

Appendix 1

communist party of india (marxist-leninist) NAXALBARI

To

Central Committee,
Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)

Dear comrades,

Over the past many years we have had a close relation with your party and learned a lot from your experiences. Our party as well as the masses led by it have always been inspired by the great advances made by the people's war led by you and have been in the forefront in mobilising support for it. Hence, the new developments in your country and the new tactics followed by you naturally became a matter of keen discussion. In view of this, as well as the criticisms raised by some fraternal parties and the revisionist's confusing propaganda, our Central body decided to take up a through study of the issues involved. The discussion our delegates had with you recently was also a part of this. Instead of limiting the study to the Central leadership the leading bodies at the State level were also involved.

We are glad to inform you that this study and discussion based on it at a Central Enlarged Meeting has been successfully completed recently. It has come to the conclusion that the *"...the political-organisational plans of the CPN (M) adhere to the tasks and orientation of new democratic revolution. Contrary to the propaganda done by the enemy and the revisionists, as well as the doubts created in the minds of some comrades, the present tactics of the CPN (M) do not in any way indicate a desire to abandon the road of revolution for the sake of a share in the existing power. On the contrary, they indicate an MLM orientation and its application. Their tactics are serving the strategy of new democratic revolution. They are applying these tactics to fight and complete the new democratic revolution. The CPN (M) is leading a great political struggle and it is our internationalist duty to uphold and build support for it."*

The Enlarged Meeting also discussed the dangers you face due to the continuing machinations of US imperialism and Indian expansionism. It has decided to carry out a campaign 'Hands off Nepal' wherever we have organisational capacity. The aims of this campaign will be giving an authentic representation of the views of your party, exposure of US imperialism and Indian expansionism and mobilisation of public support for the new democratic revolution of Nepal. ...

While coming to the conclusion that your present tactics and policies are correct, the Enlarged Meeting also had some critical observations. We would like to share them with you in the spirit of fraternal ties. The Meeting felt that *"there are some positions, formulations and analysis, within the overall correct orientation, that give room for right deviationist tendencies. Further, we think that some of the views expressed in the press statements and interviews of the CPN (M) leadership have violated the norms of internationalist relations. In general, it has not properly taken into consideration the international fall out of its public statements."* Let us try and explain these points in more detail.

Danger of Giving Room for Rightist Tendencies

- A) You have explained the international and national context for adopting the present tactics as follows: In the present world situation, no socialist state exists and no other revolution has reached near the seizure of power. US imperialism has unchallenged supremacy. The landlocked situation of Nepal also must be taken into account. Hence the present situation demands more tactical flexibility compared to during Mao's time, even while standing firm on the strategic orientation. Certain specific aspects of the military and organisational situation that make it difficult to seize cities were also cited. The isolation of the genocidal monarchy and the desperation of the SPA to get some political room are additional factors making these tactics possible.

In an overall sense this analysis is correct. But how is this reading of the situation to be related to the evaluation that a new wave of world revolution is emerging? It could be understood that while the situation is favourable in the long run, in the immediate tactical sense it is unfavourable. But doesn't the immediate situation also contain an unfavourable factor for imperialism? As we know despite unchallenged hegemony of US imperialism it is increasingly bogged down in Iraq and Afghanistan. Even if the resistance in these countries are not led by revolutionary forces, they draw strength for the principal contradiction in the world today, i.e. between imperialism and the oppressed nations and people. An earlier CPN (M) document had itself assessed in 2004, "It is also sure that more the US imperialism goes on being exposed worldwide including in Iraq, Afghanistan and the middle east and more the Indian expansionism goes on being so among the South Asian masses for its own brokerage, favourability for the success of People's War in Nepal goes on being added in the same proportion. Developments of events have been clearly indicating that this favourability will in the days to come augment in favour of the success of Nepalese People's War." This has no doubt played a role in pushing the imperialists and reactionaries to allow the SPA to come to an agreement with you. While your documents refer to the overall favourable situation in the world, this factor is missing in its explanation of the immediate situation. Recently, it has said that the US is functioning like a globalised state with 140 military bases all over the world. This is going beyond noting the status of the US today as a sole superpower, enjoying unchallenged hegemony. It ignores the serious problems faced by the US in carrying out its strategy to achieve total domination through its so called 'War on Terrorism' due to the resistance of the world peoples and also underplays the growing contention within the imperialists camp, particularly with Russia.

