

Chapter 4

Communist Movement after 1990

Parliamentary System and Various Communist Parties. Their Ideologies and Strategies, Major Issues, Forms of Protests, Support Base/Social Base

1. The United Left Front and the UNPM

The On 15 January 1990, seven Communist parties formed the United Left Front. The seven parties were “NCP (Marxist), NCP (Manandhar), NCP (Verma), NCP (Tulsilal), Majdoor Kisan Sangathan Bhela Samiti (Rohit faction),¹NCP (Chautho Mahadhiwayshun (Fourth Congress (Nirmal Lama)), and NCP (ML)” (Samyukta Bam Morcha 7). It declared its “moral support to the Nepali Congress’s movement against the Panchayat system”. It aimed at “bringing the Congress to its fold ... and if not, to coordinate its activities with them” (6). However, the Front was a loose organisation, where “the participating parties or groups, with the permission of the Front, could either stay or leave the Front” (7). Organised under “Sahana Pradhan as President, and Tulsilal Amatya, Honorary President” the Front formed a “seven-member Secretariat” (3). The “*Jana Andolan*”, which the Front decided to lead was open to “the peasants, the majdoor [working class], the youths, students, women, the national bourgeoisie and national traders” (2). It listed 18 goals’ struggle. Of them, majority were related to the setting up of a democratic polity, and the political context in which they were framed explained their presence in the list. However, considering the tenor of Communist movement in Nepal, goal 17 stood out: it was softly couched. And the Front had this to say, “17. Review the relation with India in the context of Nepal’s traditional friendly relation ...” (Samyukta Bam Morcha 6). Besides, in the list, what strikes most is the absence of goal concerning its stand towards monarchy. Later document of NCP (ML) explained the absence to the presence of “rightist

¹ See, K. C, Nepalma Communist Bhag 2 149 This faction was named NCP (Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party) after January/February 1991. In English its name is NCP (NWPP) that is NCP (Nepal Workers Peasants Party).

forces” in the Front. And the same phrase explained, though indirectly, the presence of euphemistic expression in goal 17 for it stated

The rightist forces were not even ready to include any anti-monarchic words ... On the question of national interest they were not ready to come openly against the suppression of India. So in the program of the ULF, the issues concerning national freedom and Indian expansionism were not clearly mentioned ... (NCP (UML), Bartaman Paristhiti: 1994 26).

The rightist forces which the NCP (ML) document was referring to were probably the leaders of the NCP (Verma) and NCP (Manandhar). These were leaders who advocated the strategy of National Democracy and because of their strategy they were thought to be pro-Russian.

Sometimes later, that is after 19 February 1990,² another Communist Front, *Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolan* (United National Peoples’ Movement [Henceforth, UNPM]) came into existence. It was composed of “NCP (Masal), NCP (Mashal), NCP (MLM [Krishnadas Shrestha]), Proletarian Labour Organisation, Nepal (Ruplal Biswakarma) and the United People’s Front (Sambhuram Shrestha)” (*Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolan* 1). In the list, considering the Front’s strategy,³ and owing to the lack of evidence one cannot pinpoint the ideological positions of two of its factions: the Proletarian Labour Organisation, Nepal (Ruplal Biswakarma) and the United People’s Front (Sambhuram Shrestha). In its formation, NCP (Masal) claims that it “played a significant role”, and perceives Nepali Congress and Left Front’s activities in the service of India (NCP (Masal), “Rajnitik Prastao 2047 Asad [June 1990]” 377) for it states:

² See, NCP (Masal), “Rajnitik Prastao 2047 Asad [June 1990]” 377 The Party states that the 19 February 1990 movement was mainly the movement of the Nepali Congress and the United Left Front. It had chalked out its programme, but its emphasis was on moving forward only after the formation of the United National Peoples’ Movement. Thus, as the NCP (Masal) denies its part in 19 February, it is clear that the UNPM came into existence after February 19.

³ See, p. 406 The Front welcomed factions following both strategies of New Democracy and People’s Democracy. Hence, it is not possible to find out which strategy the Proletarian Labour Organisation and United People’s Front subscribed to.

In the democratic movement two sides, the Nepali Congress and the 'Left' Front as one, and our Party and the *Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolan* (UNPM) as another, participated. But, there was a basic difference in the nature of their participation. Owing to their compromising position towards Indian expansionism, the participation of Nepali Congress and the Left Front received media attention at the international level. But, our Party did not receive any such support ... we moved forward independently depending upon our own strength and on the support of the patriotic, democratic forces of the nation and the Front. Even then our movement received the support of all democratic and left forces... (377).

When the Front announced its existence, its booklet, rejected both "Parliamentary and Panchayat arrangements for having historically failed in resolving the problems of Nepal" (*Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolan* 2–3), and came up with a 7-point programme. These programmes, in comparison with that of the ULF made its position clear. It denounced Indian expansionism; and by declaring that its goal was for establishing 'New Democracy/People's Democracy' (see below), it obliquely rejected the institution of monarchy. However, by placing the two strategies on equal footing the Front created confusion, but communicated its tactics to remain open to all Communists of Nepal barring, of course, the ULF. It did not welcome them, because it rejected their "blind support" to the "demands drafted by the Nepali Congress for the *Jana Andolan*" (*Rising Nepal*, "UNPM for Nationalising" 1990 April 17). When the programmes of the Front are compared with that of the ULF, except for the confusion that exists in its strategy and for its stands on Monarchy and Indian expansionism, they are similar. The programmes focus on issues concerning land distribution to peasants, freeing women from suppression, ending discrimination based on ethnicity etc. Considering the link of the Front to the growth of NCP (Maoist) in 1994, the programmes need to be placed here. Its booklet titled "Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolanko Niti Ra Karyakram Sambandhi Baktabya" itemises the following programmes of the Front.

[1]. Majority of the Nepalese population is peasants so their problem is the fundamental problem of the country. To solve their problem the land in the hands of the landlords should be confiscated and distributed to the tillers of the soil and to the poor landless peasants.

[2]. By freeing women from political, economic, social and family suppression they should be given rights equal to that of men.

[3]. Healthy national unity should be established by giving equal rights to all ethnic groups and languages and by opposing the domination of one language throughout Nepal.

[4]. Revoke all unequal and unjust treaties by opposing Indian expansionism and the 1950 treaty to ensure the independence of Nepal. Establish friendship with other countries on the basis of Panchasheel.

[5]. We should build independent national economy by ending the control of the imperialists and the expansionists upon our national economy.

[6]. We should ensure the political freedom and rights of the people.

[7]. Highest priority should be given for the fulfilment of the fundamental rights of the *Majdoor*, peasants, minimum wage earners, students, intellectuals and small traders. Their needs for work, food, home, clothes, education and health should be met with... (4–6).

The above problems of the people and of the country can be solved only with the establishment of either People's Democracy or New Democracy. So in place of Panchayat system ... we should establish either People's or New Democracy. To fulfil these historical purposes we have formed the United National People's Movement... (Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolan 6–7).

In these announcements, the important programmes to be noted are 4–5, because through these programmes the Front was subtly indicating that one of the issues which came in the nation's way in solving its problems was Indian expansionism. And, since majority of the Communist factions of Nepal construe Nepalese nationalism as opposition to Indian expansionism UNPM's statements above cannot be taken as an exception. By castigating Indian expansionism, the Front was also raising the issue of nationalism.

In the February 18, 1990–April 9 *Jana Andolan*, the United Left Front played an important role. According to T. Louise Brown, in the Congress-ULF alliance “the political backbone of the *Jana Andolan* was built and sustained ... by the junior partner in the alliance, the ULF” (123). And though the United National People's Movement functioned in isolation, yet Rishikesh Shaha credited the Front for elevating the nature of the movement to its “climactic” height (See p. 123). In passing such judgement on the role of the UNPM in the movement, he must have shared the NCP (Masal)'s view that “the UNPM's call for action on 6 April was decisive for it brought the King and Panchayat system to its knees before the people” (NCP (Masal), “Rajnitik Prastao 2047 Asad [June 1990]” 377). However, it could not take part in the political parleys that followed the 8 April King's proclamation. Explaining why this

happened, the Front in a press conference held in April 16 simply said that “it was side-lined”. Nevertheless, the Front was then busy in demanding the Government to seize and nationalise “all ill-gotten assets amassed by those exercising political influence during the Panchayat rule” and in asking the “abrogation of the 1950 Indo-Nepal Treaty”. Besides, it was not totally against joining the Interim Government. It was ready to join the Government provided its composition suited its taste (Rising Nepal, “UNPM for Nationalising” 1990 April 17). However, in the K. P Bhattarai Interim Government of ten-member Cabinet three berths went to the ULF and none to the UNPM. Thus, during the period it was the ULF strain of the Communists who were in position that mattered. However, the continuing alliance between the two forces was conditioned by the NCP (ML)’s (the main force within the ULF) understanding of the then political situation. According to its understanding, “the King was still the power and the Interim Government was battling against him for democracy” (NCP (ML), Bartaman Paristhiti: Oct/Nov 1990 16). Under such circumstances, the Party observed that “the revolutionary forces could not be the enemy of the Interim Government ... rather it was its ally bound by its revolutionary ideals to help and keep the Government on track by offering constructive criticisms” (16). Besides, it offered five reasons to explain why it was party to the Government. These reasons essentially rotated around three themes. First, the Party felt that its participation was necessary to concretise the joint movement’s spirit which was for establishing democracy. Second, by participating in the Government, it aimed at ensuring good governance, which it felt was necessary to nurture and sustain people’s faith in revolution. Third, it was there to check any future tie between the reformist and autocratic forces for such relationship, it thought, was harmful to the spirit of the movement. Hence it stated:

Why did our Party take part in the Interim Government? To clarify our tactics on this question a few other fact are to be clarified. Firstly, the Interim Government is the product of a united revolution and the democratic movement is still on. The united revolution was carried on for establishing multi-Party democratic structure and for achieving democratic rights. Those goals are yet to be fulfilled. Hence, there is still a need for a united Front of the participants of the revolution

which was waged in unison ... Hence, our participation in the Government is still of the nature of United Front. Secondly, when a Government reaches the position which allows it to administer the nation then it should provide relief to the people this will infuse among the people to support revolution... Thirdly, if united Front can be created for achieving democratic rights then why cannot such Front be created for fuelling the same movement and for running the Government? ... Fourthly, the Interim Government is the product of an understanding with the King. In it there are also King's nominees. They are personalities working either explicitly or implicitly in favour of autocratic forces. Hence, if revolutionary forces do not take part in the Government, then there is a high possibility that these forces in future will come to terms with the reformists. In such situation the casualty will be the gains of democratic movement ... Fifthly, there is no alternative to this coalition arrangement ... No Government representing a single Party can express in full the spirit of the united movement... (NCP (ML), Bartaman Paristhiti: Oct/Nov 1990 16–7).

Thus, while expressing its tactics it made clear that its participation in the Government was for the sake of democracy and in the interest of more revolutions, for even behind its tactics of good governance was the motive to keep afire the flames of revolution. In line with its stand on creating a democratic arrangement, the Party submitted its 14-point demands to the Interim Government, which the Government accepted as its “guiding line” (Rising Nepal, “Bhattarai Seeks Cooperation” 1990 May 3). The demands stressed upon creating a democratic Constitution based on the principle of constitutional monarchy. Besides, it demanded the transfer of power to the people; holding of free and fair elections, guaranteeing of press and academic freedom, and the abolition of all laws impeding the democratic process (Rising Nepal, “ULF ... 14-Point Demands” 1990 May 10). However, even while asking for transfer of power to the people the ULF did not demand election for Constituent Assembly. To explain its position the Party presented a series of reasons. In the main, it argued that the nature of the movement—the force that it expressed—was not enough for such change. So, the understanding reached between the King and the parties were not meant for the creation of a Constituent Assembly or a republic. In its argument, it drew a relation between a republic and a Constituent Assembly and argued, implicitly though, that a movement for a republic was required if one were to go for a Constituent Assembly. Besides, it drew attention to two convincing reasons. In one, it expressed the fear of Palace plot if a long winding course were opted in the framing of

the Constitution. In the second, it pointed out that the then situation did not guarantee the possibility of creating a Constituent Assembly where the people's force could be in the majority, because even in the *Jana Andolan* it was the towns and district population which were active. Under such condition, the Party said that it felt safer to rely on the representation of revolutionary forces in the Commission than on the creation of Constituent Assembly. Its document put these views in following terms:

Why did our Party opt for a Constitution framed by a Commission and not by a Constituent Assembly? There are multiple reasons for it. Firstly the Andolan did not have the power to accomplish such change. So the parties and the King reached understanding to end the Panchayat system; set up multi-Party democracy, and end the autocracy of the King. Such understanding implied that immediately the country was not going to be a republic and that the King was ready to remain within the bounds of the Constitution ... Secondly, the King had agreed on such Constitution when he was forced on this line by the revolt of the people. Thirdly, even a Constitution framed by a Constituent Assembly was circumscribed within its limit: it was not going to be republic. Besides, even after forming the Commission it was possible to transfer all constitutional rights in the hands of the people. Fourthly, considering past experiences, there was the possibility of Palace plot if a long winding course were followed. Fifthly, if the King were not ready for transferring the constitutional rights to the people, and if he was against constitutional monarchy, then the slogan of Constituent Assembly is not enough. For change what are required are slogans for ending monarchy and for establishing republic ... Sixthly, the democratic movement was carried out by the conscious section of the towns and of a few districts. Even in the election for a Constituent Assembly, we cannot rule out the possibility of the influences of autocratic forces among the ruling masses. Under such situation, it would not be possible to ensure the majority of anti-autocratic forces in the Constituent Assembly. Compared to it the possibility of ensuring the representation of revolutionary forces in the Commission for drafting the Constitution were high ... Hence, we did not opt for a Constituent Assembly... (NCP (ML), Bartaman Paristhiti: Oct/Nov 1990 19–20).

Compared to the NCP (ML)'s understanding of the political situation, the NCP (Masal)'s and that of the UNPM's were different. The NCP (Masal)'s understanding was coloured by its equation of nationalism with democracy, implying thereby, its usual stand that nationalism cannot prosper without democracy (transfer of power to the people) or vice versa. So, it viewed the period as a phase of limited democracy, which needed rectification by passing sovereignty into the hands of the people for its document stated:

Under the present situation we have achieved limited democracy, but under it the threat of Indian expansionism has multiplied. So, in the present context the need to struggle for democracy and nationalism has increased manifold.

Today the multi-Party system has replaced the autocratic Panchayat regime, but the multi-Party system is still limited, because power has not yet been transferred to the people ...

To pass sovereignty into the hands of the people is the pressing problem of present day politics. And to do so the only medium is the election for the establishment of a Constituent Assembly... (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Prastao 2047 Asad [June 1990]" 378–9) .

And though the UNPM's booklet did not fully explain the import of its statement that "the present task of Nepali people is to find solution to the basic problem of nationalism, democracy and problems of livelihood" (Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolan 3), yet in view of the presence of NCP (Masal) within the faction one cannot go wrong in stating that the Front too equated nationalism with democracy. Hence, during April/May 1990, the nature of demands raised by the NCP (Masal)⁴ and the UNPM were focused on two issues. These were: 1) The creation of Constituent Assembly (Rising Nepal, "UNPM Team" 1990 May 1) and 2) Abrogation of 1950 treaty, if not, separate treaties on trade and transit with India. However, in the face of dogged stand taken by the Government against their demands the UNPM even threatened Prime Minister Bhattarai with a movement (Rising Nepal, "UNPM Team" 1990 May 1), and called on the people "to counter moves which were being planned to reverse the gains of the peoples' movement" (Rising Nepal, "UNPM For" 1990 May 2). For the balance of the period, three trends characterised Communist activities. They were engaged in unity moves; in raising demands for an

⁴ See, K. C, Nepal Communist Bhag 2 130 During this period NCP (Masal) witnessed a split. The split, according to the author, occurred in the month of Chaitra [14 March–13 April 1990], under the leadership of Haribol Gajurel (Shitalkumar), Dr. Baburam Bhattarai and Sindhunath Pyakurel. They formed a group named Bidrohi Masal. However, in dating the split in March/April 1990, the author seems to have made a mistake. Because, the organ of NCP (Masal), which was published in Asad 2046 [June/July 1989], describes the split. Explaining the cause behind the split the Party indicts them as victims of Left deviation for advocating guerrilla war, armed struggle, guerrilla training for cadres as in Peru, Maoism in lieu of Maoist thought etc. See, NCP (Masal), "Masal. Anka 20" 713–4

Interim Act, and in contesting the Palace in the Palace-Government tussle over issues related to the Constitution. In the unity moves, initiatives came from minor factions namely NCP (Verma) and NCP (Manandhar). On 10 May, General Secretary, Krishna Raj Verma of the former faction announced that moves were on to unite NCP (Tulsilal), NCP (Manandhar), and NCP (Verma). Its document identified the basis for the unity in “the understanding created ... during the people’s movement” (NCP (Verma), Ajako Hamro Karya 10), but the move, in May, had an element of surprise. In earlier context, that is just after the formation of Interim Government, if NCP (Verma) saw the possibility of unity among three of the ULF partners namely “NCP (Manandhar), NCP (Tulsilal Amatya) and itself” (NCP (Verma), Ajako Hamro Karya 10–11), in the changed context, it was trying to rope in even factions like NCP (Marxist) and NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party [Rohit]) who stood by the New Democratic strategy. Arguing in similar lines, on May 14, Bishnu Bahadur Manandhar, General Secretary of NCP (Manandhar), announced the formation of a three-member committee to initiate unity talks among the parties (Rising Nepal, “Bright Prospect” 1990 May 15). Giving fillip to the move Hikmat Singh, a close associate of Pushpalal, joined NCP (Verma) on 1 June (Rising Nepal, “NCP Founder Member” 1990 June 2). Similar was the trend in the activities of NCP (ML). Radha Krishna Mainali, one of its Central Committee members declared on August 24 that the ULF to strengthen itself was trying to bring in the UNPM under its fold (Rising Nepal, “UNPM Into ULF” 1990 August 24). However, hidden in such moves of the larger faction, the NCP (ML), were clear indications that the tactics was being pursued with an eye on the coming election. During that period, they were trying to assess the power positions of the minor factions before forging alliances— a conclusion which finds its support in the Party document of the NCP (ML) where it states:

According to the new Constitution, a Party which does not collect 3% of the total votes cast will not be recognised by the Election Commission as a national Party. Under such circumstances unity among parties, who wish to unite should be forged accordingly. And with those who do not wish to unite there should be an informal Front based on electoral alliance. Then they should be allowed to contest

election as the candidate of the Party... (NCP (ML), Bartaman Paristhiti: Oct/Nov 1990 64).

Though the last statement of the Party is vague, yet what it says on the issue of unity is clear. And considering the manner in which the smaller factions were trying to rope in Communist factions with different strategy, it is clear that even their moves were coloured by similar considerations. However, these sorts of moves were not unique among the constituents of the ULF. On October 10, the NCP (Lama (Fourth Congress)), Sarvaharabadi Shramik Sangathan and NCP (Mashal) issued a joint statement saying that they were making preparations for unity (Rising Nepal, "Parties to Unite" 1990 Oct. 11). However, the NCP (Masal) did not approve of this unity move. It doubted the intention of NCP (Mashal), and viewed their effort as opportunistic, because it was not considering issues concerning political lines to be adopted for its document stated,

As far as the moves of the 'Sarvaharabadi' and the Lama group [NCP (Fourth Congress)] are concerned there is sincerity in their effort, but we doubt the intention of the other group [NCP (Mashal), under Pushpa Kamal Dahal]. Hidden in their move for unity are several plots and moves for creating more splits ... their moves are simply opportunistic, because they are not basing their unity proposals on well reasoned political line, but on the basis of Party's respect for Marxism-Leninism, Maoist thought and the cultural revolution of China... (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Prastao 2047 Asad [June 1990]" 382) .

From June 6, the issue of Interim Act caught on. Sahana Pradhan, Chairperson of the ULF demanded the Government to pass an Interim Act to replace the Panchayat Constitution to help it function independently (Rising Nepal, "ULF Demands" 1990 June 7). And in it the Party had the support of NCP (ML) for Jan Sharma writes, "The CPN (Marxist-Leninist), a dominant group in the ULF wanted the abrogation of 1962 Constitution and promulgation of an Interim Act ... [because they] wanted sovereignty to reside with the people" (82). It was perhaps their way of outdoing the Congress's stand which was for vesting sovereignty in the people, without diluting the position of the King. Their demand lingered on and in the July 8 suggestions to the Constitutional Recommendation Commission the NCP (ML) reiterated the ULF's demand. And though its suggestions on provisions concerning the wording of the

preamble, the position of the Parliament, the position of the King, the use of Army, and of emergency powers distilled lessons learnt from the political history of the nation, yet they all pointed towards one direction: the Party wanted to demote the position of the King. On the wording of the preamble, it preferred the statement that the Constitution was the outcome of “the power given to people by the movement” to the statement that “it was a gift from the King”. It suggested inclusion of provisions which would ensure the supremacy of the Parliament. On the position of the King and the use of Army, it suggested total control of the Parliament over the institutions. Its other suggestions reflected the then mood of the nation. It demanded inclusion of provisions, which would ensure equality among all ethnic groups; allow all the use of their mother tongue in educational pursuits and official works, a secular State, which barred conversion under duress and allurement, and gender equality in property inheritance and representation in the Parliament (Rising Nepal, “Guaranteed” 1990 July 9). However, its suggestions on the position of the King in the prospective Constitution served nothing more than a propaganda for Hutt said: “under the draft Constitution any change to the status of the monarchy could only be made with the monarch’s prior consent” (39). Other ULF factions like NCP (Manandhar) and NCP (Tulsilal) also emphasised on constitutional monarchy and the need for expressing the People’s movement as the source of the Constitution.⁵In October, the Communists were either asking for immediate promulgation of the draft Constitution presented to the King by the Council of Ministers (Rising Nepal, “Immediate Promulgation ... Demanded” 1990 Oct. 13), or in rejecting the Palace draft (See, p. 133). On 23 October, the ULF demanded the promulgation of the Constitution as submitted by the Cabinet and observed that it was against the Palace draft, because it was trying to establish an institution parallel to the Cabinet (the reference was to the Raj Sabha)

⁵ See, Rising Nepal, “People ... Source ... Constitution” 1990 July 6 NCP (Manandhar) suggestion to the CRC and also Rising Nepal, “Suggestions to CRC” 1990 July 20 for NCP (Tulsi Lal)’s suggestion to the CRC.

along with other regressive elements. In the Palace draft, the NCP (Fourth Congress) sensed the King's reluctance in accepting constitutional monarchy (Rising Nepal, "Political Parties Reject ... Draft" 1990 Oct 24). On 27 October, in the ULF organised mass meeting which was followed by a procession, NCP (M) leader, Man Mohan Adhikari warned the King that if the Constitution suggested by the Cabinet were not promulgated then there would be a movement against the King. Similar, were the voices of NCP (Fourth Congress) and NCP (Verma) (Rising Nepal, "ULF Nixes ... Fundamentals of Constitution" 1990 Oct. 28). On October 28, the Patan branch of the ULF organised a successful strike. Pointing out the reason behind the strike, Tulsilal observed that the strike was meant for applying pressure on the King to promulgate a democratic Constitution. According to the statement of NCP (Fourth Congress), it meant a Constitution, which did not acknowledge an individual above the Constitution (Rising Nepal, "Patan ... a Complete Bandh" 1990 Oct. 29). With similar intent the ULF decided to observe a general strike in the valley in November 7 (Rising Nepal, "ULF Calls ... Strike Nov, 7" 1990 Nov. 2). In all these activities of the ULF and its constituents, there was a veiled threat to the King, and they all perceived the King as the source of the crisis. However, NCP (Masal), in its later document, viewed these incidents as the result of Nepali Congress and ULF's wrong tactics, which made the King powerful while entering the 8th April 1990 Agreement (See p. 124). Similarly, UNPM leaders speaking in a mass meeting held on November 2 pointed out that the crisis would not have taken place had the political parties, after the people's movement, voiced for an election for a Constituent Assembly (Rising Nepal, "UNPM Mass Meeting" 1990 Nov. 3). Thus, in the perception of NCP (Masal) and UNPM the crisis was the result of wrong tactics followed by the parties in course of the *Jana Andolan* and after. Amid such circumstances, the King promulgated the Constitution of Nepal on 9 November 1990. Following the promulgation the nation entered into the Parliamentary phase.

1.1. Unity Moves among Communists:

A week after the proclamation of the Constitution, the NCP (Mashal), Proletarian Labour Organisation⁶ and NCP (Fourth Congress, Nirmal Lama faction) came together to form NCP (Unity Centre).⁷ The unity must have occurred in between 20–30 November.⁸ Why was the unity necessary? Commenting on the reasons which drove the factions towards unity the document of the Party points out, that the move was in response to the objective conditions prevailing at that moment. These conditions were “the nation’s cry for its transformation into an independent New Democratic Nepal and the need for a revolutionary Communist Party which could, under the leadership of the proletariat, accomplish such transformation by leading the nation towards a decisive revolutionary victory” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Sadasyaharulai Appeal” 1–2). Considered in the context of Nepal Communist Movement, this was a commonplace argument which prefaced every unity move and moves to create a new faction so it carried no substance. Hence, the statements which followed the hackneyed justification carried more weight in explaining what triggered the unity. And those statements were as follows:

⁶ See, NCP (Unity Centre), “Communist Movement ... of Nepal (Unity Centre)” 10 After the formation of Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party in 1975 it suffered a split in 1975. The faction which emerged out of the split was named Proletarian Communist League in 1981. Later it turned into Proletarian Labour Organisation.

⁷ See, Footnote 4 Bidrohi Masal, which was a group that had split from NCP (Masal) and which was working in the UNPM also joined the Centre. However, the exact date of their union is not known. However, documentary evidence of the exact date of this union is not available.

⁸ Two facts support this conclusion. First the 19 November Press Release of NCP (Fourth Congress) announced that its central committee was fully authorised to “give final shape to its unity talks with the Sarvahara Shramik Sangathan [Proletarian Labour Organisation] and NCP (Mashal)” (Rising Nepal, “Fourth Congress Stresses” 1990 Nov. 20). Second, see (NCP (Masal), “RIM Ko Patra” 431), where the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM)’s letter of June 12, 1991 to NCP (Unity Centre) states: “Some time ago we received an important document of the NCP (Unity Centre). This Unity Centre was formed in November 1990 by uniting NCP (Mashal), Proletarian Labour Organisation and NCP (Fourth Congress).”

But, the Communist factions which agreed on basic issues were fragmented and they considered themselves incapable of leading such a revolution. With the objective condition in the backdrop, the unity was forged to create a revolutionary Party under the leadership of the proletariat. In this general objective condition from 1990 a new objective condition was added. That was the establishment of the parliamentary system. This brought before us new opportunities, challenges and many dilemmas. These changes favoured the reactionary classes' interests so it was natural for them to organise themselves to enjoy the fruit of the changes. Hence, they were organising themselves to fully utilise the opportunities generated by the change. For the Communists it was necessary to re-invent the existing organisations and methods of struggle to make use of the opportunities and the challenges. The unity was in response to the addition of the new objective condition to the existing ones ... (NCP (Ekta Kendra), "Sadasyaharulai Appeal" 2).

Thus, had the situation not changed unity would not have occurred. Moreover, if the tone of the statements is considered then it is clear that they also wanted to enjoy the opportunities presented by the changes. And what were the opportunities offered by the changes? Their documents do not answer the question. But, their silence could not stop NCP (Masal) from commenting that it was an "opportunistic move ... with an eye on the forthcoming election" (NCP (Masal), "Rajnaitik Pratibedan Paus 2048 [1992]" 451). In this connection illustrative are the comments of RIM (Revolutionary Internationalist Movement)⁹ on "Antarik Rajnaitik Pratibedan" the first document of the Unity Centre. In a letter addressed to the Centre the RIM points out that the unity move had brushed aside issues concerning ideology and political line.¹⁰ Besides, it

⁹ See, NCP (Masal[Mashal]) 227–8 According to the document the first conference of 13 Marxist-Leninist came together in the autumn of 1980 to strengthen International Communist Movement. In its second conference in 1984 the group formed the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement with the intention to fight against the effects of counter revolution that came in China. Earlier NCP (Mashal), which was under Mohan Bikram Singh, was its founding member. Later, both NCP (Masal) and NCP (Mashal) became its members after the split of NCP (Mashal). This document is of the earlier NCP (Mashal) which after split turned into NCP (Masal), but it has published even its earlier documents in the name of NCP (Masal). Hence, the reference has Mashal within square brackets. The NCP (Unity Centre) also became its member after its formation in 1991.

¹⁰ RIM points out that while forging unity the parties did not identify their

points out that implicit in the document of the Unity Centre (Ekta Kendra) are the messages that it was interested in creating just a large Party ignoring the question of revolution for it stated:

From the entire document it becomes clear that the Centre in evaluating the failure of Communist movement in Nepal ignores the importance of developing rural areas as centres of revolutionary struggle. On the contrary it carries the message that the Centre considers the ability of creating a Party with more public support as the touchstone for evaluating the performance of a movement. In this way the Centre has kept as its goal the creation of a Party which would compete with the opportunistic and revisionist forces ... Considering the objective condition of Nepal, revolution which takes into account the goal of capturing power by creating bases in villages for encircling cities and leading a protracted armed movement is the only option. But, unfortunately the document of the Centre remains silent on this count... (NCP (Masal), "RIM Ko Patra" 435).

