “The CC meeting, held in 2060, put forward a concept that it is necessary to institutionalise the multi-party competitive politics within the constitutional frame even in the socialist states by developing innovative ideas of qualitative nature in the development of proletarian dictatorship and democracy.” (Today's Marxism and imperialism, p 10). Here, the expressions like "innovative ideas of qualitative nature" and "multi-party competitive politics" are noteworthy. Evidently, these utterances are aimed at vulgarising Marxism and annihilating its revolutionary soul.

Third: the model of democratic republic. Bhattarai has regarded democratic republic as a new model of Nepalese democratic revolution. His saying goes, “In view of maintaining proper balance between the democratic and national revolution in the specificity of semi-feudal and semi-colonial Nepalese society, the tactical step of the ‘Federal Democratic Republic’ taken on to accomplish the national bourgeois democratic revolution by bringing monarchy to an end has been successfully implemented. (Ibid p 10). Here, Bhattarai seems happy in the successful implementation of democratic republic but by way of keeping oneself away from the responsibility of making national revolution and reaching an agreement like BIPPA he has practically served Indian expansionism.

Fourth: concept regarding the dictatorship of the proletariat. Bhattarai wants to reject the concept regarding the dictatorship of the proletariat. His saying goes, “It is necessary to clarify the confusion that remains in the use of word ‘dictatorship’. Here the proletarian dictatorship means the proletarian state or authority. It is not that Gramsci's concept of hegemony too cannot be used by amending it in the changed context. Whatever be the name, in the present new context, today's Marxists must develop a scientific and a well-set concept by correcting the system that understands and implements the dictatorship of the proletariat as a one-party state.” (Ibid p 15). Let it be remembered, the genuine Marxists take in the dictatorship of the proletariat as a state power of the proletariat.

Fifth: negation of the role of violence. Violence is necessarily required in a revolution. But, Bhattarai has negated armed struggle in the context of great people's war. He says, “At a time when the armed people's war had reached at the stage of strategic counter-offensive and the old state had been partially destroyed, our party pursued a zigzag and risky path of ending monarchy through mass movement and CA and then accomplishing bourgeois democratic revolution through government, parliament and street.” Even accepting the fact that the old state was destroyed to an extent through violence, here a concept of peaceful transition has been pursued against it.

Sixth: opposition to Stalin and partisan to Trotsky. In relation to the context of the development of information technology and globalised imperialism Bhattarai says, “There exists a possibility of realising revolution in a single country as in Lenin's time but, in today's situation, a worldwide or at least a wave of simultaneous revolutions in some countries has been almost mandatory. As a result of this, today's

Marxists must realise that the present world is becoming more Trotskyite than Stalinist.” (Ibid, p 14). Here, he seems to be anti-Stalin and pro-Trotsky.

Seventh: the model of “progressive” nationalism. His article entitled ‘the essence of progressive nationalism’ is notable. Talking about national independence and democracy he writes, “According to my dissertation paper and my own concept, the national independence and democracy should be connected but while fighting for them the question of national independence can be solved after solving the question of internal democracy. Unless people are internally provided with right and until the internal democracy and the problems related with class, region, nation and gender are solved, we cannot effectively fight against the unequal relation with India, which exists after Sugauli Treaty. (Ibid p 38). Here he talks about accomplishing national and democratic revolution in different stages. It is a direct violation of Maoism.

Eighth: model of so-called new force. Bhattarai’s journey to post-Marxism by rejecting Marxism goes on further ahead. It is explicitly manifested in his article entitled, ‘need of a new force’. In this article, he has prepared a peculiar type of eclectic hotchpotch by putting Marxism and neo-liberalism at one place.

How does a new force arise? Bhattarai says, “New force can arise from two or three processes. First, it is by transforming the existing parties when they feel its necessity. When the new situation is created, it is not possible from old ideology, old party and old leadership. Another way can be a new polarisation from among those who grasp this idea from all parties. Or, a new leadership can emerge from other different processes than these.” (Need of a new force, Nepal national weekly, 2 Chaitra 2070). It is an eclectic and class collaborationist thinking as regards party building.

On the difference between two outlooks, Bhattarai says, “Generally there will be two explanations and two debates. One will be neo-liberal thinking, which regards an individual and individualism as principal. And other is Marxist or socialist outlook, which regards collectivism and society as primary and the individual as secondary. In the entire field of politics, sociology, economics, culture and aesthetics, there is debate and competition between these two outlooks. The reason behind the failure of first CA was the contradiction between these two outlooks. The constitution did not come up when they pulled apart. (Ibid). Here his idea is that a retrograde hotchpotch constitution should have been written by merging neo-liberalism and Marxism together.

