

My futile attempt to ‘transform’ Prachanda

- Basanta

Chairman must have produced a full-fledged political report before the CC meeting. This is my first impression. At least comrade Baburam and comrade Kiran have brought out written reports for this CC. It has been helpful to centralise debate on specific issues. This is a correct approach and the debate should be conducted in a comradely manner with a goal to transform each other. But, it is not possible to solve the present complication of the class struggle by weakening the ideological struggle and by admiring the positive aspects of the leaders in the name of making the line struggle friendly. It is my second impression.

I believe that the climax of ideological struggle is the starting point of transformation. It is necessary to sharpen the ideological struggle to make one spell all the hidden things out in the course of debate. But, the objective of sharp debate must not be negation but transformation. In my understanding the superficial line struggle that does not reach to the crux of the problem ultimately and necessarily ends up in compromise, which cannot build up a correct line and centralise leadership. Consequently, it weakens the party unity. One of the main reasons why our party has been so weak now is that the line struggles in the past did not reach to the crux of the problem but ended up in compromise. Now, we must not wind up this ideological struggle in any kind of compromise. A logic that it is not in the interest of party and revolution to sharpen two-line struggle when the class struggle is complex is utterly unscientific. We must struggle against this trend too. In fact, the class struggle in the society necessarily instigates two-line struggle in the party. They are inter-related.

Three documents present in this meeting represent definite trends. These documents have also presented methods to solve the problem in line with presenters' outlook. But, only that method is correct whose outlook is Marxist-Leninist-Maoist. It is obvious that many things are in agreement in these documents. We are not present here to draw up an eclectic conclusion by collecting common points available in the documents. We must be able to draw a correct conclusion on the basis of which document raises the issue based on MLM and the historical context of two-line struggle in the party.

Comrade Baburam has distinct and open outlook. He had presented his opinion in the past meetings and has done so now too. He has been consistent in his ideological and political position. He has been elucidating that the struggle for democracy and the movement for national independence are two different kinds of revolutionary processes that are carried out in two different stages. It is outright wrong, because it goes against the characteristics of the imperialist era. The oppressed people cannot reach people's democracy without bringing imperialist domination to an end. In the same manner, the oppressed nation and people cannot be independent until the oppressed class establishes a democratic state power of its own. The democracy and national independence are inter-related and both of them are simultaneously achieved under new democracy.

From this standpoint, the reformed democratic republic comrade Baburam has proposed can in no case be other than the joint dictatorship of comprador, bureaucratic bourgeois and the feudal class. In the imperialist era, there is no such big difference between feudal and comprador bourgeois. In general, the comprador is feudal and vice versa. And, both of them are lackeys of imperialism. When the interest of both of these classes is jeopardised, both the feudal and comprador bourgeois in collaboration with imperialism launch attack upon the struggling people. If that does not work, the imperialism launches direct military offensive to protect their lackeys. In defence of and in alliance with the Nepalese reactionary classes, the Indian expansionism has now stood against Nepal and Nepalese people. But, Baburam does not agree with this. Many questions may seem to be good in his document but the essence is reformist. Therefore, his document cannot be party line for the new democratic revolution in Nepal.

Although the note that the Chairman has presented in the CC is said to have based on the last PB decision, it has piled up a lot of questions to the CC, asking which one to do -- this or that. This is in itself an expression of eclecticism. His duty is not to produce questions before the CC. Contrarily, his duty is to put forward a concrete proposal before the CC and organise debate around it. For some time now, he has not presented any concrete plan before the CC meeting and has been reluctant in

implementing the plans sorted out so far. Is not he pushing the whole party towards reformism by doing all this, a question has arisen in my mind. His argument that the revolution can be accomplished by making use of 3S (Sadak, Sadan, Sarkar) is Khrushchevite peaceful transition. The terms like peaceful resolution of civil war, peaceful development of revolution and end of people's war which are frequently used in party documents and his speeches indicate it.

Chairman places the terms like revolution, people's insurrection etc. in the party documents and official meetings. In spite of this, he remains unenthusiastic to make overall preparation for armed people's insurrection including formation of united front but entertains always in parliamentary coalition. All this raises a question that ultimately he will be left with no other alternative than calling the party to write a so-called 'pro-people' constitution as comrade Baburam has been arguing. In this situation Chairman's job will only be to help fill fish in the reformist fishing trap placed by Baburam. The documents placed by Baburam and Chairman seem to contain two different types of expressions but have the same reformist content. Therefore, Chairman's document cannot be a comprehensive line for revolution because it ultimately serves reformism by putting things in mesh.

Comrade Kiran has mainly chalked out a correct orientation to complete revolution by presenting the subject matter in an objective and correct way. The question of organising people's insurrection upon the foundation of people's war does not mean to go back to people's war right now. The question is how we can incorporate in people's insurrection the revolutionary strength acquired during people's war and comrade Kiran's document is relatively correct in this regard. Therefore, comrade Kiran's document must be enriched and adopted as party document by synthesising in it the positive aspects presented by Baburam, Chairman and the entire CCMs. Some of the comrades in this CC meeting said that they saw comrade Kiran's document as a camel. It is not the problem of comrade Kiran's document but it is the problem of outlook of the concerned comrade who sees horse a camel and camel a horse.