Thus, it implicitly supports NCP (Masal)'s claim that Unity Centre had come up with an eye on the upcoming election. The Centre formalised its unity in the Unity Congress held in "VS 2048/8/29 [15 December 1991]" (K. C, Nepalma Communist Bhag 2 131 footnote 127). Meanwhile, NCP (ML) revealed its strategy by saying "our goal is to establish New democracy by thoroughly changing the existing semi-feudal and semi-colonial society of Nepal" (NCP (ML), Bartaman Paristhiti: Oct/Nov 1990 80). And clarifying what was to be considered while framing its tactics it stated:

To achieve our goal we have to go a long way. For that we have to lift class struggle to its revolutionary height. But, at this moment we have the support of the masses. And if there is free and fair election then there is a possibility of Communists coming to power. This indicates the presence of a unique situation. On the one hand there is no possibility of bringing about thorough transformation; on the other, in case of free and fair election the communists have the possibility of coming to power. Therefore, while framing our tactics today we should take the present environment into consideration ... (80-1).

Hence, the immediate activities of the Party were nothing more than the reflection of

ideological differences rather by maintaining silence they accepted the differences without laying down how the differences were to be worked out. Then RIM states that without ideological struggle it is not possible to form a viable united party. Such unity is, therefore, opportunistic." (NCP (Masal), "RIM Ko Patra" 433).

its tactical position in the changed environment. These were moves for brightening the Party's prospect in the upcoming election. Therefore, to forge unity among its ULF constituents it initiated talks with them. According to its Party organ "Navayug" the discussion lasted from 2047 Kartik 24 [10 Nov. 1990] to 2047 Mangshir 19 [5 Dec. 1990]. In it, the organ claims that the factions succeeded in "thrashing out political and ideological differences and in approving the publication of a document of understanding by 2047 Mangshir 27 [December 13, 1990]" (NCP (ML), "Navayug" 27). But, on December 10 in a press conference NCP (Tulsilal), NCP (Rohit (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party)), NCP (Verma) and NCP (Fourth Congress)¹¹ announced their dissociation from the ULF. In their statements they underlined the need for creating a new Front which would "accommodate all left forces" (Rising Nepal, Four ... Dissociate ... Left Front 1990 Dec. 11).¹² What they meant by accommodation was explained in Balchandra Mishra's description where he stated: "When the question of sharing leadership berths arose in the discussion, Narayan Man Bijukche [Rohit] and Tulsilal felt that their share, in view of their organisational strength and influence, would be below their level of expectations ... Hence, they pulled out of the unity process" (219–20). Whether Mishra's statements about sharing of leadership berths stood on the way of Communist unity is not verifiable from any documentary sources, but if one takes NCP (Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party)'s statements then it appears that the unity process was hinged more around the

¹¹ This is not understandable because by now the NCP (Fourth Congress) was already in NCP (Unity Centre). See also Rising Nepal, "Breakaway Leaders ... Wider Front" 1990 Dec. 20 where the representative of this faction, Leela Mani Pokhrel shared platform with the other three urging Communist forces to forge new alliance. By such tactics this faction was probably trying to rope in other Communist factions in their newly formed party.

¹² See, also Rising Nepal, "New ULF Creation" 1992 Dec. 16 President of NCP (NWPP), Narayan Man alias Rohit blamed ULF for working against other factions and urged other factions to form a new United Left Front considering the forthcoming election. Tulsilal Amatya pointed out that they had pulled out of the Front because its Ministers in the Interim Government were corrupt.

issue of seat sharing in the coming election for its document stated:

To bring all Communist factions under one umbrella we carried on more than 15 talks within a period of one and a half month ... In those talks if other factions were interested in creating '*Ek Bam, Ek Tham*' the NCP (UML) [meaning NCP (ML) and NCP (M)] representatives were interested only on the issue of election. Then we realised that the NCP (UML) was using the talks just to feel the pulse of the smaller factions ... they doggedly stood on their position that they would field their candidates in 180 seats ... they were trying to force us to accept their stand. Besides, their tactics was to push their policies while embroiling us in talks. Their intention was not to take us along, but to destroy our very existence...

In the talks on unity all factions stressed on Communist ethics such as, 'the stronger should support the weaker;' 'the stronger should make sacrifices' etcetera. But, Madan Bhandari of NCP (ML) ended the talks saying 'You are all interested only in saving your earnest deposits, but we are interested in achieving two-third majority ... We protested saying that united movement will be necessary even after election (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Mahanirvachan Singhawalokan 2048 1-2).

Similar NCP (UML)'s¹³ attitude was portrayed in later statements of General Secretary, Bishnu Bahadur Manandhar of NCP (Democratic) (Rising Nepal, "UML Authoritative" 1991 March 9). The truth perhaps lay somewhere in the continuum of accusations and counter accusations and if later documents of NCP (UML) is considered—the goal with which unity between NCP (Marxist) and NCP (Marxist-Leninist) was forged—then judgement tilts in favour of the statements of the smaller factions (See p. 422). Nevertheless, the fact remained, the unity talks failed. However, it had its fallout. On 12 December, Hikmat Singh resigned from NCP (Verma) denouncing Krishnaraj Verma's decision to pull out from the ULF as regrettable (Rising Nepal, "Breakaway" 1990 Dec 13). Then on 17 December, the Central Committee meeting of NCP (ML) entrusted its General Secretary, Madan Bhandari and politburo member, Madhav Kumar Nepal to start new round of unity talks with NCP (Marxist) keeping doors of parleys open even for recent deserters (Rising Nepal, "New Unity Talks" 1990 Dec 18). Reciprocating NCP (ML) gesture, the NCP

¹³ These accusations were labelled technically against the NCP (ML) but since they were labelled after the formation of NCP (UML), they referred to NCP (UML).

(Marxist) formed a three-member committee composed of Central Committee members namely, Sahana Pradhan, Bharatmohun Adhikari and Kesharmani Pokhrel (K. C, Nepalma Communist Bhag 2 98). According to the document of NCP (Marxist),¹⁴the Committee placed before the NCP (ML) representatives, “a seven-point agenda which the Party felt was to be the basis of unity”. Going through these points, one finds the agenda focused on issues related to strategy and tactics. Of these the important ones were those which made clear that the upcoming Party was to agree upon accepting “New democratic strategy”, “class struggle as the instrument of social development”, “feudal revivalist as the main enemy” and “work together for the protection of democracy” (NCP (Marxbadi (Marxist)), Rajnaitik Pratibedan: 2049 18). Then on January 6, NCP (Marxist) Pokhara National Convention declared that they had reached an understanding with NCP (ML) and that the Party was handing over the task of completing the unification process to its high level leaders (Rising Nepal, “Marxist Endorse ... Unity” 1991 Jan 6). However, the NCP (Marxist) document presents a different scenario. According to them, the Pokhara Convention had taken the decision to add three more points to the seven-point agenda and to hold more talks before reaching any decision. However, it then rues over the course followed to conclude that the decision was reached in a hurry disregarding the ideology of the Party. In sum, it blames Man Mohan Adhikari for such moves for it states:

Though the Ma-Lay [NCP (ML)] had accepted our seven point agenda, the Pokhara conference had added three more points. In the light of the additions it was necessary to hold a second round of talks with the NCP (ML) representatives. Hence, the conference decided to hold a central committee meeting in Kathmandu immediately after its conclusion. But, nothing of this sort happened, because on the day when our Central Committee meeting was scheduled, the then General Secretary of our Party [Man Mohan Adhikari], histrionically presented before us Ma-Lay representatives. Then he proposed a joint meeting of the Central Committee members of both the parties. That Joint sitting, on the basis of majority decision, declared the union between NCP

¹⁴ This is the document of the NCP (Marxist) faction which came out of NCP (UML) in January 1993. Hence, what it says should be taken carefully because its statements related to the unity move must have been coloured by its perceptions of 1993.

(Marxist) and NCP (ML) and named the new Party as NCP (United Marxist Leninist).

The union was therefore achieved in a hurry while surrendering the ideology of the Party ... (18–9).

Documentary evidence suggests that the NCP (Marxist)'s claim that the unity was forged in a hurry is correct, because the document of the NCP (UML), its *Ghoshna-Patra*, published on the 7th claims its origin from Nepal Communist Party (Ekakrit Marxbadi Ra Leninbadi [NCP (UML)])¹⁵ Rastriya Parishad (National Council)'s meeting held on the 6th and the 7th giving the impression that the NCP (UML) existed even before the Pokhara Declaration of the 6th. This is something which reason fails to accept if one were to go by the tone and tenor of Pokhara declaration. As for its second view, which subtly implicates Man Mohan's rush for unity at the cost of Party ideology the NCP (Marxist) was probably referring to the NCP (UML)'s identification of the classes whom it was trying to represent because UML's document that is its *Ghoshna-Patra* includes 'general masses' in its set of classes to state:

Nepal Communist Party (Ekakrit Marxbadi Ra Leninbadi [United Marxist and Leninist]) is the Party of the proletariat ... its final goal is to establish socialism and communism. Today's Nepalese society is in the grist of feudal, tout bureaucratic capitalist and imperialist's exploitation. Our minimum goal today is to replace Nepal's semi-feudal, semi-colonial society with New Democratic society ... Hence, in today's Nepal this is the only Party which can shoulder the historic responsibility of transforming Nepal into a rich industrially developed country. Presently, it represents the interests of the working class, peasants, women, youth, students, intellectuals, national bourgeoisie, general masses and the interest of the nation. For such end it is ready to forge any Front ... (NCP (UML), *Ghoshna-Patra*, 2047 1).

Moreover, ideological factors were not so important in the alliance tactics of the two parties become clear from later document of the NCP (UML) where its statements

¹⁵ The document is titled as follows: Nepal Communist Party (Ekakrit Marxbadi Ra Leninbadi) Ko Goshna-Patra: 2047 Sal Paus 22 Gatay Dekhi 23 Gatay [6–7 January 1991] Samma Baseyko Rastriya Parishadko Baithakma Parit Its English rendition comes to this: Manifesto of Nepal Communist Party (UML) passed by its National Council meeting held on the 6th and the 7th of January 1991.

focuses only on ‘number, strength, influence and history’ to point out what the alliance had achieved for it states:

The creation of the ULF during the *Jana Andolan* helped unity moves among the Communists. In the Malay and Marxist unity process the Rohit and Tulsilal Amatya factions were also involved. But, in their own interest and for some unknown reason they tried to destroy the ULF. Despite that it was possible to keep intact the ULF and to forge the unity between the ML and the Marxist. That unity created a unified Communist Party. By this unity the Communist movement became united in number, strength, influence and history. NCP (UML) turned into the mainstream of Communist movement (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 33)

Thus, the NCP (UML)’s document vindicates NCP (Marxist)’s accusation that in forging unity the ideological question was shoved aside. However, it had its effect: it took shape in February 1992 in the re-formation of yet another faction—the NCP (Marxist) (See p. 447). Besides, January 1991 witnessed another unity move among smaller factions represented by Communist leaders like “Krishnadas Shrestha, Nandakumar Prasai, Shakti Lamsal, Sitaram Tamang and K. B Rai” (NCP (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) 1). On 4 January 1991¹⁶ they declared their existence as NCP (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist). Thus, after January 1991 and before 12 May General Election there were a number of Communist parties in Nepal. Of these, a few were continuation from the past, a few were from the past, but with new names and a few, completely new as unions of factions. By name, they were NCP (UML), NCP (Ekta Kendra [Unity Centre]),¹⁷NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), NCP (Masal),¹⁸NCP

¹⁶ Here Surendra K. C commits a mistake. He does not consult documentary evidence and simply suggests that the Party came into being on VS 2048 Jeth 22 that is 8 June 1991. See (K. C, Nepalma Communist Bhag 2 152).

¹⁷ See, Rising Nepal, “Samyukta Morcha Manifesto” 1990 March 29 Baburam Bhattarai a leader of Bidrohi Masal, a constituent of UNPM, had joined Unity Centre before March. In March 28 he released the manifesto of Samyukta Jana Morcha (United People’s Front, Nepal), the Front organisation of the Unity Centre created to contest the election. See also. Whelpton, “Election 1991” 63 Despite accepting multi-party democracy the United People’s Front was opposed to the Constitution.)

¹⁸ See, Rising Nepal, “CPN (Masal) Split” 1991 March 21 A section of

(Democratic),¹⁹NCP (Verma), NCP (Tulsilal Amatya) and NCP (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist). And though they presented themselves as two groups following two different strategies, New Democratic and National Democratic, yet they all, excluding NCP (Masal), were ready to participate in the upcoming election. In its Ghoshna –Patra the NCP (UML) accepted, as its immediate goal, the establishment of “a plural society where different political parties peacefully competed in the interest of the nation and the people” (9). So, it welcomed election as a means for establishing its envisioned polity, where it could unleash the forces of “rapid industrialisation and development to move towards its ultimate goal of establishing *Naulo Janabad* [the literal translation is still new democracy]” (Ghosna-Patra, 8). In contrast, NCP (Nepal Majdoor- Kisan Party) was critical of the future polity: it perceived it as a bourgeois system. So, it decided to use election as an instrument to reveal the limitations of the system practising revolutionary ‘parliamentarism’ for its document stated:

We take election as a class struggle and as a means of enhancing and measuring the political consciousness of the people ... in sum we have been using election and strikes as instruments of organising the working class ... we used this election to reveal the limitations of a bourgeois system and we shall use revolutionary ‘parliamentarism’ to let people know how a bourgeois system exploits them. This is the essence of Marxist-Leninist approach towards election which we have used to organise the people against the system ... (NCP (Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party), Mahanirvachan Singhawalokan 2048, 1)

Similar were the views of United People’s Front²⁰ Nepal for Jan Sharma writes,

dissidents who favoured contesting the election went out of the party to form United People’s Forum in March 20, 1991. See also Whelpton, “Election 1991” 58. This group according to Whelpton joined the United People’s Front before the election under the leadership of Shital Kumar calling themselves the true representatives of NCP (Masal). The other group which joined the Front was NCP (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist).

¹⁹ Till December end it was NCP (Manandhar).

²⁰ See, Whelpton, “Election 1991” 58 At that time the Front did not have posts of President or General Secretary so Baburam functioned as coordinator of the Front during the election period.

The United People's Front Nepal ... [described] Parliament ... [as] a 'bourgeoisie (sic) talk shop' ... [and decided] to contest elections to 'expose the parliamentary system'. They believed that the Constituion [had] institutionalised ... limited democratic rights ... [and] that real democracy [was] possible only through the establishment of *naulo janabad* ... through a 'People's War' (Sharma 123)

In line with such tactics of exposure, Brown observes, in its manifesto the "Samyukta Jana Morcha stated its intention to participate in the electoral process but then to refuse to work with the Government in the event that its candidates were elected" (159). However, NCP (Manandhar), which had by now changed into NCP (Democratic), fell in line with NCP (UML) in welcoming election while declaring, that it believed in "protecting democracy ... and using democratic polity in the interest of the people and for the development of the nation" (NCP (Prajantrabadi) 1). It felt that the system by giving "freedom of association to the workers, the peasants, the students, the teachers ... and the national bourgeoisie ... had empowered them ... to strengthen democracy, which they could use in developing the nation to move towards national democracy" (2). The views of NCP (Verma) (NCP (Verma), *Ghoshnapatra* 3) and of NCP (Amatya) (Rising Nepal, "NCP (Amatya) Manifesto" 1991 Apr 6) were no different. However, NCP (Masal) decided to boycott the election. It passed an elaborate document titled "*Sansadiya Chunao Bahiskarko Ghoshnapatra*". The document's content which rationalised its boycott move could be differentiated into three broad categories. Its statements such as those which said, "Ne Ka Pa (Masal) emphasises on republic but Nepali Congress and Left Front emphasise upon Constitutional Monarchy. Under a republic, Monarchy is fully destroyed and unless sovereignty passes into the hands of the people even Constitutional Monarchy cannot be achieved" (NCP (Masal), "*Bahiskarko Ghoshnapatra*" 411), fell into the first category, because they added a fresh dimension to their reasoning. It explained why they advocated the transfer of power to the people besides clarifying that they were viewing the then political arrangement not even as a Constitutional Monarchy. In the second category were statements, which were critical of the functioning of the Interim Government or more precisely of the functioning of the Nepali Congress. But, even

among such statements one set reflected their often quoted perception, which viewed “Nepali Congress in the service of Indian expansionism” (NCP (Masal), “Bahiskarko Ghoshnapatra” 415). Such statements being in the nature of repetition can simply be disregarded, because they do not improve the analytical edge of the narrative. However, among such criticisms there were statements, which could be categorised as a third set. These criticisms, which formed the bulk of the content of the document, not only criticised the functioning of the Interim Government, but also clarified what the Party wanted out of a political setup of Nepal or more precisely out of democracy. These criticisms were important, because they clarified what meaning they attached to the political setup which by western standard passed out as democracy. From democracy, the Party expected the fulfilment of people’s aspirations, which, according to it, included “punishment for those involved in criminal activities during the *Jan Andolan*” (414) that is during the Panchayat regime. Besides, it wanted the Government to “realise wealth stashed abroad by corrupt Panchayati functionaries” (414) and “to control the rise in prices of essential commodities” (414). But, above all it expected economic development for it stated:

In the immediate political context the issue of power transfer from the King to the people is important, but even after such transfer of power it is wrong to assume that democracy-bourgeois democracy-would come in the country. It is wrong to think that democracy has dawned after achieving a few basic and political rights. Even for bourgeois democracy the economic structure has to change—in simpler terms the productive forces should be freed from all impediments. Imperialistic and feudal impediments-both political and economic-need to be removed if economic development is to be achieved. Only after the completion of such struggle democracy in the true sense, even in the sense of bourgeois democracy- will come and then only the basic problems of the people can be resolved. But, such struggle for change is not possible under the leadership of a capitalist and opportunistic Party. Moreover, if the leadership rests in the hand of a feudal and tout bourgeois Party such as the Nepali Congress then it is impossible to achieve bourgeois democratic revolution ... (NCP (Masal), “Bahiskarko Ghoshnapatra” 412).

Similarly, its comment on the then functioning of the Nepali Congress reflected its fear about the birth of authoritarianism in future for it said,

The Nepali Congress by encouraging the entry of Mandalays²¹ [these were earlier Panchayat members entering the Party carrying Panchayat values] within their fold and by using them in an organised form to work against other political parties is reflecting the future of the polity ... it is set to re-creating authoritarianism out of the womb of multi-Party democracy ... (NCP (Masal), “Bahiskarko Ghoshnapatra” 414–15).

Thus, democracy in its view meant fast economic growth and rejection of authoritarianism, where the latter meant opposition to Panchayat values. The latter tendency, as we shall shortly see, was carried to the extreme by other Communist parties to promise radical democratic values, which the 1991 setup was not ready to accommodate. However, in the NCP (Masal)’s statements, where it frequently foresaw the possibility of such values being absent implied that it was already convinced about the outcome of the election: it had already seen Nepali Congress in the seat of power. This conclusion finds added support in its other statements, which criticises the functioning of Nepali Congress and the trend of politics of the Interim period, when its document states:

The present Government has made no effort in resolving the problems of the workers, peasants, students ... *janajatis* (nationalities), depressed classes, women, people of Terai Considering these trends the Government which comes to power after this parliamentary election will solve neither the basic nor the immediate problems of the people ... Under the present Government there is ‘Congressisation’ of bureaucracy, media etc. After election when their position becomes stronger the situation will further deteriorate. Hence, we have decided to boycott the forthcoming election to keep our struggle continuous to serve the interest of the people ... (NCP (Masal), “Bahiskarko Ghoshnapatra” 415–16).

These statements raise questions: was the Party decision to boycott elections influenced by its prognosis of the election? Was it boycotting the election because it saw no important role for itself in the future politics of Nepal? If one considers its past, then its present boycott move was not a new stance. Moreover, whether it won a

²¹ See Whelpton, *History* 117, and Brown 156. Before election there was an influx of former *panchas* into the Congress Party. Both authors suggest that this trend influenced the future politics of Nepal. Whelpton, in particular, points out that it made it more difficult for the Congress Party to oppose old establishment.

few seats or none there was nothing to stop the Party from carrying on its struggle in the interest of the people. Thus, what seems to have influenced its boycott move was its conviction about the necessity for transferring power into the hands of the people, because without such transfer of power, it felt that the then polity was neither Constitutional Monarchy nor ‘bourgeois democracy’ capable enough to resolve the problems of Nepalese masses. Hence, its boycott politics was its tactics of denying recognition to a political setup which did not pass out as democratic in its judgement. Therefore, in the future, if the Party’s immediate goal was for seeking transfer of power to the people its tactics involved fighting against the Party which was expected to come to power in a political setup, which they rejected outright.

In contrast to such outright rejection of the political setup, as of the NCP (Masal), the Communist parties participating in the election came up with their manifestos promising radical changes. In their promises there was an element of hope: they hoped to realise them under the setup. Though they, by such participation recognised the setup, yet the intent which underlay their promises were similar to the expectations of NCP (Masal) out of their idea of democracy. They were promising that they would bring economic development and democracy. The latter, besides meaning good governance, rule of law etcetera carried an extra connotation. In their view, multi-Party democracy also meant an end to authoritarianism. Indicating such understanding, the prefatory note of NCP (UML) manifesto said, “For the sake of multi-Party democracy many youths have sacrificed their lives to end authoritarianism” (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 1). And authoritarianism, in their document, implied any tendency which was in one way or other related to the Panchayat system or its values which was characterised by the domination of one class—the feudal class. As such, they carried their idea of democracy too far not only to oppose Panchayat values, but also to emulate Mao’s 1945 line (See p. 430). Thus, promising changes in the political setup the NCP (UML) said, that it would “oppose the control of one person, Party or of an organisation in the entire administrative organisations, media, Government offices and

public enterprises to protect *Bahudaliya Prajatantra* or multi-Party democracy and would fight for their [offices and organisations'] freedom and impartiality" (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 6). What such fight for democracy meant was evident in their promise to democratise the Army and the Police force for its manifesto said, "We are for restructuring the relations between Army/Police force and the people with democratic values. We intend to democratise even the relation between the Army/Police officials and their underlings" (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 7). Its other political promises included "basic human rights, fundamental rights and a democratic polity functioning under rule of law and under the direction of the Constitution where a plural society enjoyed freedom under multi-Party democracy" (6). Besides, it observed that it sought to "fight against and, if possible, amend those provisions of the Constitution which stood in its desire to transfer power in the hands of the people" (6). It was in for a "corruption free administration, good governance and actions against all those who had indulged in corrupt practices during the Panchayat regime and perpetrated criminal activities during the *Jana Andolan*" (6). Finally, it said, "The name of the Government should be Nepal Government and it should not be named after the name of a person or after the name of a family; because the Government is not responsible to a person or a family, but to the masses" (7). For ensuring rapid economic transformation of the kingdom's economy it hedged its position. It did not talk about direct State's interventions such as the method of nationalisation, but it said,

Economy is the basis of the society and the nation ... Hence, to end the continuing grip of feudal and imperialist exploitation and to overhaul the economic structure the Party stands for the following changes:

[1]. Considering the link of the various economic sector which are of importance in the economic growth of the nation a long term plan is to be formulated. In implementing such plan there should be proper synchronisation between annual and quarterly plans.

[2]. Since centralised planning fails in taking into consideration regional demands of development decentralised planning should be the main stay of planned development.

[3]. To stop emigration of labour force and to use wasted human resources there should be regional "Employment and Information Centres" and through them the labour force creating "National Development Service" should be made the integral element of the system... (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 8).

And on the question of re-structuring agricultural economy it said, “our main slogan is in favour of restructuring agricultural economy on the basis of democratic principles” (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 11). This was, indeed, a peculiar position for a Communist Party to advocate: it hoped to change economy by changing the administrative arrangements and invoking its notion of democracy. Applying its underlying values—a distaste for Panchayat values—in resolving the problems of *Sukumbasi* or landless people it said, “The problems of *Sukumbasis* ... cannot be resolved through Panchayati principles” (11). And despite the fact that it was copying Mao’s line the Party seemed to have realised the importance of India in the economic development of Nepal so its voice on Indo-Nepal trade relation was toned down. In its statements, there were no words that reflected its [of both NCP (ML) and NCP (Marxist)] usual perspective which viewed the relation in terms of Indian imperial hegemony. It simply said, “After reassessing Indo-Nepal Trade Treaties new treaties based on the principle of mutual benefit should be signed” (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 15). And it declared that it represented the interest of ‘all the classes’ besides its usual set of four classes for it said:

This is a Party that represents the proletariats of Nepal. It protects the interest of the proletariats, peasants, women, students, intellectuals, national bourgeoisie, merchants, employees and *people of all classes* [italics added]. Following the principles of Marxism and Leninism, it accommodates the positive aspects of leaders like Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh ... and preserves the right to carry on revolution within its nation to achieve scientific socialism and communism ... (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 2–3).

In this shift towards ‘people of all classes’, the Party meant the ‘general mass’. This shift came since its formation as NCP (UML) in January 1991 (See p. 421). However, Communist strategies are intimately connected with the classes whose interest a Party seeks to lead. As a result of the shift its strategy could neither be classed as anti-capitalist, nor as anti-imperialist. Even then the Party was appealing all and sundry in the name of *Naulo Janabad* or New Democracy to fight against feudalism and imperialism for it stated:

At present the main hurdles in the development of the country are feudalism, tout bureaucracy and imperial exploitation. Without destroying them, social salvation and national freedom cannot be achieved. Hence, at present the minimum strategy of the Party is ... *Naulo Janabad*. The political characteristics of *Naulo Janabad* are plurality, plural society where rule of law, fundamental rights and human rights are guaranteed for the people. In the economic sphere it seeks to ensure land to the tillers and freedom to national industrialists and merchants. It seeks to free them from imperialist and feudal control to ensure independent economic growth of the nation. It guarantees the destruction of all inequality, authoritarian control and special privileges of a few in the realm of language, nationalities, religion and culture ... It makes the *general mass the master of the nation* [italics added] and creates the bases for socialism. Hence, *Naulo Janabad* is not only in the interest of the proletariat, but also in the interest of the entire people. It is in the interest of the nation ... (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 3).

Why was there such a confusion? It was because the Party was trying to woo the entire masses, a compulsion foisted upon it by the parliamentary system. Besides, it was emulating Mao's 1945 line and the future line prescribed in New Democracy without realising what such line implied. To begin, in 1945 Mao was in favour of establishing a coalition Government of different classes nothing more, nothing less for he had said:

Under the over-all premise of annihilating the Japanese aggressors and of building a new China, the fundamental views of us CCP member are, at present stage, identical with those held by the overwhelming majority of the Chinese populace. These are, firstly, that China should not have a feudalistic, fascist, anti-popular system of Government exclusively controlled by big bourgeoisie, because such system has been proved to be entirely bankrupt by the chief ruling cliques of the KMT in their eighteen years' rule. Secondly, China cannot, and therefore should not, attempt to build a state along the old-type democratic lines entirely ruled by the liberal bourgeois dictatorship. For ... there has been born in China a politically powerful new factor that leads the broad masses of the peasant class, the petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals, and other democratic elements—the awakened Chinese proletariat and its leader, the CCP. Thirdly, in the present stage, while the task of the Chinese people is still to oppose imperialistic and feudal oppression, while the requisite social and economic conditions are still lacking in China, the Chinese people cannot, and therefore should not, attempt to build a socialist state system (Brandt, Schwartz and Fairbank 302).

Then explaining what the Chinese Communist had in mind for the future of China

Mao said:

Then, what is our proposal? We want to build, after annihilating the Japanese aggressors a system of Government based on the support of the overwhelming majority of the people, on the united front and the

coalition of democratic alliances [of parties and groups]. We call this the New Democratic system of Government...

The New Democracy we uphold demands the overthrow of external national oppression and the doing away of the internal feudalistic, fascist oppression. After removing these oppressions we are not in favour of setting up an old democratic political system. Instead, we want to set up a political system based on the united front and alliance of all democratic classes ...

The formation of the governmental structure of this New Democracy should be based on the principle of democratic centralization, with various grades of people's congresses making decisions on the major political policies and electing the Government... (Brandt, et al. 302)

And still later, answering a question on the nature of coalition in New Democracy he said:

This also answers another question, which is this: You communist (Party) members advocate the setting up of a coalition Government, because, at present, there is no democratic election system and a coalition Government is necessary for national unification and for waging anti-Japanese war; but in future too, when there will be a democratic election system, why not let the majority Party in the National Assembly set up a one-Party Government instead of still wanting to organize a coalition Government? Our answer is this: China's historical conditions prescribe a coalition Government. I have mentioned above that matters have been changed by the appearance of a new factor, the CCP, which represents not only the proletariat, but by virtue of its programme and actual struggle, also the broad peasant class, the petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals, and other democratic elements. Any Government that excludes from itself the CP will not be able to achieve a single worthy thing; this is the basic characteristic of China in the historical stage of New Democracy... (Brandt, et al. 306)

These statements implied that Mao's New Democracy was not tolerant to a system of democracy which excluded the CCP. While advocating such line whether Mao had in mind any specific type of democracy is not clear. Besides, the Government structure which Mao described in New democracy was to be based on democratic centralisation.²² Both these conditions implied that in Mao's New Democracy there was to be the domination of one Party—the Chinese Communist Party. The UML was quick at copying Mao's 1949 tactical line, because at that point it served them to adjust themselves in the changed condition by pointing out that it was in favour of all the classes. However, it carried the same idea even in describing its strategy of *Naulo*

²² It is a euphemistic term used to discourage or manage dissidents to stop fragmentation. Therefore, it is basically a means which is against pluralism.