Baburam Bhattarai says, “Ideologically and philosophically, one should go ahead by building a suitable ideology from neo-liberal and socialist ideas to meet the present necessity.” (Ibid). Here Baburam is in search of a new ideology. According to him, the new suitable ideology can develop by merging “neo-liberal and socialist” ideologies together at one place. Not only neo-Marxism and post-Marxism but also imperialism smells in these sayings of Baburam. This is a reactionary thinking in essence.

In this very process, he has presented a proposal entitled ‘new situation, new ideology, new line, new force’ to discuss in his party. In that proposal, he has made evil-attempts to justify further his distortions and vulgarization of Marxism by again putting forward Mao’s saying that Marxism also takes birth, develops and dies. Explaining international, national and immediate situation, on the one hand, he says that “writing of a federal democratic republic constitution from the CA is the main task” and on the other he says that “entire communist groups should be united.” In the very proposal he says, “Admitting the ground reality that communist party was divided in the past mainly due to debates in the immediate tactic and that the different communist/leftist parties/groups exist in the country even at present, the initiative to build up an organisational unity among the entire communist/leftist party/groups on the basis of a new political line of socialist revolution should be taken up, because of growing proximity in their immediate tactic and conduct at present.” (5/3/2072) <http://www.baburambhattarai.com/content.php?update=449>). Here, by bringing the entire opportunists with alien ideologies and outlooks at one place, Baburam Bhattarai wants to build a hotchpotch party guided by a mishmash ideology.

UCPNM leader, Baburam Bhattarai, often talks of the development of Marxism, new application, new model, creativity and innovation in the name of opposing dogmatism. But, in essence it is nothing other than the old ideas concocted by beautifying terminologies. It has been nakedly exposed in his reactionary theory of merging neo-liberalism and Marxism together. The theory of a new force has been based on the fusion of neo-Marxism, post-Marxism and imperialism.

#### **4. Constituent Assembly, International Experience and Nepalese Revolution**

The slogan of CA adopted at the time of people's war was a tactical slogan. Its goal was to help the new democratic revolution go forward. We fought even with the forces like NC and UML, the defender of the reactionary state power. In the course of bringing the monarchy to an end we had had a united front with NC and UML. Under the leadership and initiative of our party monarchy ended and the republic was instated. But, even after the fall of monarchy, the leadership of the state power remained with comprador and bureaucratic bourgeois and feudal. From this angle, what is clear is that the tactic of CA not only failed to support the strategy of establishing new democratic state power but on the contrary it also turned to be a weapon of status quo and retrograde political forces.

In the course of democratic revolution in Germany in 1848, Marx, on the question of CA and the state power has said, "A constituent National Assembly must above all be an active, revolutionarily active assembly. The Assembly at Frankfurt is engaged in parliamentary school exercises and leaves it to the governments to act. Assuming that this learned gathering succeeds, after mature consideration, in framing the best of agendas and the best of constitutions, of what use is the best agenda and the best constitution if the governments meanwhile have placed bayonets on the agenda?" (Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Marx-Engels Collected works, Vol.-VII, from internet). In the same article Marx says, "Every provisional government after a revolution necessitates a dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that." (Ibid p 91). Explicitly, here Marx says that an energetic dictatorship is necessary for any state power after revolution.

Paying necessary attention to Marx's saying, Lenin, in the course of clarifying party's minimum programme and tactic in 1905 has said, "The revolution's decisive victory over Tsarism means the establishment of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" (V I Lenin, collected works, 10/3 page 65, progressive publishers Moscow 1981). This excerpt by Lenin is noteworthy.

Marx and Lenin have well shed light on the need to have revolutionary dictatorship to protect the fruit or the decisive victory of revolution. But a strange! We handed over the lost power to NC and UML by building a united front with them and helped them run the state power in their leadership. The result of the mass movement in April 2006, which is said to be a historic one, happened to be so in its content.

Bourgeois democratic revolution did not succeed in Russia in 1905. After several ups and downs and a long preparation it succeeded in February 1917. As a result, the state power transferred from the hand of feudal class to the bourgeoisie. The Tsarism ended and the parliamentary democratic republic got established there. Lenin's ideas presented in the context of the then Russian revolution are especially notable for us.