Now I want to talk a little on Chunwang Meeting and its decisions. In the context when the king had staged a coup I don't think it was wrong to adopt a tactic of democratic republic. It is attempted to make that tactic a strategy now and it is wrong. The very tactic was over after Republic was declared from the Constituent Assembly. In spite of this, Chairman never showed his willingness to develop another tactic until Kharipati Convention was held. We must not forget that we had to wage a long struggle in the party for about 7 months even to call CC meeting and only the ideological struggle at Kharipati Convention changed that tactic.

Chunwang's problem is at another place. I believe the analysis of imperialism and expansionism, which the Chunwang meeting made, has made the matter a more serious. There is analogy in Chunwang's analysis of imperialism by Prachanda and comrade Baburam's analysis on imperialism published in Rato Jhilko recently. Chunwang Document writes that the present world has lagged behind from what Lenin and Mao had said at their lifetime and Baburam says that imperialism has undergone a big change. From the time of introduction of Rato Jhilko to now Chairman has not said anything about it. On the other, Chunwang document writes that the US imperialism has been frying countries of the world in a single pan. And Baburam in Rato Jhilko says that India is merely an outpost of the US imperialism. These two analyses have stood upon the same footing. It means both India and Nepal should unite to fight US imperialism till the later fries the oppressed countries, both India and Nepal, in a single pan.

This analysis leads to a conclusion that the principal contradiction the Unity Congress had decided does not exist anymore. It demands the need to develop unity with Indian expansionist ruling classes and their puppets in Nepal. Consequently, it caused the tactic of democratic republic adopted at Chunwang to be a strategy. Without rejecting this analysis, a prattle that the contradiction of Nepalese society remains with the alliance of Indian expansionism and domestic reaction is not and cannot be anything other than a fraudulent logic to confuse the revolutionaries in the party and a pressure politics to bargain for the government by intimidating Indian ruling classes.

From the ideological perspective, some of the expressions of Chairman have been gradually making the grasp of MLM weaker in the party. Like for example:

One, Chairman in the Phulbari CC meeting had said that Marxism has been a question of general knowledge. First, it stands against the doctrine that Marxism goes on infinitely developing from practice to theory and the theory to practice, in turn. Second, by showing oneself to be a well versed teacher of Marxism, Chairman has taught us to take for granted that whatever he says is Marxism. But, he has not stopped saying the development of Marxism, on the other. So, a question has come up what does he mean by the development of MLM.

Two, he has been publicly propagating that New Nepal will be built by the fusion of materialism and idealism, and the fusion of Jung Bahadur and Buddha as well. It goes against the dialectical concept that the opposites are synthesised one into another. It is another version of two combine into one, to which Mao had said it to be a reactionary theory. This concept works as a bridge to take the class struggle to class collaboration. Is not our chairman replacing class struggle by class collaboration; a question has really arisen from this assertion. We have to be serious.

Three, in the last PB meeting, our party had self-criticised on its gap in proletarian internationalism. It was a good thing. But a strange, after a few weeks the Indian ruling class killed comrade Azad, the spokesperson of the CPI (Maoist), but our Chairman dared not to issue even a statement. I reminded comrade Prachanda to issue a condolence message and even placed a draft before him through Comrade Mahara. He did not rebuff it, but I was told to wait for a few days. At last, my repeated request did not work. On the other, when Jyoti Basu, the Chief Minister of West Bengal and a leader of the revisionist party, the CPI (Marxist) died, our Chairman hurriedly sent a condolence letter along with a Central Committee representative to Kolkata. What kind of proletarian internationalism is this? How can our Chairman simultaneously maintain the 'diplomatic' relation with CPI (Marxist), which is one of the accomplices in the killing of comrade Azad, and the fraternal relation with CPI (Maoist)? I request the CCM comrades not to take it lightly.

On the one hand, the aforesaid ideological questions are being posed before our Chairman and on the other he has been unenthusiastic to implement the party decisions. Not only this, he sabotaged the relatively correct decisions taken by the PB meeting. Is our Chairman doing all this to go towards armed people's insurrection or towards so-called peaceful transition? This question is hunting us. This CC meeting must be able to find correct answer to this question.

There are several such expressions and logics by our Chairman that have been making party's grasp of MLM very weak and party is getting ideologically disoriented. The problem of reluctance to take concrete decisions and hesitation to implement them, if taken, is a problem of eclecticism deeply rooted in our Chairman. The more he can struggle against his own ideological problem the more proficient he will be to lead the party. We must understand the fact that whoever is the main leadership and howsoever insightful he may be, to paraphrase Vice Chairman Comrade Prakash, if he is deviated from MLM, he cannot provide leadership to revolution. It is a universally proven fact. We must not overlook it.

The central objective of this CC meeting must be the revolutionary transformation of all of us in general and of Comrade Chairman in particular. Merely the glorification of Chairman's positive qualities does not help him transform. My criticism is not aimed at negating him but it is a comradely support for him to transform. I believe he will not take it otherwise.

Finally,

Comrades, I need not repeat again how much serious the political situation is before us. Now we need a unified Party with ideological clarity, correct political line, capable leadership, objective plan and preparedness to implement the very plan. We must be able to do it. The future of Nepal and Nepalese people relies on this. Otherwise, none in the world will spare either of us. Thank you all.

Note: It is an abridged part of what I spoke in the CC meeting held in June 2010

[Received by BannedThought.net on March 13, 2014]