Janabad. While copying the Mao's 1949 tactical line the Party was perhaps carried away by the force of Mao's frequent references to a Government of many classes to miss what was implied in his description of New Democracy, the future polity that he prescribed for China. Thus, in the UML's strategy of *Naulo Janabad* there was neither the idea of one Party domination, nor the idea of Government structure based on democratic centralisation. It only contained the 1949 Mao's tactical line expressed as strategy. This is perhaps what the Party meant when it said that it was in favour of accommodating the positive aspects of Mao in its line: it had tailored Mao's New Democracy to the democratic condition of Nepal. Its intention becomes further clear when one tries to question what classes meant in its *Naulo Janabad* of many classes. Its many classes included all those who were "anti-feudal, anti-imperialists and democratic forces" and falling within them were "Communist parties, fronts, professional organisations, employees organisations and even religious and linguistic groups" (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 5). Such idea of classes violated Mao's prescription even while forming a coalition with the KMT, because he was then advocating a coalition among non-sectarian groups. Thus, its strategy of *Naulo Janabad* was a diluted version of New Democratic strategy. In similar line, its advocacy for economic development— at that point of time— could only be explained as its reaction against the kingdom's economic background. However, its two year later document of the 5th Congress while advocating economic development and the need for administrative change, which meant power decentralisation and democratisation of the polity, suggests that such changes were necessary even for the preservation of socialism. And to reach such conclusion it drew lessons from the fall of Soviet Union. In explaining the causes behind the fall of Soviet Union, it identified two facts: the failure of the Union in unleashing the forces of production and in dismantling its over-centralised administrative arrangement and then it ended with a caveat. It called on all Communists to take lessons from the events to mean that the Party had taken the facts into consideration for its document said:

From the very beginning bourgeois forces had started attacking Soviet socialism ... In its long life, it could successfully tackle external attacks, but it failed in ducking internal attacks, so it disintegrated. In the process of building socialism it failed in maintaining the relation between control and balance. It persisted with State's over-centralised structure; it failed in nurturing the value of responsibility in its various productive units; it did not encourage research for increasing production. While competing with capitalism, it could not identify and analyse the emerging environment to come up with creative means for its progress. It did not give attention to the management of intra-regional competitive forces in the context of ensuring higher production; it plugged the free expression of its society on productive and administrative matters; it rejected democracy, rule of law, and failed to properly manage the relation between the Party and the Government. On the contrary, it gave importance to its gargantuan bureaucratic structure which was there to impose State's centralised decisions in every sphere of Soviet life. Such over-centralisation weakened the innards of Soviet socialism ... Under such situation Gorbachev initiated peace processes and disarmament in the name of complete restructuring of Soviet society [*prestroika* and *glasnost*]. The society welcomed the reforms, but the nature of the reforms, both in terms of class and national [interest] amounted to a surrender. It destroyed socialism and fragmented Soviet Union ... They should have initiated timely reform while preserving the essential bases of socialism ... This is a lesson which every Communist must take to heart ... (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 3).

These statements besides rationalising the Party's changed tactics in favour of democracy and economic development hid another implication. Its call for 'creative means' and for unleashing 'intra-regional competitive forces' for 'higher production' implied that it was not against capitalist path of development in the interest of socialism. It needed the path not only for its survival, but also for facing the competition thrown to it by capitalism. Though such position was not far from reiterating Mao's New Democratic line, where Mao was arguing in favour of free development of private capitalist economy, individual economy of the labouring class, co-operative economy under the New Democratic State (Brandt, et al. 303–4), yet it was different in the UML formulation because it did not take into account Mao's prescription which implied the domination of one-Party in the New Democratic State. As such, UML's economic position under *Naulo Janabad* turned equivalent to achieving full fledged bourgeois democracy both in content and form. Therefore, its commitment towards New Democratic strategy seemed to suggest a gloss over its surrender to the cause of out and out bourgeois democracy. With the advent of

parliamentary phase, the Party had virtually given up its ideology. In the name of communism it had turned into a votary of capitalism. Whether such thinking was at work in the creation of the manifesto is unanswerable if the document is taken at its face value. However, if the Party's silence on the issue of State's role in the management of the forces of production and its insistence on decentralised administration as the solution to the economic problems of the kingdom are considered then it is clear that similar thinking was at the back of creating the manifesto. Compared with the manifesto of NCP (UML), the manifesto of NCP (Verma) was short and its statements on the classes which it sought to represent, vague. Even then its position on economic issues reflected the trend of Communist thinking which favoured democracy and rejected authoritarianism for it said:

Nepal Communist Party, the representative of entire working Nepali people recognises the creative use of Marxism to establish an exploitation free Nepal. We favour socialism based on the foundations of human dignity and multi-Party democracy. We believe that the foundations of future socialist society rest upon enough production, variety of productive activities and availability of enough consumer goods. Hence, we are not in favour of any centralised, authoritarian economic structure ... We believe in supporting market economy based on competition; we are for private enterprises for the improvement of our economy and for creating enough employment and commodities... (NCP (Verma), Ghoshnapatra 3)

And its statements following its stand in the economic sphere, where it rejected all forms of authoritarian and centralised arrangements pointed out what it implied when it said, "The main task ahead is to strengthen democracy" (4) and "Our goal is for institutionalising democracy while democratising every sphere of our national life; supporting rule of law and protecting the rights of the people" (5). Similarly, the manifesto of NCP (Prajatantrabadi [Democratic]) consistently maintained its stand in favour of "strengthening multi-Party democracy" (NCP (Prajatantrabadi) 8). And focusing on issues involved in such effort it reiterated the position of NCP (UML) and NCP (Verma). It stated that it stood for "removing negative features of the Constitution;" "raising issues within and outside Parliament to synchronise prevalent laws with the spirit of the Constitution;" "freeing district development committees

from administrative control,” and “freeing media from Government control” (NCP (Prajatantrabadi) 8) etcetera. And rest of its manifesto is focused on improving the economic condition of Nepal, so much so that even its opinion on Indo-Nepal relation and relation with outside world like Soviet Union and China is influenced by such consideration for it states:

Because of Nepal’s geopolitical situation, its cultural and economic link with India and considering the context of Indo-Nepal open border there should be close relation between Nepal and India. And we should, for the economic development of our country, maintain a close link with socialist countries like China and Soviet Union on the basis of mutual advantage ... (NCP (Prajatantrabadi) 16).

Similar concern influenced its stand on the development of Nepal’s hydro-resources. It declared that “while protecting our national interest we should welcome Indian and foreign capital for the development of our water resources” (20). However, almost at the end of its manifesto, in item number 24 the Party declares its stand against those who had indulged in criminal activities in the Panchayat period. It says:

Ne Ka Pa (Prajatantrabadi) stands against all those who were involved in killing people; in practicing administrative and political repression; in salting national wealth abroad, and in ordering fake encounters ... during the Panchayat period. So, we propose that they should be brought to books ... (NCP (Prajatantrabadi) 23).

This stand of the Party; which was common to the stand taken by all Communist parties, participating and not participating the election, reflected its dislike against Panchayat values: its way of looking at democracy. Besides, like NCP (UML) it also perceived democracy as an instrument which needed to be nurtured in achieving its goal of socialism for it stated:

The main characteristic feature of Nepal’s present anti-Feudal, anti-Imperial struggle is national. In this struggle the increasing participation of working class and middle class sustains the democratic essence of Communist leadership and of the democratic forces. This struggle would progressively entrench and deepen democracy. In this process of achieving and strengthening political, economic and social democracy the increasing participation of working class will help present struggle from transcending the limits of out and out capitalist development. The completion of National democratic struggle against feudalism and imperialism would open the doors to socialism. This is the essence of our strategy ... (NCP (Prajatantrabadi) 3).

And in the election campaign, NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), while criticising the functioning of Interim Government asked the people:

Has the economy improved ? ... What sort of democracy is this where even for the transfer of an ordinary employee one needs the recommendation of Congress District Committee or of the General Secretary of Nepali Congress? ... Our economy is not under our control ... because of common river concept even our rivers are going into foreign hands. Our human resources are leaving the nation in search of jobs elsewhere and so is the status of Terai people (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Mahanirvachan Singhawalokan 2048 5–6).

Thus, during that phase what characterised the Communist movement of Nepal was their common understanding about their ideas and expectations from democracy and the economy of Nepal. This shared view,²³ which was prevalent among Communist parties—both participating and not participating the election—explained their tactical positions in the days to come. In fact, by seeking such changes they were trying to bring about their notion of revolutionary changes through and in a political setup which was not the outcome of a revolution. Such changes, besides others, promised ethnics “to erase constitutional provisions, which discriminated against their language, religion and culture ... promised seat reservation in the *Rastriya Sabha* ... administrative autonomy for the improvement of their languages and ... education in mother tongue” (NCP (UML), Chunao Ghosna Patra VS 2048 26–7). And as Whelpton writes, “the UPF as a whole ... called for ‘reservations’ (i.e. quotas in Government employment) for ethnic minorities and backward classes” (Whelpton, “Election 1991” 67). However, even such shared views were of no avail when the stake was a berth in the House of Representatives. In the election they fought each

²³ All politico-economic commentaries and articles related to this phase of Nepal have disregarded the nature of democracy from Communist point of view. However, in such understanding the most important element which needs to be understood is that their views were not simply against Panchayat authoritarianism. If one limits their understanding only to such reaction then it amounts to truism. What one has to understand here is that their idea of democracy was of the type which was extreme and unrealisable in the political-economic context of the then Nepal.

other bitterly. Illustrative were NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party [NeMKiPa (NWPP)])’s after election comments, which it put in the following terms:

In areas where we were strong²⁴ the NCP (UML) campaigned against us and in many of those areas they defeated us ... (4)
They indulged in false propaganda and spread the rumour that our Party was funded by Gyanendra ... to win election it brought itself to the level of Nepali Congress ... In many constituencies it promised people that it would give them land, jobs, gold, houses and even arrange males and females for unmarried spinsters and bachelors ... to win election they brought forward communal and regional slogans ... (8).

Describing the roles of other Communist factions it stated:

In the Sarlahi area ... and in other districts the NCP (Unity Centre) ditched us. Narbahadur Karmacharya, Lilamani Pokherel ... and even Nirmal Lama went to different districts and urged the people ‘to cast votes in favour of the winner’ (5).
Despite having floated the programme that it would utilise election for the purpose of exposing parliamentary democracy, the Unity Centre stooped to its lowest level to capture as many seats as possible ... (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Mahanirvachan Singhawalokan 2048 23).

1.2. Communist Activities after Election: Protests against Authoritarianism

The month, beginning from June was important both within and outside the Parliament. It began with UML General Secretary, Madan Bhandari’s threat that the Party would raise its voice both within and outside the Parliament if the stakes were democracy and national identity (Rising Nepal, “Complete Democracy” 1991 June 6). Opportunity struck when Nepal Journalist Association objected against the Press and Publication Act, 1991. It pointed out that a few of the Act’s provisions contravened the rights enshrined in the Constitution (Rising Nepal, “Press Act Undemocratic” 1991 June 6). Next day, UML’s press release objected against

²⁴ See, NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Mahanirvachan Singhawalokan 2048 2–3 The Party had categorised constituencies as A, B and C. In constituencies falling under A it claimed that it was strong. In B, less strong and in C, least strong. Constituencies falling under A were Bhaktapur, Dailekh, Zumla, Kalikot and Humla. Constituencies in B were Kavrey, Sindhupalanchok, Kathmandu and Surkhet and constituencies in C were Jajarkot, Nuwakot, Salyan, Acham, Banke and Bardiya.

Government's passing of one Bill after another in collusion with the Royal Palace without discussing them in the Parliament. In the same context, it pointed out that the Act was opposed to Article 13 of the Constitution for it imposed prior restrictions against publication of news and articles (Rising Nepal, "UML Objects" 1991 June 7). The objection implied that the Act was also the result of the Congress-Palace collusion, a trend which the UML was not ready to accept because of its tactical position. Besides, without allowing the newly elected Government to settle leaders began raising demands. Narayan Man Bijukche of NCP (NWPP) was quick at demanding stern actions against administrators of the Panchayat regime. He demanded early release of Mallik Commission Report and formulation of policies to solve ethnic-linguistic issues (Rising Nepal, "Rohit Affirms" 1991 June 7). Adding to the chorus were the voices of several organisations,²⁵ and leading them all was the voice of Nepal Civil Servants Organisation (Rising Nepal, "Civil Servants' Memorandum" 1991 June 15).

In the last week of June, Nepal Civil Servants Organisation published its programme of protest. According to Mishra, the programme was in support of its demands which were as follows:

- [4]. Implementation of High Level Commission Report on salary reform.
- [5]. Abrogation of recent changes introduced in the 1965 Civil Servants Regulation²⁶ to allow employees of all level to join the Organisation.
- [6]. Dissolution of the so-called Nepal Civil Servants Association ... (Mishra 231)

²⁵ See, Rising Nepal, "Trade Union" 1991 June 11; Rising Nepal, "Transport Workers'" 1991 June 13

²⁶ See, Samanya Prasasan Mantralaya 7–8 The Interim Cabinet in 18 March 1991 had amended the 1965 Civil Service Regulations. The changed regulations barred civil employees from participating in strikes, in pen-down strikes, sit-ins, and in representing their cases to the higher ups through any organisations. However, they could hold offices of Government recognised employee organisations and represent their cases to the authorities. Besides, they could not electioneer and taking part in elections. Finally, the rules barred gazetted officials from being a member of an employee organisation unless such organisation was related with their profession.

And the protest was scheduled to start from July 1. In the list of Civil Servants Organisation's demands, the UML perceived the Organisation's reaction against "Government's machination which sought to fragment their organisation" (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 42). From their perspective, it was "a call for implementing the promises given by the Interim Government and for ensuring economic justice by adjusting their pay to the rising index of inflation" (42). It held the Government "fully responsible for bringing the employees to the street by not respecting its own promises" (42). However, the Government's response to the Organisation's programme was a mix of threat and appeal. Repeatedly, press releases of the Ministry of General Administration urged the Organisation not to launch its movement in the face of the kingdom's economic situation. It warned the Organisation of dire consequences if it continued with its protest movement (Rising Nepal, "Benefits" 1991 June 30; Rising Nepal, "HMG Issues" 1991 July 3). Nonetheless, it began on the scheduled day. A day to day description of the movement contained in Mishra's work reveals that it was a movement marked with unusual means of protests. It started with employees donning black bands around their upper arms. Then from 7 July it was paired with *satyagraha*, which started in the office of the Ministry of General Administration. From 17 onwards it involved partial boycott of duties. On 18, other organisations supported the movement. Together they protested forming solidarity chains at Tundhikhel, Kathmandu and in the districts. On 21 it organised silent processions throughout the capital. August 4 witnessed candle-light processions, and on 23 August masked cyclists rallied around the city (Mishra 231–33). Meanwhile, the Parliament had begun functioning since 20 June. On 23rd, while electing Speaker of the House UML withdrew the nomination of its candidate ensuring unanimous election of Nepali Congress's candidate Daman Nath Dhungana to the post (Rising Nepal, "Dhungana Elected" 1991 June 24). In exchange, giving examples of parliamentary practices in South Asian states, the Party sought like behaviour from the Congress's side in the election of Deputy Speaker. However,

when the Congress did not reciprocate UML's gesture, its leaders, Man Mohan Adhikari and Jhal Nath Khanal, characterised Congress's attitude as an expression of majority pride (Rising Nepal, "Elected Deputy Speaker" 1991 July 1). In fact, even during this period it appeared that NCP (UML)'s tactics was in favour of forging a genuine understanding with the Congress in the running of the Parliament, but for Congress's denial the tactics never bore fruit. After the election of the Parliamentary posts the debate in the House turned progressively acrimonious. On 5th July Parliamentary debate, which followed King's July 1 address to the Joint House, Madhav Kumar Nepal of the UML criticised the address for having failed in indicating how the Government planned to free the kingdom from foreign domination and feudalism and UPFN leader accused the Government of betraying the civil servants (Rising Nepal, "Council Begins" 1991 July 6). On 7 July NCP (UML) and NCP (Democratic) MPs requested the Speaker to discuss civil servants problems (Rising Nepal, "MPs Demand" 1991 July 8). Next day, answering opposition's questions in the debate on the King's address, the programmes of the Government, Congress MPs, Bal Bahadur K. C said that the civil servants' agitation was politically motivated (Rising Nepal, "False Assurances" 1991 July 9). And on 10 July, when the Speaker failed to allocate time for discussing the civil servants' agitation MPs representing NCP (UML), NCP (Democratic) and UPFN boycotted the meeting of the House (Rising Nepal, "MPs Boycott" 1991 July 11). Following day, in a press release, UML General Secretary, Madan Bhandari accused the Government of plotting against Civil Servants Organisation by creating a parallel organisation and called for immediate talks with the Organisation. He warned that delay would be at the cost of general interest (Rising Nepal, "Call for Talks" 1991 July 12). However, despite opposition's call for early solution to the problem, the Government on July 13 issued directives to the Ministry of General Administration to take action against all errant employees under existing regulations (See, Ch. IV footnote 26). It proscribed 'pamphleting', postering and sit-ins on office premises (Rising Nepal, "Employees Warned" 1991 July 14). By July 15, Government had arrested more than 200

employees in Kathmandu and in the districts. Speaking in the National Council Subash Chandra Nemwang of NCP (UML) accused the Government of dividing, suppressing and resorting to unfair means in its handling of the civil servants who had played active role in the *Jana Andolan* (Rising Nepal, “Council Discusses” 1991 July 18). Then on 22 July the Government, in accordance with the provisions of Essential Services Act 2014 [1967/68], imposed prohibitory orders which allowed it to imprison nonconforming employees for six months. Besides, it activated rule 10.1 Sections 5 and 6 of Civil Service Regulations 2021 [1964/65]. Under Section 5, the Government could relieve an employee without disqualifying him of future Government services, but Section 6 armed it with powers to relieve and to disqualify employees even from future Government services. Moreover other Sections of the Regulation gave the Government the power to withhold pay raises and promotions of the employees (Rising Nepal, “Essential Services Act” 1991 July 23). In the Parliamentary debate of July 24, Bharat Mohan Adhikari of the UML accused the Government of adopting an “authoritarian attitude” and warned that his Party was going to launch a nationwide agitation either from the 26th or from the 27th of July in support of the civil servants’ agitation clubbing it with issues of price rise and of the landless (Rising Nepal, “Lower House Discusses” 1991 July 25). The UML was on its road to implement its tactics of opposing Congress’s authoritarianism (See p. 427 for UML tactics of the period). Same day, the politburo meeting of the UML decided to launch the agitation from July 27 if the Party in power did not shed its “pride of majority”, its “rigidity” and its “prejudices” against the civil servants (Rising Nepal, “UML in the Streets” 1991 July 25). On the scheduled day, NCP (UML), NCP (Unity Centre), NCP (Masal) and NCP (NWPP) came together to organise a demonstration and a mass meeting—the result of similarity in their tactical position. In the demonstration they protested against Government’s hooliganism, its insensitivity towards the issue of price rise and towards the plight of the landless and of the agitating civil servants (Rising Nepal, “Mass Meeting” 1991 July 28). The movement dragged on amid talks between the representatives of the civil servants and the

Government (Rising Nepal, “MPs Eager” 1991 Aug. 6). For the UML “the talks were mere ploys to buy time, an example of Congress’s machination” (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 42–3). On the 9th, Communist MPs representing NCP (UML), UPFN, NCP (NWPP) boycotted the Parliament session for the second time asking Government to stop taking actions against agitating civil servants (Rising Nepal, “Left Boycott” 1991 Aug. 10). On 16, Nepali Congress spokesman condemned the 18th August Valley closedown and nationwide strike of 22 called by the Communist in support of the movement. He argued that the call was not in the interest of the nation since civil servants constituted only 2% of the population and took away 60% of the national wealth (Rising Nepal, “NC Flays” 1991 Aug. 17). The figures were probably an exaggeration in support of the Government’s repeated economic argument. The *bandh* (strike) call was partially successful. Communist faction (See p. 443 for its formation) like NCP (United) stayed away from the call saying that it would take the streets only when talks between the Government and the Civil Servants’ representatives failed (Rising Nepal, “Involve in Strike” 1991 Aug. 21). By August 24 the movement hit the buffers. The Civil Servants Organisation ended its agitation saying that it believed in the Government’s promise that problems would be resolved once the agitation was over (Rising Nepal, “End Agitation” 1991 Aug. 25). Commenting on its role in the movement the NCP (UML) said:

The Nepali Congress blamed us for having created the movement. The ultra-Left [Masal and UPFN] blamed us for having failed in supporting the employees, for cheating them and for supporting the Congress. But the truth was that we were giving our moral support to the employees from the very beginning against the authoritarian attitude of the Government. Such support from our part to the cause of the civil servants was perfectly in tune with our tactical position (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 43)

Meanwhile, the movement was still adjusting itself with the changed post-election environment. This was visible in the activities of the three minor Communist factions namely, NCP (Democratic), NCP (Verma) and NCP (Amatya). The following paragraph is devoted to the description of their activities.

1.3. Formation of NCP (United) and its Tactics

On 19 July 1991, the parties announced their merger (Rising Nepal, “Parties to Merge” 1991 July 20) to form NCP (Samyukta (United)). The opening paragraph of its pamphlet produced on the occasion declared, that the unity was in response to the need of the hour for “a disciplined, revolutionary and nationwide Party subscribing to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, which is free from the tendencies of ultra-leftism, opportunism and fragmentation caused by right deviation” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Samyukta Ghoshna 1). Whom the Party was referring to in the name of ultra-leftism, opportunism and right-deviation? They were pointed against NCP (Masal) and the UPFN (NCP (Samyukta (United))), Rajnaitik Prastao: 2048 15), and though the content of the pamphlet slighted the then activities of UML, yet its later characterisation of the Party as a faction supporting “mixed economy ... rule of law and support to multi-Party system” it said, was in line with its position indicating that it was not against the UML (NCP (Samyukta (United))), Rajnaitik Prastao: 2048 8). However, at that point of time that is during the civil servants movement it was against the UML for it blamed the Party of playing power game and eroding democratic culture for its pamphlet read:

Today in the context of the existing political environment we are forced to unite to fulfil the responsibilities which have fallen upon us after the *Jana Andolan*. Today the most important political questions that needs to be addressed are those related with the strengthening democracy and democratic culture. Presently, it is being eroded by the activities of the ultra-Leftists, Opportunists and the ultra-Rightists. A direct confrontation between those in power and those out of power has begun in the nation. This is due to their love for power. Whom will it serve? It can be easily discerned.

So, in the present political situation, to save democracy and democratic culture and to eradicate poverty, ill health and illiteracy from the Nepalese society we have come together to form NCP (Samyukta)... (NCP (Samyukta (United))), Samyukta Ghoshna 3–4).

Besides, for the fast-paced economic development of Nepal the Party welcomed lessons learnt from the changes that had come in the international Communist movement for it stated:

From the changes which have come in the world Communist movement, the NCP will take lessons and will apply them in Nepal

considering her objective conditions. It will support multi-Party system, planned market economy and democracy to bring about rapid political, economic and social development and then move forward in the creation of an exploitation free humane society... (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Samyukta Ghoshna 3).

However, such Party line was similar to the line adopted by NCP (UML), because it was also thinking of changing economic structure by supporting the superstructure—democracy, multi-Party system and planned market economy. This democracy which three-months ago had emphasised on combating Panchayat authoritarianism was now against a democratic arrangement which seemed to institutionalise two-Party domination for the pamphlet said:

When we consider the political context which has emerged after the ... electoral competition then we see a distinct polarisation of the forces between the EMaLay [UML] and the Ne. Ka [Nepali Congress]. In this context words are in the round that in future the country will have a two-Party system institutionalised. However, Nepal is a poor country with its society fragmented into various classes and groups. In such context, the contradictions among the fragmented lot is bound to play a vital role in future. Hence, a political culture which moves around two-Party domination is neither practical, nor desirable... (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Samyukta Ghoshna 3).

Thus, the real intent behind the formation of the new Party was essentially for creating a combined bloc against the domination of both the UML and the Congress—a clear indication of the degree of fault that lay in the then Communist movement of Nepal. Besides, it indicated what tactics²⁷ they were to adopt, and it was reflected in their first decision of August 20 (See, p. 442). It seemed that the Party intended to maintain its independent existence, but 20 days later a change in its tactics was visible when it appealed for the creation of a united high command among Communist factions which

²⁷ See, NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnaitik Prastao: 2048 9 The Party in this document points out the differences that exists between itself and the UML. It says that in the then context UML considers itself as the only alternative to the Nepali Congress, but it believes that the only alternative is a broad National Front. Besides, it points out that it also has differences with the party on the issue of regional cooperation and in creating the National Front. On the former it says, that the UML still is against India meaning it is not, and on the latter it does not evince any interest in creating a Front, but remains guided by its ego.

included the UML (Rising Nepal, “Communist Unity” 1991 Aug. 10). Considering the timing of the appeal, it was perhaps triggered by the attitude which the Congress had reflected in its dealing with the movement of the civil servants. Nevertheless, considering the fast changes in its tactical position it appeared that the Party was in a state of confusion. At times, it was trying to maintain its independent existence, and at another, it was trying to be a part of a larger bloc.

1.4. Reactions Against Mallik Report, Protests Against Price Rise

With the dawn of July, the Communist factions were faced with the Mallik Commission’s Report. However, their responses towards the Report contrasted with the concern which they evinced in the course of the civil servants’ movement. Considering the Commission’s reference, the Report carried much weight in the Communists’ tactical position. But surprisingly, the Communist factions neither clubbed the issue in their July 1991 movement, nor protested against Girija’s inaction in 1992. Their actions were limited either in raising uncoordinated voices in the Parliament (Rising Nepal, “MPs Eager” 1991 Aug. 6), or in inking brief comments in their documents. Following its trend, the UML, in its document of the Fifth Congress, attributed Congress’s action, that is, its failure to implement the suggestions of the Commission, to its changed organisational complexion owing to the entry of the Panchayat activists in the Party (NCP (UML), *Rajnitik Pratibedan*: 1993 14). However, for NCP (Masal) it was an opportunity to condemn parliamentary system by saying,

All along we had been saying that Parliamentary system and elections held under the system is incapable of solving the problems of the people ... Despite people’s repeated demand for punishing the criminals of *Jana Andolan*, the present Government is protecting them and is admitting them in its organisation (NCP (Masal), “*Rajnitik Pratibedan* Paus 2048 [1992]” 447–8)

Its view implied, its commonplace argument that the first thing which was required in implementing the Commission’s Report was to strip the King of his powers by framing a Constitution through a Constituent Assembly. And considering the faint reactions of the Communist factions—the NCP (NWPP) did not even bother to raise

the issue in the Parliament²⁸—the Party was perhaps right in making such suggestions. However, such inaction on their part raises many questions. Was it fear of the King that dissuaded them from pursuing the issue? Or, was there, unsubstantiated though, an understanding with the King in the 8th April 1990 compromise, as indicated by Brown? Or was their avowed tactics of opposing authoritarianism simply a posture against feudalism? There are no documents to answer these questions with certainty except to surmise—perhaps the fragmented Communist factions were not in a position to challenge the authority of both the King and the Congress at the same time: to a few of the factions the issue was important in exposing the limitations of the Constitution, but for the UML it was not, because it was in favour of strengthening democracy. Hence; with the passage of time, the issue, without the support of the largest Communist faction, just faded into oblivion. From then onwards, the issue of price rise claimed much of their attentions. Paper reports²⁹ and parliamentary debates were focused on criticising Nepali Congress's economic policies, which the Communists felt were tilted in favour of foreign powers. In the Parliament, a representative view in this regard were the statements of Narayan Man Bijukche of NCP (NWPP) who said:

Nepali Congress while going to polls had floated its manifesto ... to receive public mandate. Its economic policies should have been based on the manifesto.

In its manifesto it had expressly stated that it stood for democratic socialism ... In its present economic policy there is not a single reflection of socialism. Does it, by its programme of socialism seek to copy the Indian model where even after 40 years of its variety of socialism 60% of its citizens are below poverty line? ... In its economic program the Congress in the name of socialism has focused primarily on developing the private sector ... Hidden in such approach is its desire to welcome foreign companies to change Nepal into a neo-colonial State ... For controlling price rise it has proposed no solution. Even in the Interim period it had promised to control prices, but it rose

²⁸ See, NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: Pahilo Adhiwayshun Entire Collection . In the entire collection of Naryanman Bijukche's deliberations in the then Parliamentary session compiled by the Party there is not even a single statement on the issue.

²⁹ See, Rising Nepal, "MPs Eager" 1991 Aug. 6; Rising Nepal, "Immediate Relief" 1991 Aug. 18

by 30-35%. The present Government is similarly not bothered about the rising prices (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: Pahilo Adhiwayshun 1-4)

It was a perennial issue which found its way into programmes framed by the Communist factions in their protest movements. Interestingly, these protest movements did not take one, but series of issues which were either carry over of the past or the result of immediate Government action. In 1992, their perceptions on Tanakpur issue (See p. 150), tagged with the issue of price rise, spilled over the streets as protests in January and February. In January 23, NCP (Unity Centre) led a procession in the heart of Kathmandu. The procession demanded the Government to check price rise, increase remuneration of employees in proportion to the price hike, check corruption, stop eviction of landless,³⁰ reduce education fee, stop 'congressisation' and, above all, the implementation of the Tanakpur treaty. It described the treaty as an attempt by the Congress to sell national rivers and demanded not to implement the treaty without the two-third approval of the Parliament (Rising Nepal, "Unity Centre Plans" 1992 Jan 23). Meanwhile, NCP (UML) suffered a split, which led to the re-formation of yet another Communist faction—NCP (Marxist).