The UCPNM leadership has talked a lot about February revolution in Russia and April Thesis. What is the April Thesis in fact? Lenin says, "Not a parliamentary republic - to return to a parliamentary republic from the Soviets of Workers' Deputies would be a retrograde step - but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies throughout the country, from top to bottom." (From V.I. Lenin Collected Works, 4<sup>th</sup> English Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol-24). Here Lenin, saying that to return to a parliamentary republic would be a retrograde step, has specially emphasized to go towards proletarian soviet republic. To return to democratic republic in the situation when base areas were established and people's power was already in practice is definitely a retrograde step. The UCPNM leadership has been stepping in this very retrograde move.

After the bourgeois democratic revolution was accomplished in February in 1917, Lenin had clearly placed his ideas in this way, "It is ... but (and here is where we differ from Kautsky and Co.) not a state of the type of the usual parliamentary bourgeois-democratic republic, but a state like the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Soviets of Workers' Deputies of 1905 and 1917." (From V.I. Lenin Collected Works, 4<sup>th</sup> English Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol-24, Page 86).

These sayings by Lenin are self-evident. After the bourgeois democratic revolution triumphed in 1917, Lenin moved ahead not in favour of "parliamentary bourgeois democratic republic" not to institutionalise that kind of state but to struggle for "a state like the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Soviets of Workers' Deputies of 1905 and 1917". In this process, Lenin waged strong theoretical struggle against right opportunists like Kautsky.

But here we see that the UCPNM leadership has pursued a path not towards socialism by disagreeing with bourgeois democratic republic but towards the reactionary state power based on the parliamentary democratic republic after admitting that bourgeois democratic revolution has been completed. It is an apex of political degeneration.

There are two things that everyone should understand. First, the UCPNM leadership considers that the democratic revolution has been basically completed. However the fact is that, the imperialist and expansionist intervention totally remains unresolved and feudal oppression also has not completely ended. What is the correct analysis of this situation? Can the national and democratic revolution be accomplished in two different stages? Mao has already answered it and we have mentioned it before. Second, if the democratic revolution has been completed, then does a genuine communist struggle for socialism or takes a path to institutionalize the democratic republic? The thing is clear. The genuine communists as Lenin said fight for socialism, not to institutionalize democratic republic.

The bourgeois democratic revolution failed in Russia in 1905 and the CA election did not take place there. After the February revolution in 1917, though the CA election was talked about, the ruling party did not organize it. After the October socialist revolution, the CA election took place, but it lagged behind the socialist revolution. So the CA was dissolved. What is clear from this is that the CA is only a tactic; it is not a non-missing weapon of revolution. But, the UCPNM leadership considers CA not as a tactic to realize the strategic goal but as an unchangeable strategy that never misses the target. Not only this, they have used it as a reliable shield to make them safely land to the reactionary state power.

## **5. Policy regarding unity and dialogue**

Indicating towards the UCPNM, the political resolution adopted by the CPN-Maoist in Bouddha Convention writes, “If they are honestly and earnestly self-critical of their past deviation, mistakes and shortcomings, if they make firm commitment towards Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, programme of the new democratic republic and its political line and if they are practically transformed, the door of unity with this group will remain open.” (CPN-Maoist, political resolution, 2069, page 35).

Even in the situation, when UCPNM was trapped in the quagmire of neo-revisionism, it necessitated to have dialogue for unity even facing danger. Two reasons have worked from behind this. First, after the CA-2 election result turned very poor for UCPNM, the UCPNM emphasized very much on the need to go for party unity through public statements. Second, masses of the people and a section of cadres too started laying emphasis on unity. In this situation, it necessitated to take on this question seriously.

On account of this context, Bouddha Convention’s policy for party unity and the CC decision, the PB meeting adopted a six-point theoretical, political and organisational basis to talk for party unity. Party unity could take place with those that “1 – pursue Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as guiding ideology, 2 – accept policy of new democratic revolution, programme and line, 3 – oppose parliamentarism, 4 – agree with the role of violence for social revolution and transformation, 5 – are ready to sum up party history and willing to correct mistakes and weaknesses and 6 – agree to run organisation in accordance with the crux and sentiment of democratic centralism.” (Resolution of PB of the CPN-Maoist regarding party unity, 2071/0/23). This six-point resolution forwarded by addressing the necessity and wish of the people and cadres is important theoretically, politically and organisationally.

