CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

South Asia has had a long history of witnessing different types of violent political conflicts in general and the intra-state ones in particular. Starting from the mighty country in the region, India, to the poorest of the region, Nepal, each state experience these violent political conflicts in one form or the other. These violent political conflicts have been addressed differently, mostly under the demanding situation of the concerned country or by the scholars of different orientations. Every time these problems being studied, there have been different aspects emerged, on the question how to understand them or how to resolve the same. However, these conflicts refuse to die in spite of all the initiatives taken by the authorities of the state or of different interpretations or understanding by the scholars. Of all the violent political conflicts being talked here the prominent ones have been the LTTE of Sri Lanka, Maoist Insurgency Movements in Nepal, various similar kinds of movements in India and Bangladesh and the Baluchistan Movement in Pakistan. Whatever the international scenario talks on the matter of terrorism especially the cross border ones, these internal political conflicts, starting from India to Sri Lanka to Nepal to Pakistan, have become more dire.

The above mentioned violent political conflicts are termed differently by many scholars. They are termed as insurgency, terrorism, extremism, revolution, civil war, naxalism, guerrilla warfare, coup d’état etc. Mostly these terms are used interchangeably with each other. There need not to be any doubt that every term that has been mentioned above is different from the other and has its own connotations. However, the present study is an attempt to study the
insurgency movements being faced by the different countries of South Asia. To be more specific on the area of this research, it studies in detail the Maoist insurgency in Nepal. There have been a number of questions on the Maoist movement in Nepal. And how such a movement affects the South Asia in general and India in particular?

It is important to note that, the Maoist insurgency in Nepal, with all its devastating results in the ten years of operation, emerged in the second poorest country in the world. Since its emergence in the year 1996, the Maoists of Nepal have not only created a political instability in the country but also challenged the legitimacy of an established government and a centuries old monarchy. Thousands of lives have been lost; many have been displaced through the process of the insurgency and the counter insurgency measures by the government.

The Maoists of Nepal had not only affected the socio-politico and economic sphere of Nepal but also it had its spillover effect in the South Asia region in general and the state of India in particular. Links between the likeminded groups of the Maoists in Nepal and the other countries of South Asia were matter of concern for all the South Asian countries. The ideological orientations of the Maoists of Nepal, as the name suggests, forced the countries like India to think over its policy towards Nepal in relation to china. The present study is an attempt to study the insurgency movement in South Asia with a special reference to Nepal. The time period is from 1996 to 2005. The rationale behind the time period chosen is that 1996 was the year when the Maoist movement emerged and continued till 2005. Though the Maoists were very much active after the year 2005, but they were more into a peace talk than into insurgency activities. Because in the year 2006, the Maoists of Nepal laid down their arms and took part in the
democratic process along with the other political parties of Nepal. These parties had formed an alliance called Seven party Alliance (SPA). The present study is divided into six chapters including the introduction and conclusion.

The second chapter of the thesis deals with the issue of ‘insurgency’ in general and the insurgency movements in South Asia in particular. We have first attempted to define the term insurgency. This chapter also tries to differentiate between the terms like insurgency and related terms like revolution, upsurge, terrorism, civil war, naxalism, guerrilla warfare, coup d’état etc. The typologies of the insurgency movements and their characteristics in South Asia are also explained. An attempt is made to explore the national peculiarities among the insurgency movements in South Asia. This chapter also seeks to find out the objectives of an insurgency movement and its popular base. Defining the term ‘insurgency’ is not only a difficult task but also tricky. Because the term insurgency most of the time has been intertwined and confused with other terms like, subversion, coup d’état, terrorism, guerrilla warfare, revolution, civil war, etc. The understanding of the term insurgency was first attempted by the military experts of US in 1960s. They thought that an insurgency is a political and social consequence of discrimination, exploitation and injustice of a country. Hence they did not give any specific importance to the word as a separate facet of war making or as a separate strategic thought. In the process of understanding the term, there have been continuous refinement and redefinition. The first ever study to deal with insurgency as a separate concept was that of David Galula. In his book Counterinsurgency Warfare, he defined insurgency as, “… insurgency is a protracted struggle conducted methodically, step by step, in order to attain specific intermediate objectives, leading
finally to overthrow of the existing order”.¹ There are many scholars who tried to define ‘insurgency’. Donald Hamilton in his book, *Art of Insurgency*, defined insurgency as a “political-military conflict waged against a specific faction(s) implementing irregular military actions in support of a unified political outcome, short of revolution and civil war”². On the objective of an insurgent movement Hamilton adds that, “the objective of an insurgency is to force political social upheaval in an organized fashion for the express purpose of validating a cause and therefore justifying its violent means”³. Bard E O’Neill explains an insurgency as “a struggle between a non-ruling group and the ruling authorities in which the former consciously employs political resources, (organizational skills, propaganda and or demonstrations) and instruments of violence to establish legitimacy for some aspect of political system it considers illegitimate”⁴. Insurgency, according to Paul Wilkinson, is “a relatively value-neutral concept denoting a rebellion or rising against any government in power or the civil authorities”⁵.