You have correctly stated that the present tactics flow from the strong position achieved by the 10 year old people's war. This strength is evident. Along with that there is also a favourable factor in the international and national situation, in the immediate sense itself. And it is necessary to stress this. If both the favourable and unfavourable factors are not taken into account and placed as such before the party and the masses it can lead to the development of pessimistic tendencies. Mao's writings clearly show us that this was how he analysed and presented the situation that made tactics of coalition government both possible and necessary.

- B) Another matter is the analysis made of the parliamentary parties. A recent document (August 2006), analysing the present situation says that "...development of political events has again justified the theoretical understanding that the comprador bourgeoisie, who advocate parliamentarism, not only do not wage decisive struggle against feudalism but do all they can to collaborate with it by settling their share in the power... Today, the democracy of major parliamentarian parties and their leaders has been absurd and despotic to the same extent how much stupid and national treachery has become the nationalism and patriotism of feudal kings. Once again, the history has verified that only the proletariat, by grasping the inseparable scientific relation between nationalism and democracy, can lead the bourgeois

democratic revolution to the level of its decisive victory.” This is correct and repeats the earlier analysis made you on the class character of the main Nepali parliamentary parties. But some earlier documents, particularly after the signing of the 12 point agreement with the SPA, were silent about the class roots of their vacillation. For example the November 2005 Plenum Report states, “Even while wide public opinion has been built up today in favour of constituent assembly election, it is clear that the pressure of foreign power centres is working from behind the failure of 7 political parties to abandon the collaborationist slogan of restoration of parliament...The reason behind continuing with such situation seems to be a phobia of imperialists and, to a great extent, parliamentarian party leaders, that the Maoists might acquire upper hand when constituent assembly and republic is taken up directly...they have been insisting the People’s Liberation Army, under our party leadership, and weapons to be the main problem. One can easily understand the secret behind the saying that feudal and imperialist leaders cannot believe us until we come in peaceful politics by abandoning People’s War, in other words, until we surrender, but the same kind of saying from the leaders of parliamentarian parties, who talk of full democracy or republic, can be said ridiculous only.” Here, the SPA’s vacillation is merely linked to foreign pressure and fear that the Maoists will get an upper hand in a Constitutional Assembly, and not put in the context of their class character.

It may be argued that since the CPN (M) has always been clear about the comprador class character of the main parliamentary parties it is not necessary to repeat this everywhere. But that is not a satisfactory explanation. Neither can it be explained away as a matter of tactical flexibility. It is a common law that whenever a Maoist party enters into compromises or talks with reactionary forces the possibilities for rightist tendencies to grow increase. Therefore it becomes all the more necessary to repeatedly relate political developments to the internal and international class relations and repeatedly educate the ranks.

Our concern over this increases in view of the assessment made by your November 2005 Plenum about the inner party struggle that developed in 2004-2005. The Report of that Plenum states, “...there remained no basic difference even though there were differences in emphasis and angle in some questions related with ideology of protracted nature...” and there was “...similar kind of thinking in tactic against the absolute monarchy.” The success of the CPN (M) leadership in overcoming the disunity at its top most level and converting that negative situation into a positive one is certainly a great achievement. The present advances it is making would not have been possible without this. Yet, its evaluation is silent about whether there were any basic differences or not. Clearly enough, the position advanced by com: Lal Dhoj that “As for as the sincere commitment of the revolutionary democratic forces, who aspire to reach socialism and communism via a new democratic republic, towards a bourgeois democratic republic is concerned, the CPN (Maoist) has time and again clarified its principled position towards the historical necessity of passing through a sub-stage of democratic republic in the specificities of Nepal.”¹ was contradictory to the position of the party. Since similar views were expressed in other articles also it cannot be taken as a chance remark. While it is good that transformation took place through struggle, it was also necessary to educate the party about the differences that had come up. Keeping silent about this is a bad method.

Your documents usually characterise the monarchy as representing the feudal forces. Though it is correct to make a distinction for tactical purposes between feudal forces and

¹ ‘The Royal Regression and the Question of Democratic Republic’

representatives of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie, this way of putting it weakens the understanding of the monarchy as a form of the existing Nepali state, which serves all the ruling classes. This will have implications to how the present tactics is understood in relation to the strategic task of new democratic revolution.