1.5. NCP (Marxist): Its Strategy and Tactics and Change in NCP (United)'s Strategy

Commenting on the origin of the split, Surendra K. C points out that after the formation of NCP (UML) in January 1991 a few leaders of the erstwhile NCP (Marxist) began drifting away from the UML (K. C, Nepal Communist Tesro Bhag 217). The drift ultimately ended in their holding of "7th National Conference on

³⁰ See, Rising Nepal, "Commission on Squatters" 1991 Aug. 5 On August 4 the Government had formed a High Level Commission to identify genuine landless squatters. However, the Commission was composed only of members of the ruling party. Suggestions from the opposition members, MPs of the UML and UPFN to include even members from the opposition in the Commission was vehemently rejected. Other suggestions from the opposition included 1) To take the issue beyond the consideration of vote bank 2) To devise means to ascertain genuine landless people. Add the content of Sukumbasi paper.

VS 2048 Magh 20–21 [3–4 February 1992]” to announce the “formation of NCP (Marxist)” (NCP (Marxbadi (Marxist)), Ghoshna Patra 1). Drawing upon the legacy of NCP formed in “15 September 1949 under Pushpalal” it categorised Nepal in the “semi-feudal, semi-colonial stage of historical development where distortions of Prague-capitalism had set in”. Identifying itself with the interests of “the working class, peasants, middle class, women, nationalities, untouchables and national bourgeoisie” it declared to “free Nepal from feudalism, imperialism, foreign monopoly capitalism”. It pointed out that for achieving its chosen goal it would “ensure New Democratic revolution and lead the nation towards socialism by waging class struggle” (1) against “revivalist, feudal authoritarianism and anti-democratic forces” (7). Thus, in comparison to the orientations of NCP (UML) and NCP (United) it stood aloof: it again brought in the importance of class struggle in the social development of Nepal. However, such struggles in the interest of the “workers, landless and the peasants” were to be carried out in ensuring “workers participation and representation in the management, in imparting skills to make them employable and in industrialising and modernising Nepal” (1–2). As regards its position on the issues generated by the “multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic and multi-cultural” complexion of Nepalese society, it said that their “struggle ultimately turns into a class struggle”. And to solve it the Party said, “After the arrival of democracy the linguistic, religious and minorities are trying to evolve themselves as political forces. In their endeavour, NCP (Marxist) will always support them” because, amicable relation that exists among them is essential for the unity of the nation (3). Thus, neither in solving the problems of classes nor in solving the problems of social groups the Party supported violent class struggle. The nature of class struggle which it supported was limited to waging political struggles. This was because the Party stood for preserving “multi-Party democracy, where the Constitution had transferred power to the people” (2). To preserve it the Party thought of industrialising the kingdom, for it noted:

For the preservation of democracy, social stability, people’s rights, country’s sovereignty and unity the most important condition is

economic development. For economic development the most important condition is to end feudal control over land and to make the peasants the tillers of the soil while modernising the agricultural sector and ending the interference of foreign monopolistic capital in the industrial sector of the kingdom (NCP (Marxbadi (Marxist)), Ghoshna Patra 4)

Thus, the Party, unlike NCP (UML) and NCP (United) looked the other way round: for it, economic development was the precondition for ensuring political stability. However, it was opposed to economic development based on “free market economy which was accompanied by the distortions of capitalism such as hoarding, exploitation of workers and artificial deficiencies in commodities” (4). It stood for “controlled economy, which ensured social justice” (4). And this reflected its objections against the NCP (UML)’s position for it observed:

Today in the name of *Bahudaliya Janabad*, competitive democracy and economy all distortions of capitalism have been introduced in our society. Among the people this has created abhorrence against communism itself. We shall expose all these distortions which are being advocated in the name of communism and raise the consciousness of the working class towards the necessity for New Democratic revolution and for establishing socialism (NCP (Marxbadi (Marxist)), Ghoshna Patra 5–6)

Tactically, this meant that the Party position was focused in ensuring the economic development of the kingdom while exposing the distortions that had set in the NCP (UML)’s position in the name of *Bahudaliya Janabad*.³¹ Needless to say that such politics of exposure of the Party was also aimed at opposing the neo-Liberal economic orientations of Nepali Congress. Meanwhile, the Communists continued pressurising the Congress in the Parliament. On February 23, the opposition, except

³¹ See, NCP (Marxbadi (Marxist)), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 2049 20–22 and 35 The Party holds the view that in the context of Nepal the only suitable strategy is New Democratic strategy because the imperialist are still in existence. Besides, it observes that UML’s *Naulo Janabad* is an opportunistic and non-Marxist line on the basis of which it can unite even with the revivalist or the NDP. However, it does not explain how such line opens UML’s possibility of uniting with the NDP. Perhaps it was saying that the line was tailored in the interest of electoral politics. Moreover, its document classes UML’s line as neo-revisionist line which advocates victory over imperialism by adopting competitive economy. It says that as long as imperialists exist there is always the possibility of war.

NSP, walked out demanding details about the agreements (Rising Nepal, “Opposition Walk-Out” 1992 Feb. 24).

In 24–27 March 1992, the NCP (United) held its First National Conference. Its document described the Nepalese society’s historical stage of development as the stage of “bourgeois democracy” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnaitik Prastao: 2048 4), where there were still the persistence of “feudal legacies: feudal culture, economic underdevelopment and social settings” (4). Under such situation, the document said that “the challenge before democratic revolution is to ensure rapid industrialisation of the nation while implementing fundamental land reform programmes” (5). And as a prelude to announcing changes in its strategy, it hedged its statements. Without identifying the existing classes it said, “In the present context, the possibility of the rise of industrial workers and industrial capitalists is minimum. The problems of the peasants and of the unemployed youths have multiplied and there exists no identifiable classes: they are all mixed up” (5). Then, pointing out to the changes in the World Communist movement the three factions, as one, without stating clearly, of course, gave up their earlier strategy of National Democracy. The Party statements implied that they, under compulsion, were for neo-liberal model of development without falling into the grip of neo-colonial economic structure for its document noted:

Earlier we had subscribed to the strategy of National Democracy and our goal then was to establish socialism through the non-capitalist path. The crux of the strategy was to ensure rapid economic development of our nation taking help from the socialist countries of the world. However, now the situation has changed. Soviet Union is no more in existence and Eastern European states are not socialist. China, Cuba, Korea and Vietnam are also enmeshed in their own economic crisis ... In such context, Nepal, for its economic development has to take support from developed countries and it has to bank upon its own resources. So, we have to start anew our relationships with the developed countries, especially with our neighbours, and with Western and International Funding Agencies which are under the control of the Western nations ... After the fall of the Soviet camp, these institutions in the disbursement of their fund have begun reducing the proportion of Soft loans in favour of Hard loans to collect more from interest accruing out of such loans. This is a clear indication about their intention. They intend to bind us in the neo-colonial economic structure; however, we have no choices. Under such situation we have to re-evaluate the relation that exists in the Public and Private sector of

our economy and decide how much loan we should take and for which sector... (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnaitik Prastao: 2048 5–6)?

The Party was in a dilemma: outwardly it professed its goal of “establishing a humane socialist system” (2), but inwardly it was out of its wits in devising the course for achieving its goal. Hence, it considered democracy as the panacea for everything even for establishing the rule of the working class for it stated:

After the 1989–90 revolt ... democracy has been installed. With the 1990 Constitution, the 1991 Election and the coming into power of a democratic Government the first phase of democratic revolution is over. Now, we have entered the second phase of revolution. In it we have to protect the Constitution, the rights enshrined in it and through peaceful people’s movement we have to bring a total change in the socio-economic structure with the intention of establishing a democratic State of the general working citizens... (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnaitik Prastao: 2048 2)

Thus, the process of giving up its ideological position was complete. From now on, the word proletariat had found a new substitute in the ‘general working citizens’. These positions brought it closer to the NCP (UML), which in the name of *Naulo Janabad* was advocating similar line. Within a brief period of two years, Parliamentary democracy had triumphed over the Panchayat system in forcing the factions to tailor their position to that of the UML. Hence, in its changed form the Party’s tactics rotated essentially around opposing the “monopolistic, authoritarian and undemocratic rule of the Congress” and the ultra-Leftists (15). In opposing the latter, it was perhaps guided by its fear that ultra-Leftist’s rise would be at the cost of its existence, a conclusion which finds its support when its position on the evolving bi-party domination in the politics of Nepal (See p. 444) is paired with its perceptions regarding the end result of ultra-Leftist politics for it said:

Nepali Congress, because of its policy of compromise with the feudal and imperial forces and because of its authoritarian tendencies, cannot form a National Front consisting of anti-feudal and anti-imperial forces for the sake of the nation’s progress. On account of the development of free economy the country will be progressively shackled in the chain of exploitation. The chasm between the rich and the poor will increase. *The ultra-Leftist Maoists, in the name of socialism, will take the country into the fold of sectarian dictatorship of one Party. It will fail in including the masses and in ensuring the development of the nation in their [masses] terms*[italics added]. Hence, for the all out

development of the nation ... it is essential to create an alternative to the Nepali Congress. Such alternative can be created only on the base of Left Front. In this direction one has to move now (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnitik Prastao: 2048 16)

Thus, in its tactics of creating a “National Left Front” there appeared its intent of preserving its existence (16). It hoped such front to come into being “in course of the understanding which would evolve in the process of fighting against the authoritarian rule of the Congress” (17). According to it, such fight was to be centred around issues of “corruption in the use of revenues by ministers, corruption practised along the Indo-Nepal border ... trade, import” and in keeping “Indian cooperation in Hydro-electric projects within the bounds of international norms” (17). Besides, it indicated that it stood in favour of “introducing improved ceiling laws on land ... full security to national capital ... industrialising the nation with the help of foreign aid ... ending ‘congressisation’ of media ... giving cheap education, free education to the backward classes, developing their languages and culture ... and in supporting freedom of religion” (17–20). After the National Conference the Party formed its Central Committee on March 30, 1992 under the Chairmanship of Tulsilal Amatya. And it urged all Communists, barring NCP (Masal) and UPFN, to unite and face the May/June 1992 local elections as a single front (Rising Nepal, “Forms Central Committee” 1992 March 31). However, its appeal for a united Communist front went unheeded.

1.6. Tanakpur Issue and Communist Protests

On April 6, NCP (Unity Centre) revived the Tanakpur issue. It launched another round of protest as “Movement Day”, where NCP (Masal) provided its moral support, because it said that “the decision was taken unilaterally by the Unity Centre” (NCP (Masal), “Rajnitik Prastao Srawan 2049” 466). It, was, therefore, wholly NCP (Unity Centre)’s show,³² which according to Whelpton was marked with violence.

³² See, Whelpton, History 189 He writes that the movement was jointly carried by both NCP (Masal) and UPFN, the front organisation of NCP (Unity Centre). Documentary evidence goes against such statement.

Describing it he writes, “Street ... demonstrations ... turned violent on 6 April 1992, the second anniversary of the Darbar Marg shooting during the *janandolan*. At least, twelve people died in police firing” (189). A late reaction of NCP (UML), viewed in the killing a “planned, deliberate action of the Government ... a plot to keep it engaged before local elections” (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 44). It said, after that “We organised protests extended over a period of two months³³ against the authoritarian³⁴ attitude of the Government ... The protests³⁵ included distribution of pamphlets in huge numbers, dozens of processions and collection of twelve lakh signatures demanding the resignation of the Home Minister” (44). However, on April 30 the UML entered into a six-point understanding with the Nepali Congress. Of these, four understandings were related with the smooth holding of local elections. Fifth was for the creation of an Investigation Commission to investigate the April 6, 1992 incident and the last dealt with early formation of a Consumers’ Commission to find ways and means to lower electricity tariff and prices of commodities (Rising Nepal, “NC, UML Hold Talks” 1992 May 1). The UML rationalised its action as means necessary for protecting and institutionalising democracy. Giving same reasons, it rejected both calls of NCP (Unity Centre): the call for Nepal *bandh* on May 2 and its ultimatum to Koirala to resign by 27 April.³⁶ However, commenting on the

³³ This is perhaps wrong because after April one does not come across any paper reports which indicate UML protests. Besides, this claim, as will be seen, does not square with its activities later for it entered into an understanding with Nepali Congress for the smooth holding of local elections.

³⁴ See, Rising Nepal, “Judicial Inquiry” 1992 April 10 In the Parliament Man Mohan Adhikari characterised Government action as the expression of a party intoxicated with power.

³⁵ See, Rising Nepal, “UML Sit-In” 1992 Apr 23; Rising Nepal, “Candle Procession” 1992 April 24 The UML’s protests during these period included sit-ins, candle processions and forming solidarity chains.

³⁶ See, Rising Nepal, “UML and Nepal Bandh” 1992 May 1; Rising Nepal, “Bandh No Significance” 1992 May 2

nonparticipation of UML in the Nepal *bandh* programme NCP (Masal) perceived in it the fruition of Nepali Congress's tactics of "isolating and weakening the UML" (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Prastao Srawan 2049" 466). Thereafter, in the May–June election for the creation of the Local bodies each of the Communist factions fought independently. In their failure to come together there were perhaps some deep seated perception against each other. In case of NCP (Masal) there were its perceptions regarding Unity Centre's character which it expressed in the following terms: "In the present context we also believe that ... there should be a united front ... but considering the past activities of the Ekta Kendra [Unity Centre] which, during *Jana Andolan* period, was opportunistic, dishonest and aimed at engineering splits we do not see any such possibility" (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Pratibedan Aswin 2049" 482). However, in the local election, NCP (Masal), which had boycotted the 1991 General Elections,³⁷ was a participant in the name of its All Nepal Peasants Front (Rising Nepal, "Masal on Elections" 1992 May 21). In taking such stand the Party was strengthening its organisation and practising its tactics of exposing the

³⁷ See, NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Pratibedan Aswin 2049" 475–76 Explaining why it did not take part in the 1991 General Election but in the Local Election the party gives three reasons. First the General Election was held in the context of the 1990 *Jana Andolan* where the main goal was for transferring power to the people by struggling for the creation of the Constituent Assembly. Hence, in that context it was necessary to boycott the Parliamentary election to keep the struggle continuous. Second, there are differences in between the parliamentary elections and local elections. In the former the issues are national, but in the latter the issues are related with the day to day lives of the people. So, politically the local elections are less important. Third, candidates who are elected for the Parliament come in contact with reactionaries of the highest rung and they get more material facilities as a result there is high possibility of them being changed into reactionaries. However candidates winning local elections come in contact only with local people and they do not enjoy material benefit. In the last two elections both these considerations went into our decisions. The first and the third reasoning are straightforward, but the second needs a little explanation. By giving the second reasoning the Party was perhaps trying to say that in the election, which are politically more important its line would have more impact hence it was necessary to boycott the parliamentary elections.

reactionaries³⁸ for its document said:

... On the question of our participation in the local elections in support of the Peasants' Front we have this to say. Despite their [elections] undemocratic and reactionary character, we participated in these elections to promote our politics and improve our organisational strength. We used the elections as instruments to expose the many plots and dictatorial character of the Government. We have achieved a few successes in Pyuthan and in a few villages. However, our successes should not be judged only on the basis of our numerical successes, but on the basis of our achievement in exposing the nature of various reactionary forces (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Prastao Srawan 2049" 469).

However, their performance was not up to their expectations. Even UML could capture only 26.1% of the total seats allocated for the creation of the Village Development Committees and the Municipalities (See, p. 156). Similarly, in the June 1992 election for the creation of District Development Committees its position was below its expectations. Accounting for its capture of "only 18% positions in the D.D.C elections" the UML blamed Congress for its "plots" and observed, "Considering the overall result ... our achievement has considerably dwindled. Besides, their [Congress's] victory in those constituencies where we had won in the last General Election has emboldened them" (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 44, 45). Analysing the causes behind the falling influence of the Communists in the elections, NCP (Masal) condemned the activities of the other Communist factions by pointing out to their nature of functioning which was "only for votes," (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Prastao Srawan 2049" 467) as such, unlike those of Communist parties for it said:

The local elections indicate the plummeting influence of the Communist factions among the people. Such fall is due to the existence of various opportunist Communist factions in the political arena and the non-existence of politics aimed at exposing them. In the country

³⁸ See, NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Prastao Srawan 2049" 467 and. NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Pratibedan Aswin 2049" 471–2 In these documents the party characterises both NCP (UML) and NCP (Unity Centre) as the reactionaries and opportunists who had opened their organisational doors to all elements including revivalist, that is Panchayat members, to tailor their politics to the immediate goal of winning elections.

not only the Soviet revisionist [the NCP (United)], but also the UML and the Unity Centre are posing themselves as Communists ... In the last General Elections people gave votes to the UML considering it as a Communist Party. Hence, the people gained the impression that their activities were the activities of a Communist Party. As such their faith in communism wore away. The same was the impression they gathered regarding the activities of the Unity Centre ... In such condition we have to make effort to expose these forces to raise the faith of the people in communism (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Prastao Srawan 2049" 468).

For the balance of the period, issues of corruption³⁹ and later, Tanakpur once again came to the forefront. On 5 September Communist factions⁴⁰ including UML, NCP (Unity Centre), NCP (Masal), NCP (United) and NCP (NWPP) declared their decision to protest against the Government on the Tanakpur issue. There was, however, a marked change in their tone of protest: their demand was focused more on the appeal that the treaties should be implemented only after their ratification by the Parliament (Rising Nepal, "Leftists Protest" 1992 Sept. 6). On the 9th, they submitted memoranda to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of National Council urging them to bring the matter to the Parliament (Rising Nepal, "Leftists Assail" 1992 Sept. 10). The politics involved in such demand was apparent—Nepali Congress would have certainly failed to ratify the treaties if they were required to pass through the two-third majority of the members of both the Houses. After Supreme Court verdict on the issue (See p. 158), the Communist

³⁹ See, Rising Nepal, "Bhandari Urges" 1992 Aug. 1 On July 31, Madan Bhandari, UML General Secretary thanked Sailja Acharya for her bold step in revealing the corrupt nature of Koirala Government and giving several examples of corruption prevalent in the National Trading Corporation he accused the Government of being soft towards controlling corruption.

⁴⁰ This coming together of the Communist factions is not explainable if one considers their tactical position. Tactically the UML was for strengthening democracy and so was NCP (United). In forcing the Nepali Congress to go through the Parliamentary process it had the advantage to claim that it was trying to strengthen the Constitutional provision and thereby democracy. However, the tactical position of NCP (Unity Centre), NCP (Masal) and NCP (NWPP) was to reveal the weaknesses of Parliamentary system and to destroy it. How could both these tactical position come together at the same time is not understandable.

protests were focussed in demanding the removal of Koirala. On December 16, Communist factions; UML, UPFN, NCP (Masal) and NCP (NWPP), organised protest rallies demanding Koirala's resignation (Rising Nepal, "Left Parties Demonstration" 1992 Dec. 17). Then there was a brief interlude. With the coming of 1993 the UML was engaged in its own affairs. From January 27 to February 2, the Party organised its Fifth National Congress, where it reaffirmed its faith in its leaders: it re-elected Man Mohan Adhikari and Madan Bhandari as the Chairman and the General Secretary of the Party. Explicating its strategy, its document identified the kingdom in "semi-feudal, semi-colonial stage" of historical development, where "the entire working class [was] suffering under the exploitative control of feudal class, tout bureaucratic class and foreign monopolistic capitalism" (NCP (UML), Krantiko Karyakram 1). Hence, it said, "our goal is to end the control of feudalism and imperialism" to move towards "scientific socialism and communism" (1, 4). Then clarifying its immediate goal it said:

But without industrialising the nation ... socialist society cannot be established. Hence, the task, at present is to develop national capital and industries. For this both feudalism and imperialism needs to be destroyed. Hence, at this stage, the important task is to achieve bourgeois democratic revolution ... After that we can move towards socialism" (NCP (UML), Krantiko Karyakram 4).

And explaining what stood in its way to achieving bourgeois democratic revolution the Party implicitly identified the Nepali Congress by presenting it as the representative of feudal and tout bureaucratic capitalist class, which was then in power for it said:

But until today no outside force has been able to exercise its direct control over Nepal ... Hence, the main contradiction which we have to resolve today is internal. It is the contradiction between the people and the State power where the State power is under the control of the feudal and tout bureaucratic capitalist class ... At present, the main contradiction is, therefore, between the people and the Congress Government ... (NCP (UML), Krantiko Karyakram 3).

Then to explain why it called its strategy the strategy of *Bahudaliya Janabad* it argued , unconvincingly though, that such strategy was in the interest of the working class and that it had certain unique features peculiar to the context of Nepal for it said:

Revolutions aimed at ending feudalism and imperialism have been variously called as New Democratic, National Democratic or People's Democratic revolutions. In the context of Nepal we have introduced many political, economic, and foreign policy elements. These are: supremacy of the Constitution, multi-Party competition, open society of multiple groups, administrative arrangement under rule of law, Government of the majority and opposition of the minority [Party in minority], human rights, basic democratic rights and institutionalisation of peace within a Constitution ... Hence, we have defined it as Bahudaliya Janabad. This revolution which will be led by the proletariat will be democratic in the interest of the general masses. It will establish the rule of the people and not of the capitalist class ... This is not the dictatorship of one class ... (NCP (UML), Krantiko Karyakram 5).

Moreover, the document did not clearly identify either its enemies, or its allies except to point out that its enemies were all those who represented the feudal class, tout bureaucratic capitalist class, foreign monopolistic capitalism and imperialism (21). However, its other document passed in the same Congress identified its enemies in the Nepali Congress, National Democratic and Nepal Sadbhavana Party. It identified two of the Communist factions as its allies, but with certain reservations. In Nepali Congress it viewed the representations of “feudal class, tout bureaucratic capitalists” and “middle class tilted towards the right”, who were interested in serving the interest of “International capitalism, especially the multinational companies and Indian monopoly capitalists”. In the then context, it perceived Nepali Congress as “the Constitutionally established exploiter and representative of imperialists within Nepal” (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan: 1993 21). In the National Democratic Party (RPP) it saw the representation of “erstwhile Panchayat activists aligned to the feudal and the tout bureaucratic class aimed at serving the interest of International capitalists” (21–22). The NSP, according to it, represented “rich merchants and peasants serving the interest of the feudal and tout-bureaucratic class” and, in particular, India (22). However, it felt that the NSP as well as the NCP (Unity Centre) and NCP (Masal) could be its allies at least in opposing “the autocratic and authoritarian rule of the Nepali Congress” (22–3). Needless to say that the strategy was not clear. It did not explain why and for what would the proletariat lead in the interest of the general masses? Besides, there existed a clear confusion in the position of the Party, because

at one end it deferred its struggle against imperialism—the main contradiction was not against it—but at the other end it was interested in destroying tout bureaucratic capitalist—element connected with imperialism. As for its tactics, it said that “it was in favour of amassing and increasing its strength to move towards socialism” and this involved “the protection of democracy achieved so far and its strengthening by struggling for more democratic values and garnering masses around revolutionary forces for bringing about fundamental change in the society” (NCP (UML), Karyaniti: 1993 7). In concrete terms this meant that the Party was going to “oppose Congress’s autocratic ... authoritarian regime”, “oppose revivalist forces”, “oppose undemocratic provisions of the Constitution and corruption”, “stand in favour of human rights” (7–8), “oppose all unequal treaties that existed between Nepal and India”, “stand for revolutionary land reform to transfer land to the tillers” (8), “support economic policy which favour[ed] the growth of national capital”, “support an education system that makes [made] youths employable” and “fight for equality among all sections of society divided along linguistic, religious and ethnic lines while opposing the monopoly of one language, religion and ethnic group” (9). And pointing at the then tactical need it says, “For the present the tactics is ... to pressurise the Government for the fulfilment of people’s pressing needs and for it ... one of the important area of struggle is the Parliament. To come out victorious in this field means to win the faith of the people and to form the Government” (10). Hence, the Party says that its tactics is for creating “a progressive Government by winning the elections” (11). The other aspects of its tactics were focused on encouraging Party unity and the formation of united front. However, on the former its stricture was as follows: “Party unity is important ... but for unity we should not collect all those who differ from our ideology, goal and our path” (16). Finally, to clarify the type of united front needed the document emphasised on differentiating the ‘main enemy’ for it said:

United front should be created among all forces, even if those forces represent the enemy class or a section of the enemy and if they can be used against the main enemy. However, under any circumstances or time, mistake should not be committed by aligning with a class or a

section which represents the main enemy identified in a particular moment (20–1).

With the Congress over, from February 11, four Communist factions; NCP (UML), UPFN, NWPP and CPN (Masal) again began their demonstrations. It was organised before Singha Darbar, the Secretariat of the kingdom (Rising Nepal, “Left Demo” 1992 Feb. 12). Within the Parliament, it continued demanding the resignation⁴¹ of Koirala (Rising Nepal, “Opposition Rumpus” 1993 Feb. 15). Acrimonious sessions began when the Government side revealed, in line with the findings of the Baral Committee, that the Interim Government, where UML leader Jhal Nath was also at the ministerial position, was responsible for taking decision on the issue on 15 April 1991 (Rising Nepal, “Poudel Revelation” 1993 Feb 23). From then onward; the opposition, especially the UML, shifted towards questioning the legal basis under which the Government had formed the Baral Committee and divulged to the Committee the Cabinet decisions of the Interim Government (Rising Nepal, “Debate Shifts” 1993 Feb. 26). Khanal declared to resign if his involvement in the decision were proved. However, the Government did not furnish the proofs. Meanwhile, despite having reached a consensus on the process to be adopted in evaluating the impact of Tanakpur, Communist factions continued their protests outside. At times, these protests⁴² took the form of “Torch Light Demonstrations” or

⁴¹ See, NCP (Marxbadi (Marxist)), Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2051 9 In explaining the UML’s preoccupation for the resignation of Koirala, the NCP (Marxist) document points out that this tendency was owing to UML link with a lobby of the Nepali Congress. This observation linked with UML explanation that its no-confidence motion failed because a few Nepali Congress’s MPs did not respond as expected seems to support NCP (Marxist)’s claim and, thereby, the preoccupation of the UML in the resignation of Koirala (for UML explanation on the failure of no-confidence motion see page 469). See also Brown 169 Unable to explain this tactics of the UML, she calls it an “unorthodox tactics”.

⁴² See, Rising Nepal, “Torch Light Demos” 1993 Mar. 14 and Rising Nepal, “Bandh Disrupts Life” 1993 Mar. 15 The Torch demonstration was organised by six Communist factions namely UML, NCP (Masal), UPFN, NWPP, NCP (Mashal) and Communist League. The Bandh was organised by NCP (UML), NCP (Masal), UPFN and NCP (NWPP). One important point to be noted in these combinations is that a

ended in “Valley Bandh” which were punctuated with violence. All along they demanded the resignation of Koirala (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 14 Apr. 1993). Meanwhile, from March 11–15, 1993, NCP (United) held its Unity Congress in Gaur. Though its document of the Congress did not explain why it was Unity Congress, yet in the backdrop of 1992 July and December events along with its characterisation of UML in its document of the Unity Congress it seems that the Congress was called to set its house in order and to protest against the UML’s activities directed against it. In July 1992 the Party, while condemning the undemocratic attitude of UML, had suspended its Central Committee members, who joined NCP (UML) later in December 1992.⁴³The document of the Unity Congress, which was held after the event, characterised the UML as a Party “infested with middle class activists” with “vacillating lumpen political character” (7). Instead of “sincerely working towards the building of a united Communist front” the Party viewed UML as a practitioner of “plots and treacherous moves aimed at fragmenting” the movement while “preaching opposition against Congress’s hegemonic tendencies” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Agami Rajnitik Karya 7–8 and 8).

In the days to come, the continuing Communist protests received added impetus after May 16 when UML General Secretary, Madan Bhandari and its politburo member, Jivraj Ashrit were killed at Das Dhunga when their vehicle moving towards Kathmandu plunged into the Trishuli river. However, the driver of the vehicle Amar Lama escaped the accident with minor injuries (Rising Nepal, “Bhandari, Ashrit Missing” 1993 May 17). Next day, Home Minister, Sher Bahadur Deuba formed “a

few of the factions claiming separate existence were not separate for instance UPFN represented the front organisation of NCP (Mashal) and Communist League. As a result, Communist claims and paper reports often have a tendency to awe an uninitiated readers of the movement by their numerical strength.