Sometimes after the resolution was adopted, the UCPNM placed their reply as, “We want to clarify that our party agrees in principle the theoretical, political and organisational basis you have placed in six points for party unity. On the question of point number 2, it is clear that we have decided to go forward to the strategy of socialist revolution by realising the remaining task of democratic revolution. However, our party is serious towards the historic necessity of accomplishing the Nepalese revolution, we have made and will make efforts to reach common conclusion through open and clear discussion with you, so we request for a concrete initiative in this direction.” (Prachanda, chairman, UCPNM, 207/05/25). Though the subject matter has been presented here in an abstract way, the letter was considered to be positive.

In this backdrop, there were formal and informal discussions from both sides and ultimately a joint negotiation team was constituted. The negotiation team took decision to concretise the issues and push the process forward. Also, several home-works too were held. But, finally, kicking out all these realities the UCPNM reached a sixteen-point agreement with NC and UML and decided to write an anti-people “Federal Democratic Republic” constitution from the CA. This agreement is an anti-national, anti-people

and retrograde. In this situation, the press communiqué issued after the Standing Committee meeting of our party says, “It has been clear that the UCPNM leadership has seriously betrayed the process of principled unity among the revolutionary communists and backtracked from the unity process for they took part in the retrograde agreement reached on Jeth 25, 2072. In this situation, it has been decided that to continue the unity process with UCPNM in the old manner will be disastrous for party.” (CPN-Maoist, central headquarters, 2072/02/27). Now, we cannot talk about unity in the old manner. To do so will be disastrous for party.

Was not it wrong to proceed towards unity in the situation when they were considered revisionist and they have not corrected from their wrong position, a question arises. But the thing is not like that. Even though they had not corrected their wrong position, we had carried dialogue forward by daring to face danger in the situation when firstly, we smelled a slight possibility of their correction and secondly, many revolutionary comrades remained in that group. As per the necessity of country, people and revolution, it was correct to do so as an exception, in the given particular situation. To go for dialogue and to have unity are not the same. But, all those, who are concerned, should understand that unless they correct themselves and pursue a revolutionary line neither there was possibility of unity with UCPNM leadership in the past, nor it exists now and nor will it remain in the future. In addition to this, what we should understand is that there is a big section of revolutionaries in the UCPNM and so we should not close our eyes from the historical necessity and responsibility of uniting genuine Maoists.

## **6. A theoretical synthesis**

The political resolution adopted in the Bouddha Convention writes, “The theoretical characteristics and trends that exist in Prachanda-Baburam clique can be presented in three categories, they are: right liquidationism, class capitulationism and national capitulationism. Taking into account of all these characteristics together, it is better to term this trend or stream as right neo-revisionism. The classical and modern revisionism abandon and distort the basic concept of Marxism including dialectical and historical materialism, class struggle, theory of violence and the dictatorship of the proletariat while the neo-revisionism, in the pretext of opposing dogmatism, creative application of Marxism and uniqueness of revolution does exactly the same. To snatch the essence of Marxism in the name of creative development of Marxism is the main characteristic of neo-revisionism.” (Political resolution, 2069 Asar page 29). The main characteristic of neo-revisionism has been mentioned here in brief.

Now it is necessary to discuss philosophy, political economy and socialism found in neo-revisionism.

### **a) The domain of philosophy**

Marxist philosophy is the dialectical and historical materialist philosophy. It stands against all sorts of metaphysics, idealism and centrist mishmash trends. Philosophically, the neo-revisionism is trapped in the web of metaphysics, idealism and centrist mishmash trends.

In the domain of philosophy, the neo-revisionists have been practicing eclecticism against dialectical materialism. The eclecticism prepares a hotchpotch of alien ideologies, trends, thinking and opinions. The neo-revisionists have amalgamated Marxism and capitalism, revolutionary path and opportunist path at one point by using eclecticism.

The neo-revisionists have accepted the constitution based on pluralist outlook. Pluralism admits the opposites but does not agree with the unity of opposites. It stands as opposed to the dialectical materialist monism. In the same way, the neo-revisionists also pursue vulgar evolutionism that opposes qualitative leap and stands by evolution. It opposes the path of revolution and pursues the path of reform.

The basic law of materialist dialectics is the unity and struggle of opposites. This law is known as “one divides into two”. Its opposite metaphysical thinking is also regarded in the sense of “two combine into one”. In the philosophical domain, the UCPNM leadership has embraced the concept of two combine into one.