From the definitions given above one may find out some common elements. The most striking and important common element contained in of all the definitions is the aspect of use of violence against the ruling groups. Most of the scholars also place stress on the guerrilla warfare as an inescapable element of the insurgency movement. But some way or the other the definitions mentioned earlier are not able to give a generalized kind of definition that would deal
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³ ibid.


with the insurgency holistically. Because to define insurgency merely as an armed struggle against any government, state or an authority would definitely not do justice to the term. While the armed struggle is an inescapable element of an insurgency, there are some other factors like the method of warfare, strategy, ideological affiliation, also matter a lot. The definitions mentioned here only speak about the guerrilla warfare as the method of warfare in an insurgency. But it is important to mention that, with the development of the information technology and the accessibility of the modern arms to the non state actors the insurgents are also capable of waging a fully fledged conventional war against the state or the government.

Insurgencies, worldwide in general and in South Asia in particular, have different affiliations. Sometimes an insurgency group can be a secessionist, nationalist, ethno-nationalist or conservative in nature. Insurgency movements are also mobilized by an ideology. There are many factors that give rise to an insurgency. One of the major factors in this regard is the legitimacy crisis. Legitimacy of an authority gives the moral and rational ground on which it may demand obedience from the citizens. Hence, legitimacy crisis, can give rise to an insurgency like situation in a country. Apart from the legitimacy crisis, the other factors that give rise to an insurgency are: the appearance of a systematic crisis in the political system; the occurrence of series of precipitants of accelerators of the crisis; the emergence of counter elite groups; the formulation of an insurrectionist ideology.

One of the terms that has been often used as an equivalent to insurgency is ‘revolution’. The politics of substituting ‘revolution’ with insurgency is that, individuals who are associated with an insurgency group directly or indirectly in an insurgent movement take a negative view of
the term insurgency. However, revolution, as it has been widely understood, is a sudden development in any field. Revolution is a concept which is more comprehensive. Politically it is a sudden change of decision makers. It is a drastic cut from the past socially, economically and politically as well. Accordingly, revolution does not confine itself into the political sphere only. Insurgency, as defined earlier, is political in nature with an aim to change the regime or the government which it thinks as illegitimate. In addition to this a political revolution takes place as sudden phenomena aiming not necessarily a total change in the government, though the factors responsible for the revolution are long pending.

Another term that has been used as a substitute to insurgency is ‘terrorism’. One of the basic distinctions between these two terms is, unlike the insurgents the terrorists are divided into small compartmentalized groups and the objectives and the methods of warfare are never open. These small groups carry out their activities as anonymously as possible. On the lines of the direct fight with the state army and police, having popular support, an insurgency differs from terrorism. It is not surprising that the insurgent groups also apply terror methods in their operations. Terrorism is more a method of struggle than a category of its own.

Civil war is another important term which has been used as a substitute with insurgency. Unlike insurgency, a civil war splits resources and even territory divided for a further contest of power conventional process over the entire country. However, all the insurgencies may develop their strength to a capacity which may lead to civil war in a country. The insurgents can become
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a parallel power force only when there is a weak army, weak government or the insurgent group having extra-ordinary military power and people support.

So far as the forms of warfare of an insurgency are concerned, the insurgent groups adopt the methods according to the suitability of the circumstance and the stage of the insurgency. Broadly the insurgencies adopt two types of warfare methods. The first one is the Guerrilla warfare and the second one is the Terrorist warfare. Guerrilla warfare is an important form of warfare in most of the insurgency movement. Since the primary aim and the objective of an insurgency is to overthrow the government through an armed struggle, the insurgency fights the state army which is comparatively superior and more powerful than the insurgents. Hence at the initial stage and/or for a long time of the insurgency, guerrilla warfare remains to be the major form of warfare for an insurgency. An insurgency also adopts and uses the terrorist form of warfare, where either the state is more powerful than expected by the insurgents or in order to get the popular support through the use of force. Apart from these above mentioned two types of the warfare, insurgencies in these days also have the capacity to wage a fully fledged conventional modern warfare. An insurgency movement also can be prone to propaganda warfare.