⁴³ See, Rising Nepal, “NCP (United) Expels” 1992 July 24 and. Rising Nepal, “Faction Joins UML” 1992 Dec. 7

one-man Inquiry Commission under Supreme Court retired Judge, Prachanda Raj Anil to investigate the accident” (Mishra 275). Little realising how its act would question the legitimacy of the Government’s effort, the NCP (UML) formed its “own team under Khadga Oli” to carry out its investigation. Added to it, on 19 May, “under the initiative of an organisation, which used to publish a monthly newspaper Mulyankan” a third “Public Investigation Committee, to come up with an unprejudiced findings on the accident”, was formed “under Padmaratna Tuladhar ” (Mishra 275–76). Their findings were at variance: Anil Commission reported the negligence of the driver and the other two perceived in the accident well orchestrated plot to kill the leader (Mishra 276–88). The difference in their finding, in an already vitiated environment, added fresh lease to the cycle of protests. Joint Press release of Communist factions; NCP (UML), UPFN, NCP (Masal), NCP (NWPP), Nepal Communist League, NCP (MLM) and NCP (Amatya),⁴⁴ declared “Valley protests in Asad 14 [28 June] and nationwide protests in Asad 15 [29 June]” (NCP (UML), Samyukta Bigyapti 27 June 1993). Subsequent UML’s press release clarified the perception that propelled the movement for it stated, “The seven Left’s struggle launched since Asad 13 [27 June] is on its path to remove the killer Girija Government from power”. Besides, it warned: “if the Government suppresses the planned Asad 19 [3 July] Torch demonstration and Asad 20 [4 July] all Nepal bandh, then today’s all-Party coordination meeting has decided to carry on movement for additional three days” (NCP (UML), “Prajatantrako Rakshaka Lagi” 1 July 1993). The 9th July press release of the UML changed the complexion of the movement. Announcing the Seven Left’s programme of “Chakka Jam [transport strike]” in 19 and 20 July and of all Nepal bandh in 12, 13 and 14 of August, the Party brought forward a host of issues in their list of demands. They demanded “end to congressisation, formation of an Inquiry Commission to investigate

⁴⁴ The manner in which the Communists tried to project in their protests the involvement of numerous faction is clearly indicated by the name of NCP (Amatya) in the list of factions coming together in protest movement. The NCP (Amatya) faction presents an interesting case for the following reasons:

the Das Dhunga incident, resignation of Koirala, end of anti-national attitude of the Government, compensations to those killed in the protests, end to insecurity and an end to inflation” (NCP (UML), “Press Bigyapti” 9 July 1993; Rohit 10). After the August cycle of protests, on 17, the UML entered into a nine-point agreement with the Government and unilaterally⁴⁵suspended all its future protest movements (NCP (UML), Madhav Kumar Nepalko Baktabya 17 Aug. 1993). In the nine-point agreement the UML pressed the Government for the fulfilment of the following demands:

- (1) Formation of a Judicial Inquiry Commission under a serving Supreme Court judge to investigate the Das Dhunga accident....
- (2) Release of all activists taken into police custody during the protest movement....
- (3) Additional Rs. 25, 000/ grant to the family of all those protestors killed in movements launched after restoration of democracy in the kingdom....
- (4) Reforms in educational structure in tune with the democratic change of the kingdom...
- (5) Extension of time for Parliamentary all-Party committee to forge consensus on Tanakpur issue in line with the interest of the nation.
- (6) Constitutional amendment of Treaty Act to be done in the spirit of democracy by placing it in the Lower House.
- (7) Formation of an all-Party Commission to control and monitor price rise.
- (8) Formation of a five-member task force ... to study and recommend the release of political detainee since the Panchayat period.
- (9) Formation of a three member task force ... to study the possibility of reinstating civil servants suspended or fired during the Civil Servants’ agitation (K. C, Nepal Communist Tesro Bhag 256).

However, the outcome of the agreement left one question unanswered. Why did the agreement contain nothing to address the issue of Girija’s resignation? Radha Krishna Mainali, a UML functionary pointed out that “the concerned side”⁴⁶in course of the

⁴⁵ As in earlier press releases, this press release does not bear the signatures of leaders representing the different Communist factions.

⁴⁶ See, *Rising Nepal*, “UML Calls Off” 1993 Aug. 17 The agreement was signed in presence of the High Commands of the two parties. Representing the Nepali Congress were its President, Krishna Prasad Bhattarai and Supreme Leader, Ganesh Man Singh. From the UML side were its General Secretary, Madhav Kumar Nepal and politburo member Bam Dev Gautam. The signatories representing the Nepali Congress were, Tarini Dutta Chataut, Taranath Ranabhatt and Arjun Narsingh K. C. and those from the UML side were Bharat Mohan Adhikari, Pradeep Nepal and Devi

discussion, had “assured” the Party on the issue (Rising Nepal, “Recent Pact” 1993 Aug. 20). Same day, Bharat Mohan Adhikari of the UML, in course of Parliamentary debate, informed the House that Nepali Congress had agreed to change the Prime Minister through its own procedure (Rising Nepal, “Accord Democratic” 1993 Aug. 20). The UML’s document, published after the conclusion of its National Council’s first plenum on VS 2051 Jeth 16 [30 May 1994], tried to explain its position, but the statements carried added implications. They were couched in such a manner as if the Party were suggesting that the list of demands including the demand for Girija’s resignation had emerged from other Communist factions. Besides, the tone of the statements down played the issue of Girija’s resignation for it said:

The formation of Anil Commission, its concocted report ... and the negative attitude of the Government towards only one of our demands for the formation of an impartial Commission under a serving judge of the Supreme Court actuated the movement. The Government repression fuelled it to develop into a nationwide seven Left parties movement, which demanded the resignation of Girija and the fulfilment of a list of other demands of the public. After the pressure of the public, there was a nine-point agreement with the Government. On the issue of Girija’s resignation there was an oral understanding (NCP (UML), Bartaman Paristhiti: 1994 22).

The statements which followed the explanations still seemed to suggest that the Party perceived in the agreement sufficient reason to believe that the Congress had atoned for its action and that others were responsible for keeping the movement alive. In its tone, there was an element of condemnation against other factions’ decision for it said:

The Government agreed to rectify its past mistakes in writing. This had never happened before. There was a need for understanding its importance and press the Government with another movement for the implementation of the agreement, but for the ultra left tendencies of the NCP (Unity Centre), and their anti-UML attitude other Communist factions continued with their movement (NCP (UML), Bartaman Paristhiti: 1994 22).

Prasad Ojha. Communist claims of concerned side naturally pointed towards Krishna Prasad Bhattarai and Ganesh Man Singh.

However, Unity Centre alone was not the faction which was against the agreement. There were also others: NCP (NWPP) MPs, Narayan Man Bijukche, speaking in the Fifth session (27 June–16 September 1993) of the Parliament objected against the agreement.⁴⁷ His statements reflected that the NWPP had many reasons to oppose the agreement. First, he perceived in the agreement a compromise between two parties, which represented similar class base and that it was hammered out to maintain their bi-party domination for he said:

I am not surprised about the agreement because every political Party is based upon a political principle—upon a class base. I have repeatedly told in this House that in this country the dictatorship of two Party is on the rise and that democracy is the victim. Today it has become clear and I feel what I had spoken was correct. As far as the agreement is concerned, it was in this very House where the slogan ‘anti-national Girija, give resignation’ was raised several times. How was the agreement signed without the resignation of ‘anti-national Girija? There is another thing, in this very House they had repeatedly raised the slogan ‘until our demands are fulfilled and until Girija resigns we will not enter into an agreement’. This agreement therefore smacks either of left opportunism, or of left ‘surrenderism’ and of nothing else (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: 1993–94 2).

Second, in the agreement he pointed out two flaws, which he considered were not conducive to the “spirit of democracy”—the usual UML pretext for leading movements and for terminating them.⁴⁸ He said, the agreement “by remaining silent on the issue of future security of opposition members had gone against the very democratic spirit which had propelled the movement”, and it had failed in “detering the Government from repressing future democratic movements” by limiting the agreement in just “raising compensation without asking for a Commission to inquire into why and who were responsible for suppressing the movements” (2, 3). Finally,

⁴⁷ The tactics of the UML seemed to suggest that it was still trying to forge an understanding with the Nepali Congress and this time the response of the Congress for the first time was positive, perhaps because it was besieged by the protest movement.

⁴⁸ See, *Rising Nepal*, “Recent Pact” 1993 Aug. 20 The UML was arguing that it had suspended the protests for strengthening multi-party democracy. This was the natural outcome of their tactics of the period.

clarifying how other factions viewed the agreement he said, “even at the time of reaching the agreement Sambhuran Shrestha of NCP Communist League had sensed ‘betrayal’ in the process” (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: 1993–94 3). Thus, the 17 August agreement, except for reducing the frequency of protests, failed in freeing the kingdom from protests. On 20 August, a procession organised by four Communist factions; UPFN, NCP (Masal), NCP (MLM) and NCP (NWPP) denounced the agreement (Rising Nepal, “Procession” 1993 Aug. 21). Meanwhile, on the ground there were nothing to suggest Government’s initiative in implementing the understanding reached on the 17th. With the approach of September, the parties were engaged in fixing their candidates for the upcoming 7th February parliamentary by-elections in constituencies 1 of Jhapa and Kathmandu, which had, after the death of Madan Bhandari, been lying vacant. The Ninth Plenary meeting of the UML, held in between 22–27 September, decided to field Mrs Vidya Bhandari, the widow of Madan Bhandari, as its candidate in the Kathmandu constituency (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 1993 Sept. 27). Running parallel to these events, the document representing a section of leaders identified as representatives of “*Bhinnamat*” or “alternative-view” existing within NCP (Unity Centre) reports of changes, which had set in the perception of the Central Committee of the NCP (Unity Centre) from the time of the local election. It says, “While carrying campaigns in the local election the Central Committee began supporting views which considered such participation [participation in elections] as futile merry go round exercises that yielded nothing” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Antarparty Sangharsa” 30). Following such change, their other document notes, “The Central Committee, during the by-election for the Jhapa and Kathmandu No 1 constituency, forcibly tried to change Party’s earlier decision to participate in the election” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Sadasyaharulai Appeal” 9). The change was reflected in the statements of Baburam Bhattarai, the convenor of the UPFN, when on 25 January he declared the front’s decision to boycott the elections (Rising Nepal, “UPF Firm” 1993 Jan. 26). According to UML’s document, Baburam took such decision by saying that “elections were only in the

service of the Palace” (NCP (UML), Bartaman Paristhiti: 1994 19) meaning the feudal forces. However, other factions did participate in the elections, but on the 9th when the results were declared, Vidya Bhandari defeated Krishna Prasad Bhattarai by polling 43, 319 votes against 41, 490 votes. Congress candidate Sitaula won the Jhapa seat by defeating Lila Udai Khanal of the UML. And in both the constituencies the united⁴⁹NDP came third (Rising Nepal, “Victory for Bhandari” 1994 Feb. 10). Then on the 20th of February 1994, the UML and the UPFN in unison, quoting Art. 59 (2) of the Constitution, registered their submission to the Speaker of the House expressing “no confidence in the 33 month-old Girija Government”. Citing reasons for loss of confidence in Koirala Government, the parties highlighted its failures in respecting “the spirit of the Constitution, the interest of the nation and human rights”. They said, the Government “encouraged corruption and nepotism in the name of privatisation” (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 20 Feb. 1994). Implied in Bijukche’s statements made in the course of the Special Session of the Parliament, which was held in between 24 February to 7 March for tabling the no-confidence motion, there were his objections and warning against UML’s tactical position. The statements implied that the UML’s tactics was occasioned by the breach in the Nepali Congress’s organisation, and that it was meant for searching a Parliamentary alternative to Koirala Government. Besides, it warned that such tactics may end in uniting the Congress for he said:

We have some reservations against the UML ... It did not bring the no-confidence motion in the past when we had asked ... why is it using this tactics today which it did not use yesterday? ... Even today, I consider Congress’s internal wrangle a temporary phenomenon and if this no-confidence motion serves to patch their internal problems then it will be unfortunate. Besides, if this no-confidence motion is passed without considering the nature and policies of the alternative Government ... then the nation will plunge into a state of confusion (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), “Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: 1993–94” 16–7).

However, if the two month later document of the UML is considered then it appears

⁴⁹ See, Rising Nepal, “NDP Party Unification” 1992 Feb. 5 The Thapa faction and Chand factions came together on 4 February 1992.

that its tactics then was not confined only to seeking Parliamentary alternative. In the event of the fall of Koirala Government, it seems, the Party was also in favour of mid-term poll for its document said, “considering the unpopularity, inefficiency and failures of the Congress it has no chance of winning mid-term poll, this assessment applies even to the condition of the NDP. Hence, in totality the Communists will win and our Party is poised to capture power” (NCP (UML), Bartaman Paristhiti: 1994 43–4). The question is: was the kingdom ready to lug the economic burden of such outcome? Perhaps, these parties never seriously considered the variable while framing their tactics. Hence, in the name of considering “public wave against the Nepali Congress’s rule” Narayan Man also said he was “in for the no-confidence motion”. He joined the chorus that condemned the Congress for its failure. Speaking in the no-confidence motion, he characterised the Congress as a Party of “the feudal and the tout bourgeois class” and condemned it for keeping “intact the distinction between ‘national’ and ‘non-national’⁵⁰Party in the Constitution” (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), “Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: 1993–94” 14, 14–15, 15). In his reiteration of UML’s version he added a few more issues to substantiate his statements. He objected against Nepali Congress’s policies on “Tanakpur, the retrenchment of employees ... electric supply, which was irregular, dual land ownership, which was persisting ... privatisation, and price control” (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), “Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: 1993–94” 16). On 28 February, in line with Bijukche’s prognosis, the Congress group in the Parliament decided to face the motion united (Rising Nepal, “NC Parliamentary Party” 1994 Feb. 29). In the March 7 voting, the motion was defeated by a majority of 113 against 81. There was no cross-voting from the Congress side and the Communist factions also rallied together. Their votes breakdown were: UML, 69; UPFN, 9 and NCP (United)

⁵⁰ The reference was to the 3% of the total votes which a party had to secure in the General Election failing which it was disqualified from being a national party in subsequent elections.

and NCP (NWPP) contributed two each to the pool as independents. Both Sadbhavana Party and the NDP abstained (Rising Nepal, “Victory for All” 1994 Mar. 8). The Government survived. In its explanation of the outcome, the UML document clearly indicated that it had, in its decision to table the no-confidence motion, relied on the support of other MPs besides those from the Nepali Congress and when it did not come the motion failed for it said:

The Special Session of the Parliament ... discussed threadbare the functioning of the 34 month-old Girija Government. It made public its inefficiency, inertia and failures. We asked for the resignation of Koirala for his failures in protecting the cause of nationalism, democracy and people’s interest, but for the opportunistic, pro-power MPs of NDP, NSP and a few MPs of Nepali Congress the exercise ended dramatically ... (NCP (UML), Bartaman Paristhiti: 1994 29).

After the end of the no-confidence motion, April witnessed breakdown in the Central Committee of NCP (Unity Centre). A pamphlet titled “Rastriya Sammelan Ayojak Samitiko Ahawan” declared:

The Central Committee formed by the Unity Congress has been dissolved. There were 23 members in the Committee. Out of them 11 were removed when disciplinary actions were taken against them. Then Com. Mitra resigned on the ground that he too represented the ‘*Bhinnamat*’. His resignation came on 2050/12/24 [6 April 1994]. As such there is no majority of members elected by the Unity Congress in the Central Committee. Hence, as per the tradition of International Communist practices the Central Committee of the Unity Centre stands dissolved ... In such situation the responsibility of leading the Party has fallen on ... the shoulder of the “*Bhinnamat*” ... (Rastriya Sammelan Ayojak samiti NCP (Ekta Kendra) 47).

Thus, NCP (Unity Centre) split on 6 April 1994. Explaining why the split occurred, the document of the *Bhinnamat* points out that “since the Unity Congress of the Party a section of the leadership had indulged in plots and had forced their views as the majority view” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Sadasyaharulai Appeal” 5) and, after that, they had progressively gone against the “principle of democratic centralism ... and the decision of Unity Congress to tolerate alternative opinions” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Sadasyaharulai Appeal” 4). Besides, they claimed that the leadership forced their members into the Central Committee whenever such opportunities came (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Antarparty Sangharsa” 32). The other factor which they identify as the

cause behind the split is the role played by the RIM. They claim that the RIM had tried to split the Party even in the past by pointing out that “NCP (Fourth Congress) is a rightist and there should be no unity with it” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Sadasyaharulai Appeal” 7). As for the opinion where the *Bhinnamat* differed from those of the majority view they claimed that they were against the majority view, which was “mechanically following the prescriptions of RIM to launch unconditional struggle” besides pointing out that they were “in favour of considering RIM simply as a supervising centre and not as a directing centre” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Sadasyaharulai Appeal” 7). The other area where the *Bhinnamat* was opposed to the majority view was regarding the question of launching guerrilla war. If the majority view was for “the immediate launching of class struggle in the rural areas, which meant the start of guerrilla war” the *Bhinnamat* was against such tactics for it wanted “preparation before the start of such struggle” (NCP (Ekta Kendra), “Antarparty Sangharsa” 31). Explaining where the two groups concurred and where they differed on the question of armed struggle the faction charged the majority leadership for following a mechanistic outlook, which is divorced from objective conditions or reality for its document states:

In the present stage the main contradiction is between Nepal, Nepali people combine against imperialism especially Indian expansionism and reactionary State within. There is no difference in the general political line that for the resolution of the main contradiction a strategy based on agricultural revolution under proletariat leadership which ropes in all democratic and patriotic forces should be launched to destroy the State of the feudal, the touts and the tout-capitalist class to establish New Democratic Republic through armed struggle. But, there are differences on the question regarding the forms in which ... armed struggle and military line (which is an important element of the general political line) should be implemented in the immediate context. These differences are important because they influence the methods to be used for achieving the political goals....

Mechanistic thinking ... rejects objective analysis. Divorced from the consciousness of the masses and the objective conditions, the leadership of the *Bahumat* group [majority view], which still harbours the tendencies of earlier Mashal, imposes slogans and programmes which are ultra-leftists. It thinks that the stage for immediate armed struggle is ripe. It talks about launching a protracted armed revolution based on the strategy of encircling towns by villages, forming base areas and of capturing power at the local level. On this basis it has disregarded the decisions of Party unity committee. Encouraged by

mechanistic thinking ... it disregards the fact that people are the architect of history. Therefore, thinking that revolution can be shouldered by a few brave souls expressions about making 'team actions' as the main instrument is often heard ... It holds the mechanistic view and reiterates the view that unconstitutional forms [of struggle] are always the main and constitutional forms [of struggle] are unimportant. Whereas all forms of struggle are aimed at readying for the unconstitutional form of struggle. Hence, the leadership of the majority on the one hand neglects the objective conditions while framing the programmes of struggle and takes recourse to ultra-leftist opportunistic politics and on the other hand it does not sincerely implement the decided programmes. Hence, its only characteristics is its 'expression of revolutionary vocabulary' (NCP (Ekta Kendra), "Sadasyaharulai Appeal" 16–7).

Supporting one of their claims about the causes behind the split the Sixth Congress document of NCP (Masal) noted:

In the process of unity of the Party the main role was played by the 'centrist' forces. In their effort there was no sincerity. In their process of unity they did not allow with sincerity others to express their dissenting views. Even after their unity the trend continued ... Even after their fifth Congress they removed from their Central Committee all members, who were opposed to their line ... Because of such attitude of the 'centrist' forces the Party could never come up as a single group and its constituents functioned independently ... (NCP (Masal), "Rajnitik Pratibedan 2051" 517).

Later, document of NCP (Maoist) points out that the Unity Centre split in May 1994 and it identifies the reason for the split in Party's "two line struggle" where the "political line of protracted people's war" was victorious and the "right liquidationist clique ... was ... defeated and expelled from the Party" (Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) 8). According to Surendra K. C, Prachanda is said to have stated in 2006 that the leaders who were expelled in May were "Nirmal Lama and Ruplal Biswakarma" (290). The split was also reflected in the activities of the UPFN. On April 10, in a press conference, UPFN convenor⁵¹Baburam Bhattarai, following the tactics of the Party to expose the Government and perhaps to impress the rebel leaders within, announced his six-point demands. He made it clear that the UPFN was opposed to the

⁵¹ Whelpton calls him as the coordinator, but throughout the paper reports he is identified as the convenor of the Front.

Tanakpur Treaty, the work permit,⁵² Indianisation of the economy in the name of privatisation, which he said posed a threat to Nepalese nationalism. Besides, he asked for a thorough investigation into the Baneshwor incident, end to administrative terrorism, price rise and communal discrimination. He pointed that the Party would launch Nepal *bandh* if the demands were not fulfilled as if they could be fulfilled within so short notice (Rising Nepal, “SJM Demand” 1994 Apr. 11). As promised, the *bandh* was launched on the 4th of May where the protestors were reported to have protested against Indian expansionism and raised slogans in support of Nepalese nationalism (Rising Nepal, “Bandh Peaceful” 1994 May 5). Then on May 22, under the leadership of Niranjana Govind Vaidya, a group of Communists namely, Chandeshwor Prasad Shrestha, Krishna Das Shrestha, Nand Kumar Prasain, Sita Ram Tamang,⁵³ and Jagdish Chandra Bhandari, rejected Baburam Bhattarai’s leadership within the UPFN. They claimed that he was imposing NCP (Unity Centre)’s decisions upon smaller factions of the Centre, practising one-man rule and ‘group-ism’ and sacking founder members from the Central Committee of the Unity Centre. They declared a new convenor of the UPFN—Niranjana Govind Vaidya (Rising Nepal, “Bhattarai Ousted” 1994 May 23). Later, in a press conference held on the 30th of June, Baburam Bhattarai, while castigating Vaidya group, informed the press that the UPFN was divided and 5 of its MPs had already joined a new Party and a front with the same name. He blamed the split as the handiwork of external and internal reactionaries, who wanted to weaken the nationalist movement which his Party had

⁵² See, Sharma 165 The Supreme Court in September 1993 had already passed a judgement annulling Section 4 (1) of 1992 Labour Act making it mandatory for foreign nationals to seek Labour Department’s approval before entering the job market. He was probably asking for the implementation of the judgment.

⁵³ Three of these names Krishna Das Shrestha, Nand Kumar Prasain and Sita Ram Tamang are the leaders of NCP (MLM). This means they also were a part of the group claiming to represent the *Bhinnamat*. Besides, UML document, NCP (UML), Bartaman Paristhiti: 1994 17 indicates that they were with Nirmal Lama, the leader of NCP (Fourth Congress [Nirmal Lama faction]).

been successfully waging (Rising Nepal, “Baburam Blasts” 1994 June 31). On July 2, UPFN under Niranjana Govind Vaidya claimed that five MPs; Lila Mani Pokhrel, Amik Sherchan, Bishnu Bahadur Tamang, Kamal Prasad Chaulagain and Kaman Singh Lama were still with his group. He invited Baburam to his faction’s first National Conference scheduled on 14 July to explain his position (Rising Nepal, “SJM War” 1994 July 3). And if one goes by Whelpton’s statement, then majority of UPFN members went to Vaidya faction leaving Baburam faction with only “three MPs from Rolpa and Rukum” (204). Meanwhile, the two factions of the UPFN under Baburam and Vaidya were pleading each others’ case in the Election Commission claiming their constitutional status. On August 15, the Commission, on the basis of the documents supplied by the factions, recognised Vaidya faction as the officially recognised UPFN (Rising Nepal, “SJM (Vaidya) Official” 1994 Aug. 19). The decision formalised the split in the front organisation of the Unity Centre. Thus, before the November 1994 election the NCP (Unity Centre) and the united UPFN had given way to the creation of NCP (Unity Centre) under Nirmal Lama and NCP (Unity Centre) under Prachanda along with two UPFN s.

After the fall of the Koirala Government in July 10, 1994, the UML read in the fall “the victory of the people over a force that was treading a path which was against democracy” and asked the King not to dissolve the Parliament, but to allow it to explore the possibility of forming a Government (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 1994 July 11). However, its subsequent press release of VS 2051 Asad 28 (12 July 1994) described the dissolution of the House unconstitutional, since it was based on the advice of a person who had “changed into an ordinary member of the House” after the defeat of his policies in the Parliament. It viewed in the King’s act “an attack upon the sovereignty of Parliament”, because his decision had deprived the sovereign Parliament the chance “to resolve the crisis on its own”. It demanded the formation of an all-Party Government and the immediate removal of Koirala led Council of Ministers (NCP (UML), Samachar Bulletin (Prakashnartha Presit) 1994 July 12). On 15 July, Communist factions; the UML, NCP (United), NCP (Masal) and NCP

(Communist League) came together to condemn the decisions of the King as unconstitutional—“a ploy of International reactionaries” and warned him of fresh cycle of protests (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 1994 July 15). When he stuck to his decisions, the kingdom was again sieged under fresh cycle of protests until the approach of November election.

1.7. 13 November 1994 Election: UML in Power

Communist factions participating 1994 election could be categorised, as in 1991, into three broad groups. NCP (UML), NCP (United) and NCP (Marxist) fell into the category, which accepted the 1991 Constitution and the democratic arrangement as a springboard towards socialism. NCP (NWPP) and NCP (Masal) participated the election with a view to expose the deficiencies of bourgeois democracy and to educate people about the need for New Democratic revolution. However, for lack of evidence the position of Niranjana Govind Vaidya led UPFN, the front organisation of Nirmal Lama led NCP (Unity Centre), cannot be ascertained. There was a third group, Prachanda led NCP (Unity Centre), which boycotted the election. On the basis of their main slogan NCP (UML) and NCP (United) were nearer to each other. If the former called the people to “Defeat Totalitarian Nepali Congress!” (NCP (UML), Election Manifesto ‘94 1), the latter gave the call to “Dislodge Congress [and] stop revivalist from raising their heads” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Chunao Ghoshnapatra 2051 2). The NCP (Marxist), however; did not have a slogan that reflected their focus. Declaring “Multi-party Democracy ... has enthused ... in us to remain active for nationalism and democracy” (1), NCP (UML) manifesto vowed to protect and consolidate the system by opposing “one-Party dictatorship and authoritarian tendency” and by protecting “fundamental rights”, “pluralistic open society” autonomy of “public institutions and media”, “decentralization of power ... to village, municipal and district development committees”, changing laws to make “the Election Commission free and powerful” and “opposition” honoured (14–5). On foreign policy, its stand was in favour of maintaining friendly relations with all on the basis of “Panchasheela” while working for the review of all “unequal and derogatory

treaties ... signed by the Nepali Congress, Panchayat and earlier Governments ... [on the basis of] equality, mutual respect and benefit (16). On the economic front it proposed “Tenancy rights [to] real tillers of land” (17), “planned development” (22), “Effective policy ... to end the adverse effect of monopoly of the foreign capital on national economy” (25), “trade diversification” and review of Indo-Nepal “Trade and Transit Treaty ... on the basis of ... mutual benefit” (27). On the issue of developing water resources it proposed a clear definition on “the status and rights of border rivers and national rivers of Nepal” (42). Besides, it proposed punishment to those reported against in the “Mallik Commission report”, end of “discrimination [based on] ethnicities, languages, religions and cultures ... through the enactment of appropriate laws”, “property rights to women”, change in “labour Acts” etcetera (47, 49, 51, 52). To end “social inequality it promised rapid economic development under a planned economy” (22) and the granting of “autonomy” to “the local development organs” (NCP (UML), Election Manifesto ‘94 49). Blaming Nepali Congress for “bartering Nepalese sovereignty with India and for converting Nepalese economy into a haven for Indian capital and market at the cost of Nepalese national capital”, NCP (United) manifesto drew attention towards “the growing link between NDP (RPP) and Girija”, which according to them was “reflected in the exposure given to the NDP in the media” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Chunao Ghoshnapatra 2051 3). In the economic front, it proposed “a mixed economy for industrial development” where “the participation of national capital and foreign capital was to be encouraged” (7). On foreign policy, it proposed “modernisation of 1950 treaty” and “development of water resources on the basis of mutual benefit between India and Nepal” (6). On the changes to be sought in the Constitution, it proposed “the King to be brought within the ambit of Art. 35 (2) to force him appoint ambassadors, members of Rajparishad and National Council on the basis of the recommendations of the Council of Ministers”, and it advocated “citizenship on the basis of 2036 [1980] referendum list” (4). For developing the language, culture ... and literature of *janajatis*” it proposed the “establishment of Museums and National Foundations” along with “Radio, T. V

broadcast in their languages” (5). It promised to raise “their representation in bureaucracy by 50% in the next ten years” and to “reorganise districts along linguistic line” (6). Likewise, with their faith in the 1991 Constitution, which had transferred “sovereignty in the hands of the people”, NCP (Marxist) fought the election with a five-point agenda. Among them the important ones were “(1) Protection and permanence of democracy. (2) Development of national economy ... (4) Protection of *janajatis* ... downtrodden and women and (5) nationalism ...” (NCP (Marxist)), Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2051 3). For protecting democracy its programme suggested “implementation of Mallik Commission’s Report”, “removal of undemocratic Constitutional provisions”, “power decentralisation at the local level”, “distribution of citizenship without prejudice”, “framing laws which protected people from being jailed on false charges” and “leading politics towards the end of feudalism and imperialism” (10–1). For development of economy, it stood in favour of “revolutionary land reform” “corruption free economy ... where in the name of ‘privatisation’ and ‘open market’ the kingdom was not turned into a haven for foreign capital and imperialist exploitation” (12–3). For women it sought “property rights” and for the development of *janajatis*, “the protection of their languages, cultures ... employment opportunities on priority basis” (17). Finally, for the protection of nationalism it proposed the “annulment of all treaties which were detrimental to the sovereignty ... and nationalism of Nepal” (19). However, NCP (NWPP) manifesto observed: “Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party does not believe that socialism can be reached through bourgeois democracy ... so the election should not be used simply to reach the seat of power, but to educate the masses about the deficiencies of bourgeois democracy” (NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party), Nirvachan Ghoshna-Patra 2051 6). Its programmes were focused on the resolutions of the problems of “land reform”, “*Sukumbasis*”, “development of tourism ... as a sector for earning foreign exchange”, “trading practices ... which were tilted more towards India”, “economic policies” which were focused on “privatising every sector at the cost of social welfare” and which did not give importance to “mixed economy”, “uneven development of the

regions ... lack of transport facilities in North, which impeded their development”, preferential treatment of “one religion”, “nepotism ... corruption and dominance of one caste group in administration” (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12). On the sensitive issue like development of water resources it said, “In projects like Koshi and Gandaki we do not want Nepal and Nepalese people to be cheated again, this is how we differ from the UML and Nepali Congress in our stand on Mahakali water, electricity and sovereignty” (15). On Nepal’s foreign policy it proposed a change, which, it said, was to be aimed at protecting Nepal’s “independence and sovereignty” while freeing her from threats of “economic blockade”. And on citizenship issue, it wanted the process to be made simple so that “people of Terai” could easily get it (16). However, commenting on the failures of Nepali Congress it said, “On Tanakpur issue ... and on issues of foreign policy Nepali Congress turned into a follower of imperialist. The Government failed in replacing feudal nationalism with nationalism in the interest of all. It failed in its most important duty of protecting country’s sovereignty and by allowing free entry to foreign monopoly capitalists ... it hit hard on national capital” (1). NCP (Masal)⁵⁴ participated the election with similar intent for it document said, “Though our Party knew that within a reactionary system elections are always ... undemocratic, yet we took part in the elections to use it as a medium of struggle and to expose its undemocratic ... and anti-people nature”, while “educating people that their problems can be resolved only through armed struggle and New Democratic revolution” (NCP (Masal), “Madhyawadi ... Prastao” 598, 596). Its main plank was to frustrate “Girija Government’s effort to establish a Fascist rule” (NCP (Masal), “Tatkalik Rajnaitik Marg 13” 600). And the issues which it brought forward were, “transfer of power to the people, creation of Constituent Assembly” and issues of “nationalism and day to day problems of the people” (NCP (Masal), “Madhyawadi ...

