

UCPN (Maoists): In Contradicting Speeches and Actions

[This is a translation of an article that appeared in the Nepali publication *Êikyabadyata*, probably in January or February 2010.]

Bisham Nepali

Latest protest programs lunched by UCPN (Maoist) and speeches of its leaders sound contradicting to long standing programs of Nepali working masses as well as Marxists way of examining and understanding things and incidents. Not surprisingly, sometimes leaders contradict to their own previous views. The views expressed by UCPN(Maoist) leadership and its decisions in recent past are examples that shows that converting UCPN (Maoist) to a group of confused people from a party which was ideologically correct and capable of formulating and implement brilliant strategies.

Some of contradicting views

1. In his visit to India to speak at Hindustan Times Leadership summit in October 2007, Prachanda suggested Indian Maoists through Indian media that they participate in parliamentary process for 'peaceful revolution'. This suggestion contradicts with Marxist understanding that mode of peoples' fight for classless society through transitional proletariat state called scientific socialism depends on material situation of particular time and space.
2. UCPN (Moist) is 'fighting' for reinstatement of 'Civilian Supremacy' since it was thrown out of government of reactionary state - through a coup staged by army chief Rukmangud Katwal using president of Nepal. The concept of 'Civilian Supremacy' contradicts to Marxist, Leninist and Maoist definition of state as a tool to impose dictatorship of ruling class(es) through brutal suppression of opposing class(es) using either armed forces or fear of armed forces effectively affirming 'supremacy of armed forces'.
3. As latest streak of these contradictory views and actions, a section of leadership of UCPN (Maoist) has jumped from 'Civilian Supremacy' which could be defined as a program directed against domestic reactionaries to 'National Independence' which is directed against Indian Expansionism without any significant change in class equation inside the country.
4. Though Prachanda tried to justify the action in famous 'Shaktikhor Video', integration of revolutionary army to reactionary army to form new hybrid 'National' army is not path of class struggle. Hence, this integration that implies 'class cooperation' cannot be agreeable by a communist party that believes on class struggle.
5. UCPN (Maoist) did not have national convention in recent past. Before such convention, which is being postponed once and again, there cannot be rigorous analysis of class structure of Nepali state. Consequently, the party does not know whether the primary contradiction of Nepali society changed or not. If we examine the situation superficially, it does not look like

class composition of the state has changed. Thus, Prachanda's assertion that primary contradiction of Nepali society is between Indian Expansionism and Nepali National Independence movement contradicts with official documents and decisions of UCPN (Maoist) which are not changed in recent past.

Violence and Non-violence

Nowadays, we hear many UCPN (Maoist) leaders preaching non-violence and advocating for peaceful movement. It seems that they are committed to the kind of peace that justifies violence perpetrated by ruling reactionary classes against the masses.

When Nepal was in painful years of peoples' war and we Nepalis, living in New York and Toronto used to debate whether Maoist Violence can be condoned in Nepali situation in its entirety. We would have intense discussion some condemning Maoist 'Violence' and others explaining it as repercussion of violent repression methods adopted by government against Maoist opposition. Most of the times such debates used to drift towards question of violence and non-violence. Friends used to intensely argue and counter-argue based on their political beliefs and prejudices they developed over the time.

To me, the word 'हिंसा' had completely different meaning in my childhood then the one that I learnt as a political activist in High School and college in Kathmandu. My parents have never equated it with the word 'Violence'. My parents taught me true meaning of hiMsaa (हिंसा ≠ Violence) and ahiMsaa (अहिंसा ≠ non-violence). They taught me to practice ahiMsaa in my life. In Sanskrit hiMsaa means harmful act which may or may not be violent. For example, if I am participating in enjoying benefits of others' labour, I am participating in hiMsaa. Thus, I believe that all class based societies widely practice hiMsaa. To me, peace (शान्ती) is hiMsaa free State of person, society or any living things.

My parents had their own way of teaching us to grow as a good citizen. When I was eight years old, I had a snake bite. After recovering from snake bite, I decided that I would not spare any snake that I see. It was common to see snakes crawling here and there in summer. I started killing snakes I saw, throwing stones on them or hitting them by very long stick so that I can spare myself from counter-attack. My father learnt that I kill any snake I saw and I have already killed many of them (approximately 5). In one evening, he asked whether I killed snakes or not. After hearing my affirmative answer, he suggested me not to kill them as they do not attack me unless they feel threatened by our presence. I argued that snake bit me so that I want to kill snakes. My father taught me two things on that day; first, I was not enough careful not to obstruct way of otherwise not harmful snake, and second, action of one snake does not justify killing of others that did not harm me.