The theory of one divides into two is based upon the concept of unity, struggle and transformation of opposites. It lays stress in correctly determining the contradiction between the opposites and solving it. On two combine into one, the central school of the Communist Party of China says, “The core of the theory “combine two into one” lies in merging contradictions, liquidating struggle, opposing revolution, “combining” the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, “combining” Marxism with revisionism, “combining”

socialism with imperialism and social-imperialism. This out-and-out reactionary bourgeois idealist and metaphysical world outlook is diametrically opposed to the world outlook of **one divides into two.**” (Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front (1949-64), Foreign Languages Press, Peking, P. 53)

As the party school of CPC says, the neo-revisionism lays emphasis in merging the contradictions between enemy and friendly forces, combining the comprador, bureaucratic capitalism and feudalism with Nepalese proletariat and merging opportunism and Marxism at one place. To bring Marxism and neo-liberalism together means to combine Marxism and imperialism. Now, the neo-revisionist group has adopted, not Marxism, but hybrid Marxism as the post-Marxists do.

## **b) The domain of political economy**

The political economy studies the production relation. It investigates the human relation, essentially the class relation. The political economy is a science that studies class struggle. The neo-revisionism has been making serious distortions and misinterpretations in this field too.

The neo-revisionist group has been entrapped in the quagmire of class capitulationism and national capitulationism in the domain of political economy. On the one hand, it has taken a policy of competitive politics with the political forces that represent comprador, bureaucratic capitalism and feudal class and on the other considering that imperialism is an invincible force it has taken a policy of capitulating before them.

The neo-revisionism places superstructure, not the base, in the principal position and ignores the need to change base and the production relation. To say that the bourgeois democratic revolution has been accomplished without changing socio-economic base of the country is the signifier of this fact. It should be understood as an eclectic mixture of neo-Marxism, Post-Marxism and financial capital.

The neo-revisionism, emphasizing in the merger of Marxism and neo-liberalism, has been liquidated from the proletarian stance and on the other has capitulated before financial capitalism.

## **c) The domain of socialism**

The domain of scientific socialism is related with the questions like party, state power, the goal of revolution, means of revolution, forms of struggle, strategy and tactic etc. In this domain, the neo-revisionist group has betrayed the country, people and revolution and the right, interest and goal of the proletariat. And it is pursuing the retrograde direction through right opportunism.

The neo-revisionist group is taking strides fast to change the party, not merely to a right opportunist party, but a retrograde one.

The UCPNM leadership has abandoned new democracy. In the domain of scientific socialism, the main features of the neo-revisionist group has been to abandon the new democratic revolution to be completed against feudalism and imperialism/expansionism, based on the united front of the broad masses and the leadership of the Nepalese proletariat.

In Hetauda Congress, the UCPNM leadership had adopted a policy to guarantee and institutionalise the democratic republic through CA. Now, it has already accepted the ‘multi-party competitive federal democratic republican parliamentary system based on pluralism’. Pluralism is an imperialist outlook and it has already been discussed. Multiparty competition means to partake in the state power with the reactionary classes. The democratic republic is a state power of the comprador, bureaucratic capitalism and feudal class based on the imperialist world outlook. In this situation, the UCPNM leadership, which is talking about socialism, is not scientific socialism but reformist and the imperialist socialism.

## **7. Conclusion**

This is the discussion we deemed necessary now to carry out about the retrograde journey of UCPNM leadership. The journey, the UCPNM leadership is theoretically and politically taking, will ultimately lead them to enter the opposite pole and the main leadership is responsible for this. It is a question of serious setback for the Nepalese revolution and the Nepalese Communist Movement as well. The main danger before the revolution today is not dogmatism and extremism but empiricism and right revisionism.

Today, the danger of right opportunism and betrayal towards revolution has been mounting in both the international and Nepalese Communist Movement. The main responsibility of genuine communist revolutionaries, wherever s/he is now, is to resolutely go ahead to unify the communist movement in a new way by waging struggle against all sorts of reactions and carrying out ruthless ideological struggle against right revisionism. Now, time has come for the revolutionaries in the UCPNM to think it seriously.

Certainly, the path of revolution is arduous and complex. But, we must air our commitment now to moving forward to the direction of realizing the ideal of socialism and communism through new democratic revolution, by daring to raise high the banner of proletarian revolution guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Future is ours, victory of revolution is inevitable.