⁵⁴ See, NCP (Masal), “Madhyawadi ... Prastao” 598 The party participated the election as A.N.R.J.M that is Akhil Nepal Rastriya Jana Morcha (All Nepal National People Front).

Prastao” 598). However, in the final results the Communist factions, which survived the poll were only the UML and the NCP (NWPP). The UPFN drew blank and its vote share in comparison to its share in 1991 was considerably reduced: from 3, 51, 904 it came down to 1, 00, 285. It seems that it was because of their fragmentation. The pattern of the UML’s win tapered towards the West, but in comparison to the pattern of 1991 there was a change: it did not draw blank in the Far-Western region. Its win of seats in the Eastern Region was 26; in Central Region, 28; in Western Region, 8; Mid-Western Region, 6 and in the Far-West, 11. NCP (NWPP) won two seats in Bhaktapur and 1 each in Dailekh and Jumla (both in the Mid-West) contradicting poll analysis, which tended to attribute Communist win in areas with nationalities in the majority. Moreover, the UML’s inroads in the Far-West, where in 1991 it had drawn blank, seemed to suggest that issues of nationalism had helped them in reaping poll benefits for Tanakpur lies in the Western border of Nepal. Commenting on its win of all seats in the Valley the UML press release of 20 November 1994 congratulated the Valley electorate for “playing their role as sentients of nationalism and democracy” (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 20 Nov. 1994). Its later document described its win as the result of “peoples’ faith”, which the Party had gained out of its “continuous fight for national independence, sovereignty, people’s rights ... nationalism and democracy” (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan 2052 [October 1996] 2). However, to explain the loss of the UPFN, NCP (Masal) said: “In many areas the ‘boycottist’ helped the reactionaries ... they opposed NCP (Masal) and *Samyukta Janamorcha* [UPFN] (Vaidya faction) and asked people to vote either the UML, Congress or the Rastriya Prajatantra Party [NDP]” (NCP (Masal), “Tatkalik Rajnaitik Marg 13” 601).

Then on the 30th of November, the UML, against all odds, formed its minority Government. And since its strategy of *Bahudaliya Janabad* acknowledged the virtues of competitive market economy one could hardly expect radical changes in its economic policies. Besides, after coming to power its tactics was to stay in power for its document said, “Since the 18th Central Committee meeting of our Party had hailed

our forming of the Government as a historic achievement there was no doubt that we were to leave no stone unturned to remain in power” (NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan, 2052 [February 1996] 23). Thus, its December 23rd policy statements were tailored to achieve both its strategic and tactical goals. It declared its commitment towards open economy and privatisation while promoting the atmosphere of national consensus. However, while continuing privatisation drive, it promised to transfer public undertakings to “national investors”, but in the development of power sector it announced that it would seek the support of both national and foreign investors. In the agricultural sector it proposed speedy collection of data and the establishment of a High-Level Commission to solve the problems of land reform, bonded labourers and landless agricultural workers. In tune with its focus on sectors, which had the potential of delivering “immediate results”, it announced its programme of “Build Your Village Yourself” with claims to ensure “direct implementation of programmes through effective mobilisation of local resources”. In order to resolve the problems of human rights and citizenship it announced that it would form a High-Level Human Rights Commission and a Citizenship Commission (Rising Nepal, “HM Addresses” 1994 Dec. 24). Among these, the High Level Land Reform Commission “to end dual landownership” was immediately established in 2051/9/26 [10 January 1995] under the chairmanship of Keshav Badal, a UML MP (HMG Acknowledgement). And by January 24, 1995 a Commission to resolve the problems of the *Sukumbasis* (landless squatters) began functioning in 21 Terai districts, the areas where the problem was acute (Rising Nepal, “MPs ... Squatters” 1994 Jan. 26). According to Jan Sharma, the Commission’s “target was to grant by 16 July 1995 land ownership rights to 1, 00, 000 landless ... [settlers]” (254). Considering the tactical stand of the Party, these commission approach to resolving problems could be explained as ploys to buy votes, but there were exceptions. In case of the establishment of High Level Land Reform Commission, the Party could not be negatively indicted, because so far the Congress had done nothing in this direction. However, the practitioners of exposure politics like NCP (Unity Centre)’s leader Prakash (Narayan Kazi Shrestha) viewed in the UML’s

move “its prisoning itself within the limitation of the Constitution”. He said, “In power, the UML should have sought to amend the Constitution if the Constitution were a hurdle in the implementation of revolutionary land reforms ... but it did not do so instead it tried to implement land reforms within the limitation of the Constitution” (Prakash 48). In making such comments, it seemed, Prakash was not aware of the fact that the strategy of the UML was for strengthening democracy and not in weakening it by exposing it. However, its budget allocations for opening the income earning opportunities of native communities like Raute, Dom, Chepang etc, allocation for the students of backward communities, for the disabled, for elderly pension schemes seemed to reflect its genuine tilt towards the welfare of the public. But, the same could not be judged in the allocation of Rs. 2, 651 million for the launching of its “Let’s Build Your Village Yourself [LBOVO]” programme (Rising Nepal, “Govt. Budget” 1994 Dec. 27). In the Parliament, the opposition MPs vehemently opposed the programme. They questioned why was it necessary when the Village Development Committees were already in existence (Rising Nepal, “Paper Like ... Previous” 1994 Dec. 26) ? Under the programme each VDC received Rs. 300, 000 as grants for development works. Jan Sharma categorises it among the Party’s “populist” programmes, aimed at mobilising “local cadres” (250, 251). Similar was its other programme—the *Nau Sa* programme.⁵⁵ On it the Party allocated Rs. 2 million each to the 205 electoral constituencies. Commenting on the nature of these programmes, NCP (United) said that they “lacked direction in their implementation and they had nothing in them to raise the standard of living of the poor villagers. They were floated

⁵⁵ See, NCP (UML), Rajnitik Pratibedan 2052 [October 1996] 7 The document claims that the programme was launched to hasten balanced development in the village. It included nine development objectives in each constituencies. They were implemented to provide concrete facilities to the rural communities. These objectives were the development of Siksha (education), Sadak (road), Sinchai (irrigation), Swacha Khaney Pani (clean drinking water), Shipmulak Talim Ra Rojgar (employable skill development), Samudayik briksha ropan (community afforestation), Sana Jalabidhyut (minor hydro-projects) and Sana tatha Gharaylu Udhyog (Small cottage industries).

just for garnering votes in another mid-term poll” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnitik Report: 2052 [1995] 1). In their assessment, the UML was “squandering national exchequer” through the programmes and its tactics was aimed “not in hastening class struggle, but in trying to delude the masses” (1, 2). Coming from a Party which had by now tailored its strategy to that of the UML, the criticism appeared a bit offhand. However, given the dominance of the Congress in the VDCs and the importance,⁵⁶ which the Party gave in the implementation of the programmes, especially the LBOVO, it was clear that beyond their pious intent to develop the nation through the development of villages lay their plan to whittle Congress’s rural support base.

On 23rd December, the Das Dhunga Accident Judicial Investigation Commission submitted its report. The report rejected planned conspiracy in the death of UML’s two leaders putting to rest the controversy, which the UML, in the past, had used to implement its tactics (Rising Nepal, “Das Dhunga” 1994 Dec. 24). Finally, when the controversy on Mallik Commission again came up for discussion in the Parliament the Party could do nothing except to eat opposition MPs’s challenge. It did not oppose them when they questioned if it had guts to punish those identified by the report (Rising Nepal, “MPs Squabble” 1994 Dec. 25). Meanwhile, the UPFN (Vaidya faction) submitted its memorandum of 33 demands. Leading those demands were demands for the abrogation of all unequal Indo-Nepal treaties, closure of Gorkha recruitment centres, re-working of Tanakpur Treaty, regularisation of Indo-Nepal border and a Commission to investigate Baneshwor incident etc. (Rising Nepal, “Janamorcha ... Demands” 1995 Jan. 27). However, the memorandum carried no threats of protests. Contrary to such demands, the 3rd National Council meeting of

⁵⁶ See, Rising Nepal, “LBOVO Review” 1995 May 26; Rising Nepal, “116 VDCs Complete LBOVO” 1995 June 28 Of the various programmes launched this programme was propagandised as the one necessary for the development of the villages and through it the kingdom and it was the only programme which the Government was monitoring closely.

NCP (Marxist) urged the Government to develop better ties with India in the interest of mutual benefits (Rising Nepal, “Develop Ties ... India” 1995 Jan. 3). On the 6th of February, M. K. Nepal, the Deputy Prime Minister left for India with two aims: to review the friendship ties between the two countries and to consolidate them. Before leaving he clarified that both the countries should not feel cheated out of the ties (Rising Nepal, “DPM Engaged ... New Delhi” 1995 Feb. 7). Later document of the CPN (Unity Centre (Nirmal Lama faction)) considered the UML’s review proposal a “positive” move “only in the sense that it [was] for the first time that a formal proposal [had] been put forth at the governmental level”. However, in its later document it said, “The Party statement on this matter was made clear. Because of the ... special relation and expansionist hegemony, not friendship and equality, are the foundation-stone of the treaty, [hence] revision is not sufficient—the treaty must be completely revoked” (NCP (Unity Centre), *All Patriots* 7). Describing what transpired in the talk between Nepal and Rao, the then Indian Prime Minister, Jan Sharma presents a very negative picture for he writes:

After two rounds of discussions, Rao told Nepal: (a) It was not possible to amend the 1950 Treaty but it could be replaced by a new one; (b) reciprocity does not mean equality in the relations between Nepal and India; and (c) the treaty was the result of the bilateral relationship and not the cause ... When Nepal proposed that the Treaty be updated and revised because it did not provide for amendment, Rao said, ‘Then go ahead and cancel it’. Replied Nepal, ‘Yes, we can do that ... But ... that would not be in the interest of both the countries (Sharma 264).

Though Sharma quotes Peoples’ Review to substantiate the discussion scenario, yet it is difficult to accept it, because intimate diplomatic talks are rarely divulged. Besides, could Rao be so curt in dealing with a foreign dignitary? Sharma’s portrayal of the talk scenario seems to reflect what Brown describes as the prevailing mood of “large sections of the Nepali press” which was bent on portraying “his mission ... fruitless”. She further writes, “their assessment was inaccurate”, because she contends that the “Indian Government later announced its readiness to review the 1950 Treaty” (203). On coming back, Nepal also claimed that India was ready to resolve Tanakpur issue on the basis of mutual benefit, and that he had asked India to reduce the indigenous

content requirement of exportable commodities to reduce the gaping Nepal's trade deficit with India (Rising Nepal, "Visit ... Satisfactory" 1995 Feb. 10). The same month, according to Brown, the kingdom witnessed "UML's shake-up of the bureaucracy". It replaced "fifty-five of Nepal's seventy-five Chief District Officers" and selected "new managers for state enterprises". According to her, the replacements and appointments were interpreted by Government "critics" as a policy of 'UML-isation' (198). Then in the second week of April, as a follow-up to Deputy Prime Minister's visit, Prime Minister, Adhikari visited India. According to Gyawali and Dixit, the visit, ended in the UML forwarding a package deal,⁵⁷ which was framed "after receiving signals from India's CPM" (249). They say, the deal "proposed increasing the quantum of electricity and water to ... Nepal, but [it] required Nepal to agree to the construction of a ... storage dam at Pancheswor ... [the] very linkage of the Tanakpur Barrage with the Pancheswor that the UML had previously opposed ... and whose dissociation was secured ... during ... Rao's visit" (249). Later, document of the Party says that in framing the Mahakali package it had to enter into a "give and take process" (NCP (UML), Mahakali Nadiko ... Wastawikta 30). What it gave was clear: it allowed India to use Pancheswor in a bid to resolve the Mahakali issue. It was perhaps the price that it had to pay for resolving the issue and to get India's response to review the 1950 Treaty—a response which was necessary to prove that it stood for Nepalese nationalism. However, the outcome was seen by the UPFN (Baburam faction), the front organisation of NCP (Maoist), which had come into being in March 1995, as UML's backtracking from its earlier commitment. Addressing a rally, UPFN leader, Pampha Bhusal declared that the faction was on its way to organise protest movements. Reminding UML that it was a reiteration of its past demands, the faction put forward a set of 38 demands, which included the abrogation of 1950 Treaty, the

⁵⁷ See, NCP (UML), Mahakali Nadiko ... Wastawikta 7 The document points out that the idea of Mahakali package had evolved within the Party at the time of the Deputy Prime Minister's visit to India.

cancellation of Tanakpur Treaty, control of Indo-Nepal border, implementation of work permit, banning of vehicle which plied within Nepal with Indian license plate and end to the harassment of their activists in the Rolpa region. The faction claimed that the Government was framing them in fabricated charges. It threatened to go on strike on May 4 if its demands were not met with (Rising Nepal, “SJM ... Abrogated” 1995 Apr. 25). By now, their tactics of exposure politics had assumed a design. It included a set of long, knotty demands and threats of protest movements if those demands were not fulfilled within an unreasonable span of time. It was a deliberate move, which was aimed at developing armed struggle (See chapter V Maoist tactics no.4). The Government was coming under pressure from both the opposition and the Communist factions. The functioning of its Landless Squatters’ Problems Resolution Commission that is the *Sukumbasi* Commission, which by April 17 had claimed to have allotted land to 9, 538 families,⁵⁸ came under the attack of the UPFN (Vaidya) faction and the NCP (Masal). In a joint press statement the two factions blamed the UML Government for having failed in allotting land to 1335 landless squatters of Gaighat region (Rising Nepal, “SJM, Masal Flay Govt” 1995 May 25). The landless squatters of the region probably represented the parties’ interest for the document of the NCP (United) claims that the *Sukumbasi* Commission “distributed land selectively to the supporters of the UML without considering the plight of genuine candidates” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnitik Report: 2052 [1995] 4). On the 4th of May, within Communist rule, the UPFN (Baburam) faction carried out its first and last threat: it shut the kingdom down amid incidents of violence (Rising Nepal, “Baton-Charge” 1995 May 5). When the House was dissolved in June and fresh election was slated in November, Communist factions like NCP (Masal) declared its willingness to fight the coming election, but to make people understand “how democracy within Parliamentary system gets distorted into ... dirty

⁵⁸ See, Rising Nepal, “Land Allotted” 1995 Apr. 18

game”. The Party said, “Participation in election ... is our auxiliary tactics our main tactics will always be centred around developing people’s struggle outside the precinct of the Parliament” (NCP (Masal), “Chunaolai ... Upayog Garau” 746, 747). However, strange was the behaviour of NCP (United) and NCP (Marxist). They joined hands with Mongol National Organisation, an ethnic group, to form a front to fight the election (Rising Nepal, “Leftist ... National Front” 1995 June 25). The NCP (Maoist) declared not to participate in the mid-term election dubbing the exercise as a symbol of “another reactionary conspiracy against the needs and struggle of Nepalese people” (Rising Nepal, “Maoist .. Boycott Election” 1995 June 25). Finally, when the Supreme Court decision in September restored the House and the UML lost its power NCP (United) came up with a long list, which sought to explain the reasons behind the fall of the UML led Government. In essence, it hit upon the UML’s tactics. It said that its failure was owing to “its insistence upon forming a Government on its own ... with plans to win majority through a mid-term poll” (NCP (Samyukta (United)), Rajnitik Report: 2052 [1995] 2). Similar was the perception of NCP (Unity Centre)’s leader Prakash (Narayan Kazi Shrestha) for he said, “the NCP (UML) ... was only the largest Party in the Parliament. To form a Government under such a situation was nothing but an indulgence into a delusion” (46). The year came to the close with the protest rally of the UPFN (Baburam faction). In a mass meeting held in Kathmandu, three of its leaders Babu Ram Bhattarai, Pampha Bhusal and Hisila Yami informed the crowd that a contingent of 1500 policemen were terrorising the people of Rolpa district (Rising Nepal, “SJM Holds Protest” 1995 Dec. 9). This was the Government’s Romeo operation, which according to Home Minister, Khum Bahadur Khadka, had been launched in Rolpa to arrest people possessing illegal weapons, committing arson and manhandling regular police forces. He promised to send an all-Party Parliamentary team in near future to assess the situation (Rising Nepal, “Team to Be Sent ... Soon” 1995 Dec. 12). The all-Party Parliamentary team which was sent there on a fact finding tour informed the Parliament that the nature of the clash, which involved the two parties, the UPFN and the Congress, was political (For details see, p. 524). It

asked the Government to immediately terminate the operation and to find a political solution to the problem (Rising Nepal, “Stop Operation Romeo” 1996 Jan. 4).

1.8. Communist Movement: January 1996–1999, the Beginning of Maoist Movement

On the 5th of February UPFN leader, Baburam informed the press that the faction has submitted a 40 point demand to the Government. He threatened the Government with dire consequences if the demands were not fulfilled (Rising Nepal, “SJM ... Treaty is Treason” 1996 Feb. 6). Since, this was a patterned behaviour of the UPFN (Baburam) faction, the Government must have taken the declaration on the go. From February 8, NCP (UML) held its second National Council meeting in Janakpurdham (city in the southern border). In it, the Party vowed to pull down Deuba Government to install UML led progressive Government for the preservation and promotion of nationalism. It called upon its cadres to mobilise themselves toward that end (Rising Nepal, “Let’s Consolidate ... UML” 1996 Feb. 9). However, when it failed to bring down the Government in March 1996, it began raising objections against the issue of ratifying the Mahakali Treaty. A fresh twist was given to the issue of the Treaty when its 9th September press release said:

...The 28th Central Committee meeting of the Party ... has discussed the Report of task force created to study the Treaty ...
 ...After thorough discussion it has decided to ratify the Treaty.
 ...However, the meeting has decided to ratify the Treaty only if the Government of India and the Government of Nepal guarantees us in writing that they would scientifically solve the border issues, remove the Indian Army post from Darchula region [region in the West of Nepal], ensure irrigation of Terai region of Nepal ... (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 9 Sept. 1996).

Opposing the release, on 19 September, a joint Press Release of ten members⁵⁹ of the Party said, “Since, this Treaty seriously damages national interest we along with 26 other MPs have decided to boycott the Joint sitting of the House convened to ratify the Treaty” (NCP (UML), Mahakali Sandhi ... Samyukta Baktabya 19 Sept. 1996). On

⁵⁹ They were Sahana Pradhan, Bamdev Gautam, Chandra Prakash Mainali, Radhakrishna Mainali, Trilochan Dhakal, Keshavlal Shrestha, Siddhilal Singh, Hiranyalal Shrestha, Kamal Koirala and Hemraj Rai

the 20th the Treaty was ratified in the House's Joint sitting, where thirty-one MPs of the UML were absent. Among them were Bamdev Gautam, Sahana Pradhan, Chandra Prakash Mainali and Radhakrishna Mainali (Rising Nepal, "Ratification ... Consensus" 1996 Sept. 21). The dissent was ominous. In a later press release of the Party, its President, Man Mohan Adhikari "directed Party colleagues to brace themselves to fight against elements who were trying to fragment the Party" (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 30 Sept. 1996). Then a press release of 15 October, coming from Radhakrishna Mainali indicated that the Party had decided to hammer out the differences to ensure unity in the Party (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 15 Oct. 1996). Even then tussle was going on within the Party; because in its February 1997 Central Committee meeting, members aligned with existing General Secretary, Madhav Kumar Nepal registered a counter charge-sheet against Bamdev Gautam, whose group had filed a charge-sheet⁶⁰ against Madhav Kumar Nepal. They had asked Nepal to resign from his post in favour of Bamdev Gautam (Rising Nepal, "Tussle ... Continues" 1997 Feb. 25). However, all such news and Party press releases just vanished after the Party formed a coalition Government under Lokendra Bahadur Chand in March 1997. Later, when it performed well in the local elections its document perceived in the result the fruit of "its good governance in the nine month Government" and the role of "the Party's strategy, *Janatako Bahudaliya Janabad*", which it had adopted "in the Fifth Party Congress" and which "expressed the Party's faith in democratic processes and peaceful multi-Party competition". It said, "our victory in elections is owing to the faith that the people have reposed on our ideology" (NCP (UML), 2054-2-5 Gatay Baseyko ... Committeeko ... Prastao 9 June 1997). In power, the Party was all praise for its Fifth Congress strategy and tactics. However, after the fall of the Chand Ministry in October 1997, clashes reappeared in the Party.

⁶⁰ See, NCP (M-L), "Bibhajanka Karanharu" 18 According to the document of NCP (M-L) which came into being later in 1998 the charge-sheet against Madhav Kumar Nepal was filed in the 32nd Central Committee meeting by 22 members of the Committee as such he was in the minority.

In its Sixth Congress; held in 25–31 January 1998 at Nepalgunj (mid-Western part of Nepal), controversy arose in between the two groups, one under Madhav Kumar Nepal and the other under Bamdev Gautam. Considered on the basis of the documents produced in the Congress, both the groups supported the strategy of *Janatako Bahudaliya Janabad*. However, the Bamdev led faction raised objections against the tactical line⁶¹ adopted by the Congress. In the document produced by the faction, Bamdev argued that the Fifth Congress document had wrongly interpreted the tactics suggested by Madan Bhandari. He said, that the document had “considered the main tactics as the goal of the Party”, giving the impression that “the tactics of strengthening power was itself the goal of the Party” or “its strategy” (NCP (UML), “Bartaman Paristhitima ... Karyaniti (Farak Mat)” 26). Thereafter he said:

The aim of our present tactics should be to serve our strategy of completing *Janabadi* [total power to the people] revolution by strengthening the democratic rights of the people, by acquiring more rights for them and by protecting country’s sovereignty, integrity, independence and nationalism. Since such revolution is against feudalism, tout bureaucratic capitalism, expansionism and imperialism ... our tactics should always be aimed against our enemies. In the past we adopted a soft attitude towards American imperialism and disregarded the role of Indian expansionism which was out there to establish its control over our natural resources ... From now on our tactics should always forward the cause of nationalism ... (NCP (UML), “Bartaman Paristhitima ... Karyaniti (Farak Mat)” 30–1).

However, the document of the 6th Congress, which was brought out by the UML did not prescribe such tactics—tactics aimed towards the enemies. It simply reiterated its faith in the tactics fixed by the Fifth Congress (NCP (UML), *Bahudaliya Janabadko ... Karyaniti* 2). The Party finally split in March 5, 1998.⁶² However, the faction formally

⁶¹ See, Whelpton, *History* 197 The cause behind the split is interpreted as the differences between Bamdev Gautam and C. P Mainali’s support for Mao’s New Democratic Strategy and UML’s strategy. However, neither documents nor paper reports of the period supports such claim. Besides, the later activities of NCP (M-L), as shall be seen, was also not in tune with the claim of Whelpton.

⁶² See, *Rising Nepal*, “CPN-ML Registered” 1998 Mar. 6 On this day the faction was registered as CPN-ML in the Parliament Secretariat.

announced its formation as NCP (M-L) in its “National meet of 27–29 Fagun VS 2054 [11–13 March 1998]”. Rationalising its birth, its document said, “This Party has come into existence out of the Parliamentary group of the NCP (UML), which represents its revolutionary trend. It is against UML’s liquidationist policy decisions on national issues” (NCP (M-L), “Ghoshna-Patra” 1). Its document, which pointed out the various causes⁶³ behind the split, observed at one point:

American imperialism and Indian expansionism are the main enemies of Nepalese revolution ... but the leadership of the UML in its documents of the Sixth Congress has removed these issues ... as a result the Madhav-KP Oli group has given up those issues which the Communist Party had been raising so far (NCP (M-L), “Bibhajanka Karanharu” 5).

The document of the NCP (M-L), published a few months later had this to say regarding its strategy: “Presently, on our shoulder is the historic responsibility of protecting and developing the strategy of *Janatako Bahudaliya Janabad*” (NCP (M-L), Bartaman ... Karyaniti 16). And amplifying its tactics, which was at the heart of its dissociation from NCP (UML) it said:

The intention of our tactics is to strengthen the democratic rights of the people ... and country’s sovereignty, integrity and independence ... Hence the tactics which we forward should always be against the enemy of our revolution. In the past we had softened our stand towards American imperialism and Indian expansionism. We disregarded the increasing Indian pressure over our natural resources. Despite our softened approach they did not stop interfering in our internal affairs and they went on plotting against our revolutionaries. Presently, the Indian rulers have shamefacedly begun laying their claim over our land, Kalapani and have stationed their soldiers there ... From now on our tactics should always be directed towards the protection of our nationalism and democracy and we should use all means of struggle towards that end ... (NCP (M-L), Bartaman ... Karyaniti 29–30).

Following the split, Gautam was nominated as the leader of its 46 MPs in the Parliament and Sahana Pradhan (widow of Pushpalal) was elected as its President.⁶⁴ Then a pamphlet published in April 1998 declared

⁶³ See, NCP (M-L), “Bibhajanka Karanharu”

⁶⁴ See, Rising Nepal, “Gautam Nominated” 1998 Mar. 8; Rising Nepal,

Today on 2055 Baisakh 4 [17 April 1998] a joint meeting of the following different political parties ... discussed the ordinance brought in the Parliament to amend the Offence Against the State and Punishment Act 2046. This ordinance goes against the spirit of the 1990 movement. Reaching a decision to stall the ordinance the following parties have decided to lead a joint movement ... To discuss issues related with nationalism, day to day problems of the people and the country's sovereignty the meeting has decided to meet again in Baisakh 6 [April 19] (NCP (Unity Centre), "Anusuchi 1" 34)

The parties signing the document were NCP (Unity Centre), NCP (Masal), NCP (MLM), NCP (United), NCP (ML), NCP (M), NCP (NWPP), UPFN, and *Samyukta Rastriya Janandolan Samyojak Samiti* (United National People's Coordination Committee).⁶⁵ The 'Nau Bam' or Nine Left Parties' movement had begun. As scheduled, the Nine parties met on the 8th of April and decided to submit, on the 14th of April, a memorandum to the Government. From then on, it decided to launch protest movement from 27 April. The memorandum, published by one of the constituents of the Nine Left combine, NCP (Unity Centre), was focused on three issues:

- (1) Withdrawal of the ordinance meant for amending the Offence Against the State and Punishment Act 2046.
- (2) Raise issues concerning nationalism and national interest, ask Government to initiate the removal of Indian soldiers from Kalapani, annul all unequal Indo-Nepal treaties and revise them on the basis of equality and mutual benefits, ask Government to initiate moves against Indian encroachment of Nepal's territory in Pasupatinagar⁶⁶ and in other areas.
- (3) Control corruption and price rise and pressurise the Government to form a Commission to investigate the wealth of ministers and other corrupt officials (NCP (Unity Centre), "Baisakh 6 Gatayko Nirnaya" 34).

"Sahana Pradhan Elected President" 1998 March 14

⁶⁵ This was the front organisation of the NCP (Maoist). For its sudden appearance in the scene, see Chapter IV

⁶⁶ See also, NCP (Unity Centre), "Gyapanpatra" 35 The group claimed that India had encroached the no-man's land in the Pasupatinagar area which is in the Eastern side of Nepal bordering Indian state of West Bengal.