Any form of warfare used by an insurgency has to have a particular strategy to make the movement win against the state. So far as the strategies of insurgencies are concerned some of the important strategies are discussed in this chapter. One of the very important strategies adopted by the insurgent groups is the Leninist Strategy. Insurgencies adopting the Leninist strategy concentrate their activities in the urban areas which have political and economic powers. Importance is given to small but highly disciplined and organized groups to fight the state.
Leninist insurgents give importance to conspiratorial organization combined with active support from selected social groups. Secondly, there are insurgent groups which believe in the Maoist strategy. As the name suggests these strategies were advocated by Mao during the Cultural Revolution in China. The insurgent groups which follow the Maoist strategies believe in three main elements. They are: popular support, organization and the environment. As Mao advocated, these insurgent groups follow three stages of warfare: terrorism, guerilla warfare and the mobile conventional warfare. Thirdly, an alternative to Maoist strategy, Cuban strategy is also followed by many insurgencies. This strategic framework was advocated by Che Guevara. Though the strategies given by him sounds almost like the Maoist strategies, yet he differed from him from in a fundamental aspect. Unlike the Maoist strategy, the Cuban strategy advocates that, an insurgency need not to wait until all the conditions are favorable for it: the insurgency can create them\(^7\). Ideas of Cuban strategy vis-à-vis, guerrilla warfare, country side as the basic area of the armed fighting are almost the same as the Maoist strategy advocated. Fourthly, urban strategy, followed by an insurgent group, situates the activism initially in the cities. So far as the strategy of the urban insurgency is concerned, they like to “turn political crisis into armed conflict by performing violent actions that will force those in power to transform the political situation of the country into a military situation. And that will alienate the masses who from then on will revolt against the army and the police and thus blame them for this state of things\(^8\)”.

Organizationally, these insurgents rely on small cells with a linkman and puts stress on organization, propaganda and terrorism as their techniques.
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\(^8\) For details see Carlos Marghella, “On Principles and Strategic Questions” as cited in Bard E. O’Neill’s, *Insurgency: A Frame work of Analysis*, No-4, p. 33
We may now turn to various armed movements in South Asian region. The question that may be asked here is whether all the armed movements in this region fall under the insurgency category. Because South Asia as a region has been experiencing several armed conflicts against various governments particularly in post colonial period in particular. In the process of dealing with some of the major armed conflicts, we have attempted to find out whether, all of them are similar in nature or they have their own peculiarities depending on the specificities of the environment and the area.

In the following chapter we propose to study the historical background of the Communist movement in Nepal in general and the emergence of the Maoist insurgency in particular. In the process of dealing with the historical background of the Maoist insurgency, this chapter also discusses the causes of the emergence of the Maoists in Nepal. The communist movement in Nepal was inspired by the Communist Party of India. For the first time the communist movement in Nepal emerged when there was a strike by the workers at the Biratnagar Jute mill in 1947. The man who led the strike was Man Mohan Adhikari. Man Mohan Adhikari at that time was a member of the Communist Party of India. Another man, who was an active member of Nepali Congress, left the party and determined to start a communist movement in Nepal, was Puspa Lal Shrestha. For the first time he translated the Communist Manifesto into Nepali language in April 1949. To some this was the time when the communist party of Nepal was established. This translated version of the Communist Manifesto was made public in 15th September 1949. Since there is posit of information on the origin of the CPN, different views are expressed by different people.
The party’s slogan at its founding convention was, ‘civil liberties for all the classes’\(^9\). The communist groups were active as part of the Mukti Sena (Liberation Army). Through its leaflets distributed to the people in 1949 it was declared that, “Nepal should establish a ‘new democracy’ as in China- if necessary through armed struggle- so as to create a People’s Republic”\(^10\). During the period of the emergence of the communists in Nepal (1947-49), Nepal was ruled by the Ranas\(^11\). There was a discontent among the people against the Rana regime. In 1950-51 a “revolution” was started against the Ranas led by the Nepali Congress. The Ranas were dethroned and a democracy of sorts set up was introduced in the sense Nepal had an elected Prime Minister although the Monarch continued. However, the Communists of Nepal were not very clear about their role during the 1950 revolution. The CPN was very critical about the Nepali Congress, since the Nepali Congress had its association with the disgruntled section of the Ranas. The Communist party of Nepal (CPN) was also very critical about the outcome of the 1951 revolution. In its First Convention, the CPN’s stand was that the 1951 revolution had no political significance, since it was not a total revolution. Subsequently, the CPN committed itself to strive for an all party conference, an interim government and elected constituent Assembly. It failed to influence for the above causes because of the lack of organizational base. From its first congress in the year 1951, till 1960 the CPN witnessed a number of disagreements and intra-party conflicts. These conflicts and disagreements came to become formal for the first time when the CPN got divided on the issue of supporting the king on his action of banning the political parties and introducing a new constitution. By the year 1962, the CPN was divided more on the
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\(^10\) As cited in Karki Arjun and Seddon David (ed), *The Peoples; War in Nepal: Left Perspective*, (Adroit Publishers, Delhi, 2003), P.6