- C) The November 2005 CC document has explained the party's understanding on its present tactics: "Now the slogan of interim government, election of the constituent assembly and democratic republic that our party, taking into account of the international and domestic balance of power, has formulated is a tactical slogan put forward for the forward-looking political way out. Remaining clear on the principle that the tactic must serve strategy, our party has viewed the democratic republic neither as the bourgeois parliamentary republic nor directly as the new democratic one. This republic with an extensive reorganization of the state power as to resolve the problems related with class, nationality, region and sex prevailing in the country, would play a role of transitional multiparty republic. Certainly, the reactionary class and their parties will try to transform this republic into bourgeois parliamentary one, where as our party of the proletariat class will try to transform it into new democratic republic. How long will be the period of transition, is not a thing that can right now be ascertained. It is clear that it will depend upon the then national and international situation and state of power balance. As for now, this slogan has played and will play an important role to unite all the forces against the absolute monarchy dominant in the old state for it has been a common enemy for both revolutionary and parliamentary forces."

First of all it is still not clear whether the democratic republic mentioned here is the presently proposed interim government or the one to be formed under a new constitution adopted by the constitutional assembly. Our delegation could not get a satisfactory explanation. It is quite possible that since the party is developing its tactics and understanding in a quickly changing political situation it is at present not able to give a clear answer. But the position expressed in the quote given above raises some questions. The conception of democratic republic formed under a new constitution as a transitory form is problematic. Similarly, it is wrong to conceive that the reactionaries in a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country can form a bourgeois parliamentary republic. Yet, we can agree that an interim government, in which the SPA also is a partner, will be neither new democratic or simply a continuation of the past. But in that case also it will have class content. It will be a dual power. It is true that the length of the period it will exist cannot be ascertained right now. But, as a general principle, dual power can exist only for a fairly short period. This is particularly true when it is coexisting within a single structure. If this is not explained as such a rightist tendency promoting the desirability and possibility of a fairly long period of co-existence with the reactionary parties can well come up.

- D) This is also related to the possible outcome of the present tactics. Your overwhelming emphasis after the reinstatement of the old parliament was that there is very little chance for the formation of an interim government or elections to a constituent assembly. Its latest document (August 2006) evaluates that, "...in spite of wide opinion inside the country, peaceful restructuring of state, election of constituent assembly and establishment of democratic republic is becoming impossible. As a result of interference of imperialist and expansionist powers, who represent most clearly the interest of feudal, comprador and bureaucratic capitalist class, and capitulationist character of major parliamentary parties, who kneel down before them, peaceful way out from the table of talks has been turning out to be impossible." Most probably this will be correct. But, the possibility that the US imperialists and other reactionaries may go ahead with a lengthy truce, including the formation of an interim government, holding elections to a Constitutional Assembly and allowing the

monarchy to be scrapped, cannot be ruled out altogether. The unfavourable political situation they face within Nepal at present in view of the support gained by the CPN (M), problems faced by US imperialists in West Asia, the concern within the Indian ruling classes on getting directly involved militarily, as well as the question of how China will react, give rise to this possibility. Obviously they will never accept the interim constitution proposed by the CPN (M). But the party also will not be able to insist on total acceptance as a condition for continuing the present process.

At present you are not giving any weight to this possibility. But if it materialises then this approach of ruling it out will seriously weaken the capacity of the party in manoeuvring and in ideological training the broad masses and new sections attracted towards it. The present plan of the party to build a broad republican front and launch a new mass movement is oriented on preparing a "...general insurrection for the republic." It has been explained that though the content of this republic achieved through an insurrection will be new democratic it is not stated as such out of tactical considerations. Tactical slogans should definitely be capable of linking up with the mood of the masses. Lenin's slogans of "Peace, Bread and Democracy" during the preparations for the October insurrection is an example. But a distinction must be made between such slogans and the direction given to the party through its documents. In the political situation of Nepal where the attainment of the republic is widely understood as the scrapping of the monarchy, when there already is the history of a tendency in the top leadership level arguing for a sub-stage of bourgeois democracy, when party documents themselves say that the republic conceived by the party is not immediately a new democratic one, such blurring of ideological-political clarity will definitely give room for rightist tendencies to grow. This will increase if the enemy decides to do away with the monarchy and set up some sham republic, even incorporating some formal rights for oppressed sections (like in South Africa).

In relation to this it must also be stressed that the immediate success of the present tactics will not reduce the gravity of the danger of giving room for rightist tendencies. For example, though the Soviet party under Stalin succeeded in defeating the fascist forces and defending the socialist state, the errors in the line followed by the party such as promotion of Russian nationalism, ultimately strengthened the capitalist roaders.² The bitter experiences of capitalist restoration have driven home the lesson of constant ideological training of not only the party but also the broad masses. The GPCR also gives the lesson of how those who didn't break with bourgeois democratic outlook could be revolutionaries during the new democratic stage but transformed into capitalist roaders once it was over.