Besides, an appeal coming from the leader of NCP (Unity Centre), claimed that the amendment of the Act was being sought by the Government “to legalise State terrorism in the name of controlling the ‘Maoist People’s War’” (NCP (Unity Centre), “NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra) Ka ... Awahan” 3). As part of their second phase protest movement NCP (ML) declared that it would launch its ‘Let’s Go to Kalapani’ programme on the 5th of June. The programme included the march of hundred students and journalists to Kalapani to protest against Indian intrusion (Rising Nepal, “ML to Launch ... Kalapani Drive” 1998 June 1). On the 29th, the group submitted its appeal to the UN through Kathmandu based UN Representative, Carroll Long. In the appeal they asked the world forum to mobilise peace loving countries of the world to pressurise India to withdraw her troops from Kalapani (Rising Nepal, “Nine Left Appeal ... UN” 1998 June 30). Meanwhile, rumour about NCP (ML)’s possible inclusion in the Government began doing its round. Commenting on the rumour Prakash (Narayan Kazi Shrestha) said, “If they join the Government then they would lose their very foundation—their very claim that they are different from NCP (UML) and it would be suicidal” (NCP (Unity Centre), “MaLay ... Hamro Karyabhar” 12). However, the rumour turned into a reality when on 16 August NCP (ML)’s Central Committee member, C. P Mainali declared that his Party has reached an agreement with the Congress and that it was joining the Koirala Government. According to him, the Congress leadership had assured them that they would initiate the removal of Indian troops from Kalapani besides resolving other border issues (Rising Nepal, “ML ... to Join ... Govt.” 1998 Aug. 17). 13 of their MPs joined the Government; the movement lost its steam. Then in August 22, the so-called Nine Left group also entered into a nine-point agreement with the Government. The content of the agreement rotated around three issues. Point 1 through 3 of the agreement were related with issues of Indo-Nepal border and other treaties. Point 4 through 5 were related with the process of managing the Maoist movement in which the Government, their document claimed, had agreed not to indict activists of other political parties in

the name of controlling the Maoists and rest were focused on controlling prices (NCP (Unity Centre), “Nau Bam ... Bhadra 6 ... Samjhauta” 38). However; indicating what the movement had primarily focused on, Prakash said, “The main thrust of our movement was on forcing India to remove her soldiers from Kalapani and to force the Government from withdrawing the ordinance” (NCP (Unity Centre), “Sangharsalai Naya ... Ekjut Hoau” 7). The issue of price rise was, therefore, just a means for mobilising the masses—their commitment towards the people. After the fall of Koirala Government the Communist factions again began bracing themselves for the third General Election.

1.9. Communist Perceptions in May 1999 Election:

Communist factions taking part in the 1999 General Election were: NCP (UML), NCP (ML), NCP (NWPP), UPFN, and Rastriya Janamorcha (National People’s Front). Rastriya Janamorcha, the electoral Front of NCP (Masal) had “electoral understanding with NCP (MLM), NCP (Marxist) and NCP (United)” (NCP (Masal), “Aam Nirvachan ... Baktabya [1999]” 647). In terms of seats contested, the major contenders among them were NCP (UML) and NCP (ML). They fielded their candidates in 195 and 197 constituencies respectively (Election Commission 14–5). The UML contested the election with a view to strengthen the democratic system. It was for “political stability, good governance, development, security, justice, equality, nationalism and in favour of forces which helped these ideals” (NCP (UML), “Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2056” 9). It sought to appeal the people on the strength of its performance in its brief period in power. It reminded people of what it did for “the deprived section of the society” and for “revising the 1950 Treaty” etcetera (10–4). In future, it promised “corruption free governance”, “a poverty-free kingdom” under “planned economy” (31–2). As in the past, it promised that it would pass laws “to ensure equal property rights for the women” (56), laws to ensure “equal linguistic, cultural, and religious rights for the *janajatis*” (58). And for preserving their culture and history it promised “to establish National Foundations[!]” and “felicitate their eminent personalities[!]” (59). However, the manifesto of NCP (ML) declared that it

was “not for incremental reforms, but for a total change”. It said “We intend to establish a *Janabadi* system which is truly pro-people by destroying the present semi-feudal, semi-colonial structure”. It further said, “In the present situation we are the only Party, the only national alternative on whom the people can repose their faith ... other Communist factions ... and even UML which has kowtowed before Indian expansionism, imperialism and feudalism cannot be an alternative before the nation” (NCP (M-L), “Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2056 [1999]” 5). Leading its long list of promises to the electorate was its claim that it intended to preserve progressive Nepalese nationalism. Explaining the components of such nationalism it said,

The main aspect of progressive nationalism is the protection of Nepalese sovereignty, geographical integrity, unity and tolerance among all *Janajatis*, linguistic, cultural and religious groups while ensuring improvement in their economic condition. The conglomeration of all these is our nationalism (NCP (M-L), “Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2056 [1999]” 5)

Following it were promises to annul 1950 Treaty and all unequal treaties between India and Nepal, to resolve the problem of Kalapani, to use kingdom’s resources in its service, to implement the work permit needed for foreigners working in Nepal and to end the concept of open border (6). However, in the political front it promised “to amend the Constitution in favour of the working class” and “to make the *Bahudaliya* system strong enough to withstand the onslaught of the revivalist forces and forces against the sovereignty of the country” (7). The other entries in the manifesto promised “efficient ... honest administration” (8), “independent judiciary” (9), “independent economy” (11), “revolutionary land reform” (12), “trade and transit facilities which are in tune with the rights of a land-locked State” (16), “development of villages under decentralised administration” (22), “balanced regional development” (24) etcetera. However, it had nothing to say on the Maoist problem, except to point out that the then governments “have killed thousands of innocent, unarmed people in the name of controlling ‘Maoists’” (2). And considering earlier trends one cannot perhaps go wrong in saying that the attitude of NCP (United) and NCP (M) were also in favour of strengthening democracy. In comparison to these the NCP (NWPP) took

part in the election saying, “In the past half a dozen governments were formed but they could not solve the problems of the people ... the so-called big national parties’ lust for power and position and their dishonesty ... have disillusioned the masses towards democracy” (1–2). So, it said, “We shall use the coming General Elections to tell the masses that the problems of the working class can be resolved only under socialism” (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party (NCP (NWPP)) 2). In similar vein, NCP (MLM) took part in the election with a view to use it for “revolutionary purposes” that is to “Demolish the claims of the existing reformatory and liberal parties’ that there is no alternative to parliamentary democracy while trying to free people from their lies, anti-people activities and anti-national attitudes” (NCP (MLM) 1). The NCP (Masal)’s front Rastriya Janamorcha came up with a long 21 issues where the important ones were the appeal for “nationalism, democracy”, “end to corruption” (Rastriya Janamorcha 1), “end to State terrorism carried in the name of controlling the Maoists” (3), “end to the exploitation of peasants ... by ending dual land ownership”, “end to the interference in the autonomous status of local bodies”, “end to the discrimination practised by the ruling parties against the people of Terai” (5, 7, 8) etcetera. However, its document passed before the election indicates that it was also using the election to “educate people regarding the necessity for New Democratic revolution” and to fight against the “rise of revivalist and Fascist forces” (NCP (Masal), “Aam Nirvachan ... Baktabya [1999]” 643, 647). By Fascist forces it was particularly referring to the Nepali Congress (647). Similar, was the intention of NCP (Unity Centre) for its leader Prakash said, “The NCP (Unity Centre) has clearly indicated in its manifesto that parliamentary system cannot serve our nationalism and resolve the day to day problems of the people ... using non-parliamentary struggle as its primary tactics it intends to use election as an auxiliary tactics to destroy parliamentary system” (Ne. Ka. Pa (Ekta Kendra) 4–5). Thus, in the 1999 General Elections there were, as in the past, two broad groups. Of these, one group believed in strengthening parliamentary democracy by participating in the election and another, in destroying it. However, the election results went in favour of the Nepali Congress

(See p. 182). Analysing the Congress win, NCP (Masal) blamed the system and Congress's corruption for it said, "The results have vindicated our repeated claim that Parliamentary system is not a democratic system. Elections held under such system do not reflect real results ... In the elections the Girija Government to come to power misused power, police force, and its lumpen elements to capture booths and to distribute money while violating election code of conduct" (NCP (Masal), "Nirvachanko ... Prastao" 649). However, NCP (NWPP) pointed out that NCP (Maoist) also served the Congress by boycotting the polls for it said, "When the election results were declared then the districts, which were under the influence of the Maoists' 'People's War' and their 'boycott policy', returned candidates of 'Fascist' Nepali Congress and 'anti-nationalist' UML. From the two constituencies of Rolpa the seats went to the Congress candidates, and the two constituencies of Rukum returned one UML and another Congress candidates" (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party (NCP (NWPP)) 8). In the failure of NDP (Chand) faction if NCP (Masal) saw "the fall of pro-Monarchy forces" it viewed in NCP (ML)'s loss "the failure of a patriotic and democratic force" (NCP (Masal), "Nirvachanko ... Prastao" 651). Analysing why it fared badly in the election NCP (ML)'s document pointed out towards nine reasons such as, "its weak organisation", "plots of foreign reactionaries", "its inability to arouse among its activists enough hatred against anti-national forces", "its failure to oppose the Congress's lumpen elements" and "the black money which was used by both the UML and the Congress" (NCP (ML), "Rajnitik Pratibedan: September 1999" 22–23). Perhaps, corruption in election was a set characteristics of Nepalese democracy.

After election, the UML, in tune with its tactics, began obstructing the Parliament. In August, for a week its MPs boycotted the House proceedings when its demand for the creation of a parliamentary body to probe irregularities in May election was denied (Rising Nepal, "House Deadlock Continues" 1999 Aug. 30). From October onwards, it took up its favourite tool—price rise, to oppose the Government. Evaluating the six month functioning of Bhattarai Government it said,

“The general people had hoped for ... new momentum of development ... However, the Government has not done anything ... even after six months. It has proved itself irresponsible by increasing the prices of essential commodities. It has increased the price of fertilisers by 40% ... kerosene and diesel by 23 and 48.8%” and “electricity by 30% per unit” (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 1999 Oct. 27). From November, it declared that it would launch its first phase of protests from VS 2056/7/20 [6 November 1999]. It involved the use of processions throughout the kingdom and Nepal Bandh in November 13 (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 1999 Nov. 1). However, its later statements revealed why it had picked up the issue. In its programme of protests, which underlined five issues for which the protests were being organised, number 3 stated, “The Government has decided to spend Rs 10 crores in its Bisheshwar with Poor programme ... Under this programme the Government is channelising money in the villages through its committees formed in the centre. It, therefore, goes against the autonomy of local bodies and is against the institutionalisation of democracy” (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 1999 Nov. 19). By now, its tactics of leading movements were clear: it always tagged price rise to mobilise forces in order to serve its political ends. The movement dragged on until December first week.

1.10. Communist activities: 2000–October 2002

When crisis assailed Nepali Congress in February 2000, the UML declared that it would lead a series of protest movements from March onwards. This time, it picked up the issue of corruption and considered it as the main cause behind all ills for it stated:

People elected this Government to end corruption. Those who cannot end corruption cannot manage a Government. The same thing applies to their inability in ensuring security, in protecting nationalism and in controlling price rise. A Government which cannot resolve issues of democracy, nationalism and day to day problems of the people should by itself give up its responsibilities (NCP (UML), Press Baktabya 2000 Feb. 28).

What seemed to explain such demands was their other statement where it said “In this phase our Party shall mobilise forces against corruption ... it will mobilise people to

oppose Congress's authoritarian rule and its plot to destroy the autonomy of the local bodies" (NCP (UML), Press Baktabya 2000 Feb. 28). Thus, at this stage one finds a curious mixture in their tactics: they were perhaps seeking Congress's recognition of their existence—the reflection of their tactics after 1991 elections where in the name of fighting against Congress's authoritarianism they had sought their recognition in the Parliament from the Congress—coupled with their post 1993 tactics, which was aimed at evolving as a competent force in parliamentary struggle. However, while announcing their movement they rationalised their actions by criticising the Nepali Congress "as an irresponsible Party involved in internal struggle when the country at large was suffering from insecurity" little realising that the same criticism, at least of being irresponsible in leading movements, was equally applicable to them (NCP (UML), Press Baktabya 2000 Feb. 28). Their movement dragged on sometimes with ten point demands and sometimes with 17 point demands.⁶⁷ Meanwhile, on the 4th of April, UPFN leaders met Deuba led Maoist Problems Resolution and Recommendation Committee. In their suggestions to the Committee they pointed out that Maoist problem should be solved politically since it was a political problem, and that the Government should not use Armed Police Force for that would only perpetuate State terrorism. Besides, they pointed out that for resolving the problem the Government should also seek to preserve nationalism and solve problems of poverty, unemployment, price rise, economic disparity and corruption (Rising Nepal, "SJM ... Meet Deuba" 2000 Apr. 5). However, until November, except focusing on dialogues between the Government and the Maoists none of the Communist factions explained what they meant when they said that the Maoist problem needed a political solution.

⁶⁷ See, NCP (UML), Press Statement 2000 Mar. 20 NCP (UML), Press Baktabya: Mangharu Pura Gareyos Bhanney Baray 2000 Apr. 11 NCP (UML), Press Baktabya 2000 Apr. 16 In its 16 April statement the Party forwarded 10 point demands where demand No. 1 was to end corruption and it was followed by other demands like preservation of nationalism and the autonomy of local bodies. Its later statements, see, NCP (UML), Press Baktabya 2000 May 5 added seven more demands to the 16 April demands.

But, on the 7th of November UML indicated that by political solution it meant a thorough amendments of the 1990 Constitution (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 2000 Nov. 7). So, on the 28th of November the Party decided “to carry on parleys with all political parties and to mobilise masses in support of its concrete proposals for the amendments of the Constitution” (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 2000 Nov. 28). However, even then the areas where it favoured amendments were not clear. Its later document gives some clue regarding the areas where it sought to amend the Constitution, but if these clues indicate the nature of the Party’s proposal then they were not significant for it simply reiterated its earlier demands for “electoral reforms ... progressive land reform, control of corruption, decentralisation, local bodies’ autonomy, social justice, and recognition of linguistic, religious and ethnic issues” (NCP (UML), “Pratibedan: VS 2058 [Aug. 2001]” 9). From March 2001 onward, it was again leading protest movements along with other Communist factions for the resignation of “corrupt Koirala” (Rising Nepal, “UML ... Joint Struggle” 2001 Mar. 24). It continued throughout April⁶⁸ and in the following month only to be intervened by the Palace incident of June 1. Following Koirala’s resignation in July, they were totally focused on resolving Maoist insurgency through dialogue. With the failure of the talks and after the imposition of emergency from November 2001 there were hardly any protests. However, when Army actions against the Maoists seemed to yield results they were all in a hurry to end emergency in the name of preserving the spirit of 1990 *Janandolan* and the Constitution. Besides, year 2002 witnessed two unity moves among the Communist factions. The NCP (ML) united with NCP (UML) in VS 2058/11/1 [15 February, 2002] (NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 2002 Feb. 15) and just before October 4, 2002 when Gyanendra was on his way to usurp power five Communist factions came together on the 3rd of October to announce the formation of

⁶⁸ See, NCP (UML), Samyukta Press Baktabya 2001 Apr. 16; NCP (UML), Sangharsha Sambandhi Bishes Baktabya 2001 Apr. 16 and NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 2001 Apr. 19; NCP (UML), Press Bigyapti 2001 May 26

Samyukta Bam Morcha (United Left Front). These five parties were NCP (Marxist), NCP (United), NCP (MLM), NCP (ML) and a lesser known Socialist Movement of Nepal (Rising Nepal, "Five Parties Form Bam Morcha" 2002 Oct. 4). There was no doubt that their unity was aimed at contesting the much speculated November election. Gyanendra's 4th October broadcast to the nation must have pulled the rug from under them. With Gyanendra's action the parliamentary phase in the political development of Nepal came to an end mellowing Communist activities. However, their activities throughout the 90s exhibited a pattern in their ideological orientations, choice of issues and in the nature of their protests which were perhaps the reflection of their class/social base. Hence, drawing upon the study of the Communist movement carried so far, the following section will briefly describe their ideology, their choice of issues out of the major issues facing the kingdom and the nature of Communist protests while dealing a little elaborately the class basis of the movement.

1.11. Communist Ideologies and Strategies, Major Issues, Forms of Protests and Support/Social Base.

On the basis of the study carried so far, it is clear that the ideological orientations of Communist parties like NCP (UML), NCP (Marxist), after their dissociation from the UML, and NCP (United) were liberal. They were all struggling for the establishment of freedom of speech, freedom of press, a system of free and fair election, equality, good governance characterised by decentralisation of power and transparency in the functioning of the Government. In the process, the major issues which they highlighted were those about citizenship, equality of women, and an economic arrangement which ensured rapid economic development without sacrificing public welfare. In the economic front the central goal was for the development of an independent economy, a free economy tilted towards the growth of national capitalists. However, confusion persisted in their stand on the degree and the nature of free economy, because for public welfare they also advocated a mixed economy free from corruption. Their search for an independent economy went hand in hand with their advocacy for an economy free from the control of the kingdom's

southern neighbour, which, on account of geopolitical compulsions, invariably led them to advocate their variety of nationalism. It offered them the explanation for all the woes of the kingdom—it was used even to explain the persistence of feudalism in the kingdom. As such, much of their time in the 90s were spent in opposing the rise of feudal forces and in combating the autocratic, undemocratic rule of Koirala which they claimed was tilted in favour of Indian expansionism and imperialism. Besides, a few of them diluted their strategies to tailor them in the context of the changed environment. NCP (UML)'s strategy of *Bahudaliya Janabad* and NCP (United)'s strategy of National Democracy, despite their claim in favour of classes (whose definition was diluted to include all), were, in essence, tailored to project their outright support for a market based economy and liberal democracy. The NCP (Marxist)'s strategy of New Democracy did not dilute its claim in favour of the four classes, but even their goal was essentially focused on the development of democracy which they argued was dependent on the economic development of the kingdom. At the other end there were other Communist factions like NCP (Masal), NCP (NWPP), NCP (Unity Centre) and NCP (MLM) who advocated New Democracy as their strategy, but they were also using the same issues to point out that they cannot be achieved under the Parliamentary system. Hence, they were saying that people should opt for the New Democratic system, where they claimed that it would be possible to achieve what the UML and the NCP (United) sought to achieve. This implied that their ideological orientations were also liberal. The only aspect, which differentiated the latter group from the former was that in advocating those liberal issues they were, in their documents, championing the cause of the working class, peasants, national bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois classes. In that sense, theirs was a class approach to the issues of liberalism. Hence, Communist movement of Nepal from 1990–2002, was like the 19th century European liberal movements. Besides, the nature of their protests reflected distinct characteristics. On occasions, such as in the Employees' movement in 1990, their use of cycle rallies, candle-light processions and human chains to draw the attention of the Government were unique, but they were invariably for issues

characteristic of old movements. As regards the multiple protests carried out under the leadership of the UML with the support of other Communist factions the issues were mostly political. They had nothing in them to reflect the interest of the classes whom the parties claimed to represent. In the beginning of the nineties, the focus of the protests were for the protection of Nepalese nationalism. Later, it was lopsided against Girija Prasad Koirala. And even at the close of the nineties the two dominant issues were either nationalism or the removal of Koirala. These protests were motivated by their immediate political goals, that is to harass the Government of the day and were always wrapped with one issue: their protest against price rise. Besides, they did not take up issues about the status of peasants, women, *janajatis* and for the resolution of the problem of citizenship which were the demands of the day. In nature, these protests used to be violent and of a long-drawn type, which were fully exploited by those Communist factions, including the UPFN, which practised the politics of exposition. In contrast, when the CPN (Maoist), on their own, launched protests their demands packaged the entire issues facing the nations. They skillfully projected gender, regional, ethnic issues and issues of nationalism as class issues resulting out of national and regional oppression inherent in a *Khas* dominated centralised feudal structure. In nature, their protests were of short duration seeking fulfilment of all their packaged demands within a short period of time. The motive behind such protests were always to expose the weaknesses of the parliamentary system and to whittle the legitimacy of the Government rather than solving the problems of the proletariat, peasants, national bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois classes whom they claimed to represent. And though their avowed strategy was for creating a Communist State by destroying the feudal structure, yet if one were to take the article of Baburam published after Gyanendra's coup in 2002, it reflected that they were essentially fighting for a bourgeois democracy. Thus, neither their protests, nor their People's War reflected a class bias. The reason for such complexion of the movement lay in the class/social bases of the movement. Hence, the following paragraph is devoted towards the consideration of the class/social bases of the movement. In doing so it

will take the documentary evidences and the biographies of a few Communist leaders available in paper reports.

While going through the different documents of the entire Communist factions one comes across a statement, where they all admit that the numerical strength of the proletariat in Nepal is low, but is expected to grow (For examples see, p. 368 & 520). There is virtually no role of proletariat in this movement. Besides, while commenting upon the nature of Communist leadership they all point out that they are primarily the representative of the middle class.⁶⁹ These statements make clear the social basis of the movement. However, the question is: who are these leaders representing the middle class? If one takes the background of the leaders who came to limelight after 1990 then they are as follows:

Man Mohan Adhikari was educated in India during the forties and he joined as a simple labourer to participate in the Biratnagar Jute Mill movement in 1947 (Rising Nepal, "Long Innings" 1991 May 26). When he assumed his office as Prime Minister in 1994, he had 20 tolas gold, 2 Kattha and 21 Anna land, one house in Biratnagar and one under construction in Kathmandu. Besides, his account had a total of Rs. 12 Lakh 34 thousand in the bank (Rising Nepal, "PM, Nepal ... Disclose Assets" 1994 Dec. 14). Similarly, Jan Sharma, while writing about the background of Madhav Kumar Nepal says that he was earlier a "bank clerk", who had joined the NCP (ML) in 1971 (243). His assets in 1994 included five housing plots spread throughout the kingdom and two double storeyed buildings which included one in the prime location of Kathmandu. He possessed ten tolas gold and shares in different factories (Rising

⁶⁹ NCP (Pushpalal) 75 In 1968 NCP (Pushpalal)'s document was saying that the leadership of the Party was in the hands of the middle class. One of the fragmentation in the NCP (Pushpalal) group was caused by the claims of the dissociating group that the Party was led by the middle class (See, p. 341). See also NCP (Masal[Mashal]) 271 where the party points out that it was essentially a movement led by the upper caste leaders. See, also NCP (Unity Centre), "Communist Movement ... of Nepal (Unity Centre)" 21 The Party expressly states that its leaders are all from the petty-bourgeois class.

Nepal, “PM, Nepal ... Disclose Assets” 1994 Dec. 14). In similar vein, C. P Mainali another Communist leader was a graduate, who was linked with the Jhapa movement of the 70s (Rising Nepal, “C. P. Mainali ... Biography” 1994 Dec. 16). In 1994 he possessed several housing plots spread across Nepal and bank deposits, shares, gold and silver up to 100 tolas (Rising Nepal, “6 More ... Declare Property” 1994 Dec. 16). And though property details of Pushpa Kamal Dahal and of Baburam Bhattarai are yet to be disclosed, yet their biographies reveal that they both came from middle class background. The former was qualified up to B.Sc in Agriculture Science. He was a teacher before entering politics. Baburam earned a Ph.D long after joining politics. He claimed that he came from a peasant family, which was dependent upon his *purohit* father (Rising Nepal, “From Rebel ... Head of Govt” 2006 Aug. 16). Thus, they all represented the educated middle class who had supplanted Communist leadership which was supposed to be in the hands of the proletariat. In fact, in the entire Communist movement of Nepal, if there was anyone who had even an inkling of proletariat background then it was Man Mohan Adhikari. With such leadership, it is no wonder that the movement evinced a liberal orientation.

Works Cited

- Brandt, Conard, Benjamin Schwartz, and John K Fairbank. A Documentary History of Chinese Communism. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1952.
- Brown, T. Louise. The Challenge to Democracy in Nepal. First Indian Reprint. London: Routledge, 2010. 1996.
- Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist). "One Year of People's War in Nepal: A Review." The Worker: Organ of the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist). No. 3. Np: Publication Department Central Committee Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist), 1997, Feb. 6–18.
- Election Commission. "Election Commission House of Representatives: Election Results-2056." Kathmandu: Election Commission, VS 2056 [1999].
- Gyawali, Dipak and Ajaya Dixit. "Mahakali Impasse: A Futile Paradigm's Bequested Travails." Ed. Dhurba Kumar. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asia Studies, 2000. 236–301. 1999.
- HMG. Uchchastariya Bhumisudhar (Badal) Ayog 2051 [1995] Ko Pratibedan. Kathmandu: Pairavi Prakashan, VS 2057 [2000]. Print.
- Hutt, Michael. "Drafting the 1990 Constitution." Nepal in the Nineties: Versions of the Past, Visions of the Future. Ed. Michael Hutt. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1994. 28–47.
- K. C, Surendra. Nepalma Communist Andolanko Itihas (Bhag 2). Kathmandu: Vidyarthi Pustak Bhandar, VS 2060 [2003/04].
- . Nepalma Communist Andolanko Itihas (Tesro Bhag). Kathmandu: Vidyarthi Pustak Bhandar, VS 2065 [2008/09].
- Mishra, Balchandra. Jhapa Andolankahi Emalay Bivhajansamma. Kathmandu: Vidyarthi Pustak Bhandar, VS 2058 [2001/02].
- NCP (Ekta Kendra). "Sampurna Party Sadasyaharulai Appeal." Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra) Ko Ekta Mahadhiwayshundwara Nirwachit "Bhinnamat" Ka Ke. Sa. Sa Haru Tatha Rastriya Sallahakar Parishadka Adhyakshadwara Sampurna Party Sadasyaharulai: Appeal. Np: Rastriya Sammelan Ayojak Samiti, Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra), VS 2050/12/7 [25 March 1994]. 1–28.
- . "Vartaman 'Antarparty Sangharsa' Barey: (2050 Jesthako Pahilo Satama Sampanna Kendriya Samitiko Bistarit Baithakma 'Bhinnamat' Ko Tarfabata Prastut Prastao)." Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra) Ko Ekta Mahadhiwayshundwara Nirwachit "Bhinnamat" Ka Ke. Sa. Sa Haru Tatha Rastriya Sallahakar Parishadka Adhyakshadwara Sampurna Party Sadasyaharulai: Appeal. Np: Rastriya Sammelan Ayojak Samiti, Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra), n.d. 29–46.