In my childhood, I used to graze cattle. Nests of hornets were common and prime target for showing off our bravery. We either used to burn hornet nests or we used catch them using our Nepali cap (Topi) and through them away. That was really dangerous action as agitated hornets could storm on us. Generally we used to play with hornet nests in winter as hornets are not as

active winter as in summer. After lighting fire on their nest or throwing their nest away using our cap, we used to run away from the vicinity. When my father learnt it, he repeated the snake lesson and asked me to refrain from harming others for no justifiable reasons.

Leeches are so common at my village in summer that nobody on street or on fields can return home without getting leech bite. My father had developed habit of carrying salt, Sichuan Pepper and special type of chewing tobacco to fight leech bite. Despite that, when returning home, my father used to have several leeches sucking his blood. Actually, everybody suffers from this problem. He used to sit besides fireplace and put all of the creatures sticking on his skin into the fire. When I asked that why he kills leeches so brutally, he told me that there were two reasons that made him kill leeches. One of them was they attack people and other animals not for defense but for their food. And, the other one was that they propagate in geometric progression if left alive which would lead to harming more people and animal. Hence, he said that killing leeches was ahiMsaa as it controls hiMsaa caused by new generation of leeches. Thus, he explained, hiMsaa directed against perpetuation of hiMsaa is ahiMsaa. According to him, my father was burning leeches for peace or reduction of hiMsaa. Based on my fathers' teaching, I believe that Nepali communist movement has led violent movements times and again, but all of the movements were against hiMsaa.

Non-violent or Violent Movement for lasting Peace

Nepali communist movement since its inception has lunched both violent and nonviolent movements with clear vision of establishing Nepal as New Democratic state that takes the society to Scientific Socialism and Communism. It fought against not only exploitation of surplus value of labor but also social, cultural and linguistic exploitation of masses and gender discrimination based on class and caste structure of semi-feudal, semi-colonial bureaucratic and comprador capitalist state that prevails in Nepal. When it met with brutal suppression measures from the state like Chitang massacre in 1979, Piskar massacre in 1984, etc., violence became only way of expressing peoples' aspiration for better society, it adopted violence. When peaceful means appeared more benefiting than violent ones, it adopted peaceful movement like those in 1990 and 2006. But, major changes never occurred without a violent movement.

Armed movement lunched by Nepali Congress in 1951 had successfully eliminated feudal Rana regime - a hereditary prime ministerial system - and established New Westminster system with constitutional monarchy. After royal coup on December 15, 1960 Nepali congress had lunched armed struggle and non-people based armed tactics like bombing the king and high-jacking a plane and organizing unsuccessful mutiny within Royal Nepal Army until BP in 1976 declared that he will work with the monarch to 'fight against growing communist influence'.

In case of communist party, the factions that advocated armed revolt always emerged as mainstream communist party in Nepal. Jhapa armed movement of 1974 became foundation stone for formation of Nepal Communist Party (ML) which enjoyed support of majority of progressive forces until it converted itself to reactionary party. Other precursors of CPN (ML) were Mukti Morcha group which lunched armed action against feudal landlords in Arghakhachi

district, Sandesh Group which lunched farmers' revolt in Dang district and a faction of Sarbharabadi Shramik Sangathan which carried similar actions in Chitwan District. When the revolutionary image of CPN (UML) - new version of CPN (ML) - tarnished due to rightist deviation of the party and CPN (Maoist) lunched protracted peoples' war proving itself as only revolutionary alternative to different rightist communist groups existed in Nepal, CPN (Maoist) emerged as largest communist party in Nepal.

The impact of Peoples' War is not only Nepali but also in international communist movement is felt by every political entity all over the world. Rapid increase in strength of CPN (ML) in Panchayat era and spectacular increase in strength of CPN (Maoist) during Peoples' War clearly shows that radical political changes witnessed in Nepal in 1990 and 2006 are results of armed struggle that transformed itself to forceful peoples' revolt that appeared to be a relatively less violent one due to political maneuvering needed to suite revolting unarmed masses and material situation of international power equation. Nepali people have accepted right to revolt as fundamental rights of working masses. Looking at this history of peoples' movement in Nepal it is apparently dishonest and self-serving to preach parliamentary peaceful path by Prachanda to Indian Maoists.

Civilian Supremacy

In his famous book 'The State and Revolution' Lenin wrote "Democracy is a form of the state, it represents, on the one hand, the organized, systematic use of force against persons; but, on the other hand, it signifies the formal recognition of equality of citizens, the equal right of all to determine the structure of, and to administer, the state.". In same book he says "A standing army and police are the chief instruments of state power." Saying so, Lenin is not talking about 'Civilian Supremacy' but he is talking about rule of law. 'Organized' and 'Systematic' use of force against 'persons' cannot be considered as civilian supremacy. It can be considered rule of law if use of such force is practiced under guidance of pre-defined law. As use of force is involved a state needs "A standing army and police" as "the chief instruments of state power" to impose dictatorship of ruling class(es) upon the ruled ones. Thus, as Mao rightly said "political power grows out of the barrel of gun" on his essay 'Problems of War and Strategy', no state can be created and sustain without use of brutal forces like army and police. Democratic states try to limit their 'use of force against persons' in boundaries of their constitution and law as long as people do not challenge class interest of the ruling class(es). When class interest is challenged, ruling classes disregard their own constitution, laws and norms to silence voices of opposition. Nepal's peaceful coup staged by representatives of ruling classes and their 'chief instrument' can be seen in this light.