Diplomacy and Internationalism

Some of the comments in the interviews of com: Prachanda have violated the norms of internationalist relations. His interview to the "Hindu", where he commented on the Indian Maoist movement, was unnecessary and wrong. We are glad that you have done self criticism on this. But we feel some larger issues are involved. Some statements made by the CPN (M) leadership have also caused confusion and aided the revisionists in their propaganda against MLM. You have explained that in the context of talks and political struggle room must be given for diplomatic manoeuvring. This is understandable. But at the same time every Maoist party also has the internationalist obligation to take into consideration the international fall out of its public positions and the way they will be used by the enemy. Developing a correct line on handling the contradiction between the tactical, diplomatic needs of a party and its internationalist obligations is a long standing issue within the ICM. We urge you to address this aspect while carrying out your present policies.

² This was summed up in the Declaration of the RIM.

The question of a New Line for Proletarian Revolution in the 21st Century

We have given great importance to learning from the lessons of the people's war in Nepal. In particular, we consider the success of the CPN (M) in co-ordinating political and military struggle and in handling and using contradictions among the enemy as an important contribution. But we have not agreed with your formulation "Prachanda Path". This position goes against the universal character of proletarian ideology.³ About incorporating the tactics of insurrection in the strategy of people's war we are in agreement. Though this has been put forward and practiced during the Chinese as well as Vietnamese revolutions and also incorporated in the Peruvian revolution, the Nepal experience has highlighted the possibility and necessity of doing this right from the very beginning of the people's war, especially in the political struggle. But the concept of fusing the strategy of people's war with armed insurrectionary strategy (generally known as 'fusion theory') is problematic because it undermines the universality of the protracted people's war strategy in oppressed countries.

For some time now, you have raised the question of developing the strategy and tactics to deal with the challenges of making proletarian revolution in the 21st century. At present it is argued that its present tactics is part of developing "...a new ideological, political and military line of the proletariat against globalised imperialism and its globalised massive structure.", a "...new model of revolution".

It is true that there is a particularity in the present situation where all reactionary states are engaged in a concerted attack on revolutionary and other armed struggles in the name of fighting 'terrorism'. The impact of globalisation is also creating new opportunities as well as hurdles for the revolutionary movements. Hence the ideology, strategy and tactics of the proletariat must certainly be developed to meet the challenges of the present period. They develop in close relation to revolutionary practice. We are in basic agreement with the CPN (Maoist) on this. But we don't agree to this concept of globalised imperialism because imperialism was always a global system. Moreover, the necessity of developing a new general line must be substantiated through a proper analysis of the world situation and verified over a period of revolutionary practice. In this regard we believe that there is a tendency to hasty and sweeping generalisations on your part. For example, you have explained that your present tactics are necessitated by the particular international and national situation existing today. In that case careful study and analysis is necessary to separate what is particular to this situation and what remains universally valid that can be incorporated in proletarian strategy. Evidently, it is far too early to make such an analysis and draw conclusions. It will also be useful in this context to remember the caution expressed by Lenin over generalising the experiences of the successful Russian revolution.

In your 2nd National Conference of 2003, you had presented a position calling for multi-party competition in a socialist country to prevent the bureaucratisation of the Maoist party. This position has been contrasted to that of Mao's China where co-operation between different parties accepting the socialist constitution was allowed. It has also called for the general arming of the masses and the gradual dissolution of the standing army. This idea of arming the masses is a step forward. The fact that you are grappling with the question of political institutions better suited to prevent capitalist restoration is also a positive development. The rich experiences already gained through the building of new power in Nepal's countryside will be certainly of good use. But the idea of multi-party competition does not accord to the material reality and challenges of class struggle in a socialist country. World experience shows that the overthrown ruling classes, backed by imperialism, will never respect any constitution. Our views on this have already been explained.⁴ The present tactics of the CPN (M) are related to these ideas and concepts. While the overall thrust of these positions is to grapple with some serious questions thrown up by the setback of the world socialist revolution and new developments in the world, as yet

³ This was dealt with in "The Struggle to Establish MLM", in Naxalbari, No: 2.

⁴ 'The Current Debate on the Socialist State System', published in Struggle..

they are raw. Hence there is a good possibility that they may be grasped in ways quite opposite to what is intended, particularly by the new sections of masses now being drawn in to your folds.

Comrades,

Our party is greatly indebted to you for the frank manner in which you have exchanged your experiences and views with us. We have presented our critical observations in detail so that you too may get a good idea of our thinking. We hope that we may get an opportunity to discuss these issues with you in our next meeting.

With revolutionary greetings,

Central Organising Committee,

Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) NAXALBARI

October 20, 2006