- NCP (Marxbadi (Marxist)). Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi) Ko Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2051. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi), Kendriya Prachar Bibhag, Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2051.
- . Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi) Ko Ghoshna Patra: (Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi) Satau Rastriya Sammelanka Sanyojak Com. Prabhunarayan Chaudhariko Adhyakchatama Gata 2048 Magh 20–21 Gatay Sampanna Baithakma Prastut Tatha Parit Bhyeko). Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi), VS 2048 [1992].
- . Rajnaitik Pratibedan: (Nepal Communist Party “Marxbadi” Ko 2049 Magh 6–9 Ma Sampanna Satau Rastriya Sammelanma Prastut Tatha Parit). Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi), Kendriya Samiti, VS 2049.
- NCP (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist). “Press Bigyapti.” Nepal Communist Party (Ma. Lay. Ma) Ko Sangchipta Karyakram. Np: Np, VS 2047 Paus 20 [4 January 1991]. 1.
- NCP (Masal). “Chunaolai Krantikari Rajnitiko Hatiyarka Rupma Upayog Garau.” Anka 39. VS 2052 Bhadra [March/April 1996]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 744–45.
- . “Madhyawadi Sansadiya Chunaosambandhi Prastao: (2051 Sal Bhadra 28 Gatay Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Kendriya Samitiko Chaitau Mahadhiwayshunpachiko Pahilo Bistarit Baithakma Parit).” VS 2051 Bhadra 28 [13 September 1994]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 593–99.
- . “Masal. Anka 20.” Asad 2046 [June/July 1989]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 711–14.
- NCP (Masal[Mashal]). “Party Ra Krantika Tatkalik Niti Ra Karyaharu: (Ne. Ka. Pa (Masal) Ko 2041 Ma Ayodhyama Sampanna Pachau Mahadhiwayshunma Parit Tatkalik Rajnitik Prastao).” VS 2041[1984/85]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 220–85.
- NCP (Masal). “Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Nirvachanko Mulyankansambandhi Prastao: (Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Kendriya Samitiko 2056 Jeth 27 Gatay Dekhi 31 Gataysamma Sampanna Baithakdwara Parit Prastao).” VS 2056 Jeth 26–31[9–14 June 1999]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 649–52.
- . “Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Nitisambandhi Baktabya: Aam Nirvachan, 2056 [1999].” Nd. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 643–8.
- . “Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra) Lai ‘RIM’ Ko Patra: (Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Kendriya Karyalaya Bhadra 2048).” VS 2048 Jestha 29 [12 June 1991]. Rato

- Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 431–41.
- . “Rajnitik Pratibedan: (2048 Sal Paus 20 Gataydekhi 24 Gataysamma Sampanna Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Chaitau Rastriya Sammelanma Kendriya Sangathan Samitika Tarfabata Com. Mohan Bikram Singhdwara Prastut Ra Parit).” VS 2048 Paus 20–24 [4–8 January 1992]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 442–63.
- . “Rajnitik Pratibedan: (2049 Aswin 1 Ra 2 Ma Sampanna Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Kendriya Sangathan Samitiko Bistarit Baithakma Mahamantri Com. Mohan Bikram Singhdwara Prastut Ra Parit).” VS 2049 Aswin 1–2 [17–18 September 1992]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 470–85.
- . “Rajnitik Pratibedan: (2051 Sal Jestha 11–20 Gataysamma Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Chaitau Mahadhiwayshunma Kendriya Sangathan Samitika Mahamantri Mohan Bikram Singhdwara Prastut Ra Parit).” VS 2051 Jestha 11–20 [25 May–3 June 1994]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 495–556.
- . “Rajnitik Prastao: (2047 Sal Asadko Pahilo Haptama [June 1990] Baseyko Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Kendriya Sangathan Samitiko Baithakma Parit).” VS 2047 Asad [June 1990]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 375–89.
- . “Sansadiya Chunao Bahiskarko Ghoshnapatra: (Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko 2047 Falgun 19–21 Ma Bhayeko Bistarit Baithakma Parit).” VS 2047 Falgun 19–21 [3–5 March 1991]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 410–22.
- . “Tatkalik Rajnitik Prastao: (2051 Marg 13, 14 Ra 15 Gatay Samma Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Kendriya Samitidwara Parit Prastao).” VS 2051 Marg 13–15 [27–29 January 1995]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 600–7.
- . “Tatkalik Rajnitik Prastao: (Ne. Ka. Pa. (Masal) Ko Kendriya Sangathan Samitiko 2049 Srawan 2 Gataydekhi 5 Samma Basayko Baithakma Parit).” VS 2049 Srawan 2–5 [17–20 July 1992]. Rato Tarwar: Dastabeja Bisheshanka. 1, _ ed. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Masal), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2059 Sravan [July/August 2002]. 464–69.
- NCP (ML). Bartaman Paristhiti Ra Partyko Daetwa: Ne. Ka. Pa. (Malay) Kendriya Committeeko Pachau Purna Baithak (7 Kartik Dekhi 24 Kartik 2047 Samma [October 31- November 10, 1990] Ma Mahasachiv Com. Madan Bhandaridwara

- Prastut Awam Parit Rajnitik Pratibedan. 1 and _ edition. Kathmandu: Prakashan Bibhag, Kendriya Committee, VS 2047 Mangshir [November/December 1990].
- NCP (M-L). "EMalay Bibhajanka Karanharu." Kendriya Karyalaya, Bagbazar, Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi-Leninbadi), 1998. Print.
- NCP (MLM). "Aam Nirvachan 2056 Ko Sambandhama Nepal Communist Party (MaLayMa Ko Abhimat." Kathmandu: Kendriya committee, Nepal Communist Party (MaLayMa [MLM]), VS 2055 Chaitra 16 [30 March 1999].
- NCP (ML). "Navayug." 1, VS 2048 Mangshir/Paus [November/December 1991].
- NCP (M-L). "Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi-Leninbadi): Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2056." Kendriya Karyalaya, Ne.Ka.Pa (MaLay): Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi-Leninbadi), 1999. Print.
- NCP (ML). "Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi-Leninbadi) Dosro Rastriya Karyakarta Bhela 2056 Bhadra 21–23, Pokharadwara Parit: Rajnitik Pratibedan Tatha Prastaoharu." Bagbazar, Kathmandu: NeKaPa (MaLay [NCP (ML)]), VS 2056 Bhadra 21–23 [6–8 September 1999].
- NCP (M-L). "Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi-Leninbadi) Ko Ghoshna-Patra." Kendriya Karyalaya, Ne.Ka.Pa (MaLay): Nepal Communist Party (Marxbadi-Leninbadi), 1998. Print.
- . . Bartaman Paristhitima Hamro Karyaniti. Kendriya Karyalaya, Bagbazar: B. Su. Rastriya Abhiyan Sanchalak Samiti, NeKaPa (MaLay), VS 2055 [1998/99]. Print.
- NCP (Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party). "Bisesh Adhiwayshun." Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: [Pratinidhi Sabhako Pachau Adhiwayshun (13 Asad -31 Bhadra 2050) Bisesh Adhiwayshun (12Falgun-23 Falgun 2050) Chaitao Adhiwayshun (14 Falgun- 26 Chaitra 2050) Ra Satau Adhiwayshun (15 Asad-26 Asad 2051) Ma Nepal Majdoor Kisan Partyka Adhyaksha Awam Sansad Narayan Man Bijukche (Com. Rohit) Lay Byakta Garnu Bhayeka Abhibyaktiharuko Sankalan]. Bhaktapur: Nepali Krantikari Mahila Sangh, Nagar Samiti, Bhaktapur, VS 2051 Falgun [Feb/March 1994]. 14–17.
- . Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party: Nirvachan Ghoshna-Patra 2051. Bhaktapur: Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party, Kendriya Chunao Prachar Samiti, VS 2051.
- . Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Partyko Mahanirvachan Singhawalokan 2048: [Nepal Majdoor Kisan Partyko 2048 Jeth 12–16 Gatay Baseko Kendriya Padadhikari Tatha Mahanirvachan 2048 Ka Ummedwarharu Ko Samyukta Bhelama Chalafala Gari Bhelapachi Baseyko Kendriya Samiti Dwara Parit Singhawalokan]. Kathmandu: Kendriya Prakashan Samiti, Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party, VS 2048 Jeth.
- . Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: [Pratinidhi Sabhako Pachau Adhiwayshun (13 Asad -31 Bhadra 2050) Bisesh Adhiwayshun (12Falgun-23 Falgun 2050) Chaitao Adhiwayshun (14 Falgun- 26 Chaitra 2050) Ra Satau Adhiwayshun (15 Asad-26 Asad 2051) Ma Nepal Majdoor Kisan Partyka Adhyaksha Awam Sansad Narayan Man Bijukche (Com. Rohit) Lay Byakta Garnu Bhayeka Abhibyaktiharuko

- Sankalan]. Bhaktapur: Nepali Krantikari Mahila Sangh, Nagar Samiti, Bhaktapur, VS 2050 [1993].
- . Pratinidhi Sabhama Com. Rohit: [Pratinidhi Sabhako Pahilo Adhiwayshun (2048 Asad 6 Dekhi Asoj 13 Gatay [20 June-29 September 1991]) Ma Nepal Majdoor Kisan Partyka Adhyaksha Awam Sansad Narayan Man Bijukche (Com. Rohit) Lay Byakt Garnu Bhayeka Abhibyaktiharuko Sankalan]. Kathmandu: Yuva Adhyayan Gosthi, VS 2048 Magh 4 [Jan 18, 1992].
- NCP (Prajatantrabadi). Nepal Communist Party (Prajatantrabadi) Ko Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2048. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist party (Prajatantrabadi), Kendriya Prachar Samiti, VS 2048 [1991].
- NCP (Pushpalal). “Nepal Communist Partyko Atharaha Barshako Krantikari Sangharshako Singhawalokan Awam Siksha: (2025 Jestha Gorakhpurma Sampanna Bhayeko Tesro Aitihisik Sammelandwara Parit).” VS 2025 Mangsir [November 1968]. Pushpalal Chaneyeka Rachana: Bhag 3. Comp. Pushpalal Smriti Pratisthan. Kathmandu: Pushpalal Smriti Pratisthan, n.d. 1–98.
- NCP (Samyukta (United)). Hamro Agami Rajnitik Karya: (2049 Falgun 28-Chaitra 2 Gatay [11–15 March 1993], Gaurma Sampanna NeKaPa (Samyukta) Ko Ekta Mahadhiwayshundwara Anumodit). Kathmandu: Kendriya Prachar Bibhag, Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta), VS 2049 Falgun [March/April 1993]. Pamphlet.
- . Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta) Kendriya Karya Samitidwara Anumodit Rajnitik Report (2052 Kartik 16–18 Gatay [2–4 November 1995], Mahottari). Np: Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta), VS 2052 [1995].
- . Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta) Ko Chunao Ghoshnapatra -2051. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta), Kendriya Prachar Bibhag, VS 2051.
- . Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta) Rastriya Sammelandwara Parit (2048 Chaitra 11–14 [24–27 March 1992]):Rajnitik Prastao. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta), Prachar Bibhag, Kendriya Karyalaya, Dillibazar, VS 2048 (1992).
- . Nepal Communist Party (Samyukta): Samyukta Ghoshna. Kathmandu: Np, nd. Pamphlet.
- NCP (UML). 2054–2-25 Gatay Baseko NeKaPa (EMalay) Sthayi Committeeko Baithakdwara Parit Prastao. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2054/2/27 [9 June 1997].
- . Bartaman Paristhiti Ra Hamro Party Samaksha Biddhaman Chunautiharu: Palpama Sampanna Rastriya Parishadko Pratham Purna Baithak (Jestha 14–16, 2051 [28 May-30 May 1994] Dwara Parit Pratibedan. Np: Kendriya Prachar Bibhag, Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay), VS Jeth 13, 2051 [27 May, 1994].
- . “Chunao Ghoshna-Patra 2056.” Balkhu: Kendriya Committee, NCP (UML), VS 2055 Chaitra 1 [15 March 1999].
- . Election Manifesto for Mid-Term Poll ‘94. Np: Central Committee, Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist-Leninist), 1994.

- . "Girija Sarkarlai Sattachut Garaun: Srawan 4 Ra 5 Gatay Chakka Jam Garaun." Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2050/3/25 [9 July 1993].
- . "Janata, Rastra Ra Prjatantrako Rakshaka Lagi Jujharu Pratirodh Sangharsama Utrau." Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2050/3/17 [1 July 1993].
- . Mahakali Nadiko Ekakrit Bikas Sambandhi Sandhi, Bhram Ra Wastawikta. Balkhu: Nepal Communist Party, Kendriya Karyalaya, 2053 Asoj [September/October 1996].
- . Mahakali Sandhi Anumodanbarey Samyukta Baktabya. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2053/6/3 [19 September 1996].
- . "Mahasachivko Pratibedan." VS 2058/4/26 [10 August 2001]. Kendriya Committeeko Bayesau Baithak (20–25 Srawan 2058) Ma Parit Dastabejharu. 2, _ ed. Madannagar, Balkhu: Kendriya Sachivalaya, Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay), VS 2058 Asvin. 1–25. VS 2058 Bhadra.
- . Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay) Ka Mahasachiv Com. Madhav Kumar Nepalko Baktabya. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2050/5/1 [17 August 1993].
- . Ne.Ka.Pa (EMalay) Kendriya Committeeko 24 Au Purna Baithakbata Parit Rajnitik Pratibedan. Madannagar, Balkhu: Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2052 Asoj 31 [17 October 1996].
- . Nepal Communist Party (Ekakrit Marxbadi Ra Leninbadi) Ko Chunoa Ghosna Patra. Np: Kendriya Prachar Prasar Samiti, Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay), VS 2048 [1992/93].
- Nepal Communist Party (Ekakrit Marxbadi Ra Leninbadi) Ko Goshna-Patra: 2047 Sal Paus 22 Gatay Dekhi 23 Gatay [6–7 January 1991] Samma Basesyko Rastriya Parishadko Baithakma Parit
- . Nepal Communist Party (Ekakrit Marxbadi-Leninbadi) Ko Chaitau Rastriya Mahadhiwayshun (Magh 12–18, 2054) Dwara Parit Janatako Bahudaliya Janabadko Tatkalik Karyaniti. 4, _ ed. Madannagar, Kathmandu: Kendriya Karyalaya, Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay), VS 2055 Mangshir. VS 2054 Falgun.
- . "Nepal Communist Party (Ekakrit Marxbadi-Leninbadi) Ko Chaitau Rastriya Mahadhiwayshun (Magh 12–18, 2054) Ma Chalafalaka Lagi Prastut : Bartaman Paristhitima Hamro Karyaniti (Farak Mat)." Madannagar, Kathmandu: Kendriya Karyalaya, Nepal Communist Party (EMaLay), 1998.
- . Nepali Krantikyo Karyakram: Janatako Bahudaliya Janabad Pachau Rastriya Mahadhiwayshun (VS 2049 Magh 14–20 [27Jan to 2 Feb. 1993]) Ma Parit. 6, _ ed. Madannagar, Balkhu: Ne. Ka. Pa. (Emalay), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2055 Mangshir [Nov/Dec 1998]. VS 2049 Chaitra [Mar/April 1993].
- . Press Baktabya: Mangharu Pura Gareyos Bhanney Baray. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2056/12/29 [11 April 2000].
- . Press Baktabya. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2056/11/16 [28 February 2000].
- . Press Baktabya. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2057/1/23 [5 May 2000].
- . Press Baktabya. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2057/1/4 [16 April 2000].

- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, 2050, June 11. 1+.
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2050/10/8 [20 Feb. 1994].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2050/1/2 [14 April 1993].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2051/3/27 [11 July 1994].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2051/3/31 [1994 July 15].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2051/8/4 [20 November 1994].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2053/5/24 [9 September 1996].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2053/6/14 [30 September 1996].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2053/6/29 [15 October 1996].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2056/7/10 [27 October 1999].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2056/7/15 [1 November 1999].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2056/8/3 [19 November 1999].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2057/7/22 [7 November 2000].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2057/8/13 [28 November 2000].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2058/11/1 [15 February 2002].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2058/1/6 [19 April 2001].
- . Press Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2058/2/13 [26 May 2001].
- . Press Statement. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2056/12/7 [20 March 2000].
- . Rajnitik Pratibedan: Janakpurma Sampanna Rastriya Parishadko Dosro Purna Baithak (25–27, Magh 2052) Dwara Parit Pratibedan. Kendriya Committee, Nepal Communist Party (EMaLay), 2052 Magh 5 [14 January 1996].
- . Rajnitik Pratibedan: Pachau Rastriya Mahadhiwayshun (VS 2049 Magh 14–20 [27 Jan-2 Feb 1993]). 5th. _ ed. Madannagar, Balkhu: Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2053 Aswin [Sept/Oct 1996]. VS 2049 Chaitra [Mar/April 1993].
- . Samachar Bulletin (Prakashnartha Presit). Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2051/3/28 [12 July 1994].
- . Samyukta Bigyapti. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2050/3/13 [27 June 1993].
- . Samyukta Press Baktabya. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2058/1/3 [16 April 2001].
- . Sangharsha Sambandhi Bishes Baktabya. Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2058/1/3 [16 April 2001].
- . Tatkalik Karyaniti: Pachau Rastriya Mahadhiwayshun (VS 2049 Magh 14–20 [27 Jan-2 Feb 1993]) Ma Parit. 2, _ ed. Madannagar, Balkhu: Ne. Ka. Pa (EMalay), Kendriya Karyalaya, VS 2055 Mangshir [Nov/Dec 1998]. VS 2049 Chaitra [Mar/April 1993].
- NCP (Unity Centre). All Patriots Unite: Revoke the 1950 Treaty. Np: Central Department of Publication, CPN (Unity Centre), 2000, June.
- . “Anusuchi 1.” Nau ‘Bam’ Ko Andolan Ra NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra). Kendriyaa Prakashan Bibhag: NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra), VS 2055 Baisakh 4 [17 April 1998].

- . "Baisakh 6 Gatayko Nirnaya." Nau 'Bam' Ko Andolan Ra NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra). Kendriyaa Prakashan Bibhag: NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra), VS 2055 Baisakh 6 [19 April 1998].
- . "The Communist Movement of Nepal :(From the Political Report Adopted by the 1st National Convention (1997) of Communist Party of Nepal (Unity Centre))." On the Communist Movement of Nepal and the Strategy and Tactics of Nepali Revolution. Np: Central Department of Publication, CPN (Unity Centre), 1998, Oct. 5–25.
- . "Gyapanpatra." Nau 'Bam' Ko Andolan Ra NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra). Kendriyaa Prakashan Bibhag: NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra), VS 2055/8/1 [21 April 1998]. 35–36.
- . "MaLay, Samyukta Sangharsa Ra Hamro Karyabhar." Nau 'Bam' Ko Andolan Ra NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra). Kendriyaa Prakashan Bibhag: NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra), VS 2055 Asad 29 [13 July 1998]. 10–15.
- . "'Nau Bam' Ra Sarkarbich Bhadra 6 Gatay Bhayeko Nau Bunday Samjhauta." Nau 'Bam' Ko Andolan Ra NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra). Kendriyaa Prakashan Bibhag: NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra), VS 2055 Bhadra 6 [22 July 1998].
- . "NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra) Ka Mahasachiv Com. Prakashdwara Awilamba Samyukta Andolanma Jutna Bishesh Awahan." Nau 'Bam' Ko Andolan Ra NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra). Kendriyaa Prakashan Bibhag: NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra), VS 2054 Chaitra 31 [13 April 1998]. 2–5.
- . "Sangharsalai Naya Uchai Pradan Garna Ekjut Hoau." Appeal. Nau 'Bam' Ko Andolan Ra NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra). Kendriyaa Prakashan Bibhag: NeKaPa (Ekta Kendra), VS 2055 Jeth 24 [7 June 1998]. 6–9.
- NCP (Verma). Ajako Hamro Karya. Kathmandu: Nepal Communist Party [Verma], Kendriya Prachar Samiti, VS 2047 [1990/91].
- . Chunao Ghoshnapatra. Kathmandu: Kendriya Prachar Bibhag, Nepal Communist Party (Verma), VS 2048 [1991/92].
- Ne. Ka. Pa (Ekta Kendra). "Chunao Upyogdwara Janatalai Prasikchit Garnay Niti Nai Ahilayko Sandarbham Thik Niti Ho." Sansadiya Nirvachanbarey Com. Prakashka Bicharharu. Kathmandu: Prarambha Prakashan Pvt. Ltd, 2055. 1–9.
- Nepal Majdoor Kisan Party (NCP (NWPP)). "Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party Nirvachan Ghoshnapatra 2056 [May 1999]." Bhaktapur: Nepal Majdoor-Kisan Party, Kendriya Chunao Prachar Samiti, VS 2055 Chaitra [March/April 1999].
- Prakash, pseud for Narayan Kazi Shrestha. "Communist Party Ra Pratikriyabadi Sarkar." Krantikari Marxbad Ra Nepali Kranti. Kendriya Prakashan Bibhag, Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra), VS 2052 Paus [December/January 1995/96]. 43–8.
- Rastriya Janamorcha. "Chunao Goshnapatra 2055 [1999]." Kathmandu: Rastriya Janamorcha, Kendriya Karyalaya, 2055.
- Rastriya Sammelan Ayojak samiti NCP (Ekta Kendra). "Rastriya Sammelan Ayojak Samitiko Ahawan." Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra) Ko Ekta Mahadhiwayshundwara

Nirwachit "Bhinnamat" Ka Ke. Sa. Sa Haru Tatha Rastriya Sallahakar Parishadka Adhyakshadwara Sampurna Party Sadasyaharulai: Appeal. Np: Rastriya Sammelan Ayojak Samiti, Nepal Communist Party (Ekta Kendra), 2051, Feb. 15. 47–8.

Rising Nepal. "116 VDCs Complete LBOVO," 1995, June 28. 1+.

---. "6 More Ministers Declare Property," 1994, Dec. 16.

---. "Accord Democratic Practice: Chataut," 1993, Aug. 20. 1+.

---. "Another Faction Joins UML," 1992, Dec. 7.

---. "Baburam Blasts Faction," 1994, June 31.

---. "Bandh Disrupts Normal Life," 1993, Mar. 15. 1+.

---. "Bandh Peaceful, Mixed Effects in Districts," 1994, May 5. 1+.

---. "Baton-Charge in Gaighat," 1995, May 5.

---. "Benefits Being Considered," 1991, June 30.

---. "Bhandari, Ashrit Missing as Jeep Falls Into Trishuli," 1993, May 17. 1+.

---. "Bhandari Urges Govt. to Combat Corruption," 1992, Aug. 1. 1+.

---. "Bhattarai Ousted as Convenor of UPFN," 1994, May 23. 1+.

---. "Bhattarai Seeks Cooperation," 1990, May 3.

---. "Breakaway Leaders Call for Wider Front," 1990, Dec. 20.

---. "Breakaway More Citicized," 1990, Dec. 13. 1+.

---. "Bright Prospect for Unity: Says Manandhar," 1990, May 15. 1+.

---. "C. P. Mainali: A Short Biography," 1994, Dec. 16.

---. "Call for Talks Between Govt., Civil Servants," 1991, July 12.

---. "Civil Servants End Agitation," 1991, Aug. 25. 1+.

---. "Civil Servants' Memorandum to Girija," 1991, June 15. 1+.

---. "Communist Parties to Unite," 1990, Oct. 11. 1+.

---. "Communist Unity Urged," 1991, Aug. 10.

---. "Complete Democracy Needed: Bhandari," 1991, June 6. 1+.

---. "Council Begins Discussion," 1991, July 6. 1+.

---. "Council Discusses Civil Servants' Movement," 1991, July 18.

---. "CPN (Maoist) to Boycott Election," 1995, June 25.

---. "CPN (Masal) Split Over Participation in Election," 1991, Mar. 21.

---. "CPN (ML) to Start New Unity Talks," 1990, Dec. 18.

---. "CPN-ML Decides to Join NC Govt," 1998, Aug. 17. 1+.

---. "CPN-ML Registered at Parliament Secretariat," 1998, Mar. 6. 1+.

---. "Debate Shifts to Khanal," 1993, Feb. 26.

---. "Develop Ties with India, NCP (Marxist) Says," 1995, Jan. 3.

---. "Das Dhunga Report," 1994, Dec. 24. 1+.

---. "Dhungana Elected Speaker Unopposed," 1991, June 24. 1+.

---. "DPM Engaged in Hectic Schedule in New Delhi," 1995, Feb. 7. 1+.

---. "Efforts on to Bring UNPM Into ULF," 1990, Aug. 24.

- . "Essential Services Act 2014 Imposed," 1991, July 23.
- . "Five Parties Form Bam Morcha," 2002, Oct. 4. 1+.
- . Four Constituents Dissociate from United Left Front. Kathmandu: Rising Nepal, 1990, Dec. 11.
- . "Fourth Congress Stresses Unity Talks," 1990, Nov. 20.
- . "From Rebel-Chief to Head of Govt," 2006, Aug. 16.
- . "Gautam Nominated as CPN-ML's PP Leader," 1998, Mar. 8.
- . "Govt. Budget Estimates of Rs. 42, 690, 611 Million," 1994, Dec. 27. 1+.
- . "Guranteed Multi-Party Democracy: NCP (ML)," 1990, July 9. 1+.
- . "HM Addresses Joint Sitting of Parliament," 1994, Dec. 24. 1+.
- . "HMG Issues Another Notice Urging Employees to Cooperate," 1991, July 3. 1+.
- . "House Deadlock Continues as Opposition Boycott Meet," 1999, Aug. 30. 1+.
- . "Immediate Promulgation of Constitution Demanded," 1990, Oct. 13.
- . "Immediate Relief to the People Urged," 1991, Aug. 18. 1+.
- . "It is Victory for All, Says Koirala," 1994, Mar. 8.
- . "Janamorcha Puts Forth Demands," 1995, Jan. 27. 1+.
- . "Land Allotted to 9, 538 Families," 1995, Apr. 18. 1+.
- . "LBOVO Review," 1995, May 26. 1+.
- . "Left Demo Over Tanakpur," 1993, Feb. 12.
- . "Left Opposition Boycott Session," 1991, Aug. 10. 1+.
- . "Left Parties Stage Protest Demonstration," 1992, Dec. 17. 1+.
- . "Leftist Parties to Form National Front," 1995, June 25. 1+.
- . "Leftists Assail Govt. on Tanakpur," 1992, Sept. 10. 1+.
- . "Leftists to Stage Protest Demonstrations," 1992, Sept. 6.
- . "Let's Consolidate, Says UML," 1996, Feb. 9.
- . "Long Innings in Politics," 1991, May 25. 1+.
- . "Lower House Discusses Agitation," 1991, July 25. 1+.
- . "Marxist Endorse Basic Points for Unity," 1991, Jan. 6. 1+.
- . "Masal Support to ANPA on Elections," 1992, May 21.
- . "Mass Meeting Organised," 1991, July 28. 1+.
- . "ML to Launch 'Let's Go to Kalapani' Drive," 1998, June 1. 1+.
- . "Motion About Commission on Squatters Passed," 1991, Aug. 5. 1+.
- . "MPs Demand to Know Govt. Step on Civil Servants Protest," 1991, July 8. 1+.
- . "MPs Eager to Know Details," 1991, Aug. 6. 1+.
- . "MPs Focus on Squatters," 1995, Jan. 26. 1+.
- . "MPs Squabble Over Report," 1994, Dec. 25.
- . "NC Flays Left's Bandh Call," 1991, Aug. 17. 1+.
- . "NC Parliamentary Party Unanimous to Face No Trust Move," 1994, Feb. 29. 1+.

- . "NC, UML Hold Talks: Enquiry Panel Formation Among 6 Points Agreed," 1992, May 1.
- . "NCP (Amatya) Manifesto," 1991, Apr. 6. 1+.
- . "NCP (Democratic), Samyukta Jana Morcha Give Manifesto," 1990, Mar. 29. 1+.
- . "NCP Founder Member Joins NCP (Verma)," 1990, June 2.
- . "NCP (United) Expels Four Members," 1992, July 24. 1+.
- . "NCP (United) Forms Central Committee," 1992, Mar. 31. 1+.
- . "NCP (United) not to Involve in Strike," 1991, Aug. 21.
- . "NDP Party Unification Complete," 1992, Feb. 4.
- . "'Nepal Bandh' Has No Significance, Says Bhandari," 1992, May 2.
- . "Nine Left Appeal the UN," 1998, June 30.
- . "Opposition Creates Rumpus," 1993, Feb. 15. 1+.
- . "Opposition Demand Judicial Inquiry," 1992, Apr. 10. 1+.
- . "Opposition MPs Boycott Meeting," 1991, July 11. 1+.
- . "Opposition Parties Except NSP Stage Walk-Out," 1992, Feb. 24.
- . "'Paper Like the Previous One'," 1994, Dec. 26. 1+.
- . "Parties to Merge Today," 1991, July 20.
- . "Patan Observes a Complete Bandh," 1990, Oct. 29. 1+.
- . "People Should Be Source of New Constitution," 1990, July 6. 1+.
- . "PM, Nepal, Oli Disclose Assets," 1994, Dec. 14.
- . "Political Parties Reject Palace Draft," 1990, Oct. 24.
- . "Poudel Revelation Gives Tanakpur Tangle a New Turn," 1993, Feb. 23.
- . "Procession," 1993, Aug. 21.
- . "Programmes No False Assurances," 1991, July 9. 1+.
- . "Protesting Employees Warned," 1991, July 14.
- . "Ratification Result of National Consensus," 1996, Sept. 21. 1+.
- . "Recent Pact High Level Understanding," 1993, Aug. 20.
- . "Rohit Affirms Support to Govt," 1991, June 7. 1+.
- . "Sahana Pradhan Elected President of CPN-ML Party," 1998, Mar. 14. 1+.
- . "SJM Delegation Meet Deuba," 2000, Apr. 5. 1+.
- . "SJM Holds Protest Rally," 1995, Dec. 9. 1+.
- . "SJM, Masal Flay Govt," 1995, May 24. 1+.
- . "SJM Releases 6-Point Demand," 1994, Apr. 11. 1+.
- . "SJM Says Mahakali Treaty is Treason," 1996, Feb. 6. 1+.
- . "SJM (Vaidya) Given Official Recognition," 1994, Aug. 19.
- . "SJM Wants 1950 Treaty Abrogated," 1995, Apr. 25.
- . "SJM War of Words Continues," 1994, July 3. 1+.
- . "Some Press Act Provisions 'Undemocratic'," 1991, June 6. 1+.
- . "Stop Operation Romeo: MP," 1996, Jan. 4.
- . "Suggestions to CRC," 1990, July 20.

- . "Team to Be Sent to Rolpa Soon: Khadka," 1995, Dec. 12. 1+.
- . "Thakur Elected Deputy Speaker," 1991, July 1. 1+.
- . "Torch Light Demos Held," 1993, Mar. 14.
- . "Trade Union Congress Gives Memorandum," 1991, June 11.
- . "Transport Workers' Team Calls on PM," 1991, June 13.
- . "Tussle Between UML Factions Continues," 1997, Feb. 25. 1+.
- . "ULF Calls for General Strike Nov, 7," 1990, Nov. 2. 1+.
- . "ULF Demands Interim Act," 1990, June 7.
- . "ULF Nixes Compromises on Fundamentals of Constitution," 1990, Oct. 28. 1+.
- . "ULF Submits 14-Point Demands," 1990, May 10. 1+.
- . "UML Accused of Being Authoritative," 1991, Mar. 9.
- . "UML Calls Off All Protest Programmes," 1993, Aug. 18.
- . "UML not to Take Part in Nepal Bandh," 1992, May 1. 1+.
- . "UML Objects to Framing Laws Without House Approval," 1991, June 7.
- . "UML Sit-in at NEA," 1992, Apr. 23.
- . "UML to Come Out in the Streets," 1991, July 25. 1+.
- . "UML to Continue Joint Struggle," 2001, Mar. 24.
- . "UML's Candle Procession," 1992, Apr. 24.
- . "Unity Centre Plans Protest Programmes," 1992, Jan. 23. 1+.
- . "UNPM for Nationalising All Ill Gotten Assets," 1990, Apr. 17. 1+.
- . "UNPM for Unified Communist Party," 1990, May 2.
- . "UNPM Mass Meeting," 1990, Nov. 3. 1+.
- . "UNPM Team Meets Bhattarai with Demands," 1990, May 1. 1+.
- . "UPF Firm on Boycotting by-Elections," 1994, Jan. 26.
- . "Victory for Bhandari," 1994, Feb. 10.
- . "Visit Highly Satisfactory: Tanakpur, 1950 Treaty Discussed," 1995, Feb. 10. 1+.
- . "Work for New ULF Creation," 1990, Dec. 16. 1+.

Rohit, Com. Comrade Rohit on Current Politics of Nepal. Bhaktapur: Nepal Workers & Peasants' Party, Central Publishing Committee Nepal, VS 2052 Srawan [August 1995]. Booklet.

Samanya Prasasan Mantralaya. "Nijamati Sewa (Athayesau Sansodhan) Niyamawali, 2047." Nepal Rajpatra, Bhag 3. Khanda 40, Sankhya 48. HMG, VS 2047 Chait 4 [18 March 1991]. 1-9.

Samyukta Bam Morcha. Samyukta Bam Morcha Ko Ghoshna-Patra. Np: Np, VS 2046 [1989/90].

Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolan. Samyukta Rastriya Jana Andolanko Niti Ra Karyakram Sambandhi Baktabya. Kathmandu: Kendriya Prachar Bibhag, Nepal Marxbadi-Leninbadi Party, nd.

Sharma, Jan. Democracy Without Roots. 1, _ ed. Delhi: Book Faith India, 1998.

Whelpton, John. "The General Election of May 1991." Nepal in the Nineties: Versions of the Past, Visions of the Future. Ed. Michael Hutt. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1994. 48-81.

---. A History of Nepal. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. 2005.