As state sustains using force against people, in class based society, civilian supremacy can not exist. Frederick Engels, in his '*Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*' eloquently said that "The proletariat seizes from state power and turns the means of production into state property to begin with. But thereby it abolishes itself as the proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, and abolishes also the state as state.". Gradual withering of the state in socialist stage of development of the society, the requirement

of forces diminishes and civilian supremacy immerses only to convert into supremacy of human being when state completely withers away.

Hence, if UCPN (Maoist) wanted to do away with prevailing state, the struggle could be for 'Peoples' Democracy' or 'New Democracy' not for civilian supremacy. If the party has evaluated that dismantling prevailing state is a long term goal, then, the struggle could be directed for rule of law. When the country is not directly ruled by military, even in bourgeoisie terms, civilian supremacy is not the right slogan that represents direction of peoples' struggle for Peoples' Democratic Republic of Nepal.

Struggle for National Independence

It is evident that prevailing Nepali state is being operated by directions of Indian state, but, it is done through ruling class of Nepal. Reactionary parties like Nepali Congress and so-called CPN (UML) are tools of Indian state to expand and secure its financial and territorial interests in Nepal. There is competition among Nepali political parties in cajoling Indian state for its political blessing. Prachanda himself tried to woo Indian state saying that Indian Maoist should participate in peaceful parliamentary process and that Pakistani state has offered him military hardware support during peoples' war but the offer was rejected by Prachanda.

Nepal is not occupied by foreign military forces. There is no significant change in class equation in Nepal since abolition of Monarchy. Nepal is still semi-colonial, semi-feudal comprador capitalist and bureaucratic capitalist state. When we say 'Comprador capitalist' that means foreign capital is ruling the country through its local machinery. Hence, in Nepali case, struggle of National Independence can be fought inside the country and it should be directed against domestic reactionary forces not the foreign one.

There is tendency in Nepal that political parties describe foreign intervention according to their class interest. When Indian military chief says that 'Maoist combatant should not be integrated in Nepali army' it is not considered as foreign intervention by ruling parties, but, when UN pointed out deficiencies of state in complying with comprehensive peace accord, Nepali ruling parties openly termed it as foreign intervention.

This double standard is also apparent in inner party feud. If foreign power backs one, he/she would consider oneself most powerful person in the country. If the perceived backing is for leader not on power, then the person in question would be labeled as foreign stooge. Recent 'revelation' by Prachanda that India favors Dr. Baburam Bhattarai as next prime minister can be understood in this context.

Hence, before taking movement towards National Independence, leaders need to learn to see things as they are and all types of foreign interventions should be considered as steps towards total colonization and should be rejected. Nepali national independence movement can be fought curbing undiplomatic movement of foreign diplomats, exposing political leaders and parties that work for foreign interest, developing a common national policy that promotes national independence and hurting foreign economic interests -- that are not benefiting to

Nepal and Nepali people -- inside the country. It cannot be fought labeling comrades as foreign stooges just to prove oneself as a centre of nationalism.

Conclusion

It has been difficult for well-wishers of Nepali revolution to understand direction UCPN (Maoist) is taking. In surface, political moves of the party can be compared to those of CPN (UML) after 1990 popular movement. Talking revolutionary to people and acting reactionary was basic unwritten rule of that party. Political move of that party at that time were not defined by material need of people but by personal political ambitions of the leaders. It was and is common to hear and read self-promoting mindless statements from UML leaders against each other and for the praise of foreign powers. It is sad to see history repeating.

Nobody can imagine that leaders of UCPN (Maoist) do not understand fundamental questions of Marxism. Nobody can believe that leaders who fought successful peoples' war against all odds got disillusioned by the dream of people itself. It is hard to believe that those who risked their lives for common cause are fighting to each other to serve personal interest. But, what is there that makes leaders take all wrong decision that could lead leaders to ministerial position but cannot bring people equality and social justice? There can be long lists of blunder the party made and there can be long list of missed opportunities. It is difficult to understand things observing from such a long distance. But, one thing is sure that no power can defeat Nepali people if their leaders guide them to right direction. Believing in people may bring personal difficulties to leaders, but believing in foreign powers will certainly bring disaster to the country. I wish I failed to understand moves of the party and the party is moving towards positive direction.