\(^11\) The ‘Ranas’ used to be the Prime Ministers of the ‘Shah’ Kings in Nepal prior to 1848. In 1848 the Prime Minister Jung Bahadur Rana took over power from the Shaha King through a massacre which was known as Kot Massacre. The Ranas ruled Nepal from 1848 to 1950 on the hereditary basis.
ideological lines. One group supporting the Soviet line led by Rayamajhi and the other consisting of leaders like Pushpa Lal, Man Mohan Adhikari and Tulsi Amatya comprised a pro-China faction.

The new constitution that was introduced by the king Mahendra established what was known as the Panchayat regime. During the Panchayat regime there was a crisis in the CPN leadership and most of the party cadres were either in jail and or hiding in India. Though all of them were-by and large-affiliated to the CPN, but their activities had hardly co-ordinated, since there was no central command structure. A number of cadres like Man Mohan Adhikari and Shambhu Ram Shrestha wanted to co-ordinate the divisions and to have a central committee. They were released in 1968 from the jail as they agreed to assist and support the king without reservation. In 1971 both Nirmal Lama and Mohan Bikram Singh were also released and a ‘central nucleus’ was formed to unify party apparatus. The aim was to bring the various strands of the communist movement under one party umbrella. The central nucleus also tried to include the Puspa Lal party into it. But Puspa Lal wanted others to join his party and remained strong on working with the Nepali congress against the Panchayat Regime.

One of the major successes and the landmarks of the CPN after the first decade of the panchayat rule was the Jhapa uprising. For the first time in the history of Nepal a group

---

12. Panchayat Democracy was introduced in 1962 by King Mahendra in Nepal by dismissing the Constitution of 1959. According to the Panchayat democracy all the political parties were banned. This was otherwise known as partyless panchayat democracy. According to the legislation of 1962, Panchayat Democracy would have four tier structure: village panchayat, district panchayat, zonal panchayat and national panchayat. The Panchayat Democracy continued from 1962 to 1990. This period is otherwise known as Panchayat Era/Regime. For details of Panchayat Democracy see Bhuwan Lal Joshi and Leo E. Rose, *Democratic Innovations in Nepal*, (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966), pp. 395-442

influenced by the Indian Naxalites and the ideas of Mao raised an armed struggle against the local establishment and the local land lords. Though it was crushed brutally, this uprising led the path towards establishing the CPN (ML). An underground convention was held and the All Nepal Communist Co-ordination committee Marxist Leninist (ML) was formed in 1975. Over next few years other localized movements also joined the committee and finally communist party of Nepal (Marxist Leninist) was established on 26th December 1978. The ML rejected the simple application of imported dogma and recognized the need to analyze and understand the objective conditions of Nepal. It also emphasized that, a distinctive revolutionary Nepali road to socialism would be based on an understanding of economic and social conditions in Nepal\textsuperscript{14}. CPN (ML) was involved with a process of incorporating the smaller groups within it and by the time of 1990 people’s movement, it had become the largest communist organization in the country having networks in 50 districts\textsuperscript{15}. 

Interestingly, one finds that the communist movement in Nepal had as many as twenty different factions of the communist party. Ironically, some of them had few members, but their ideological and strategic moorings did not show wide divergence. The communists, irrespective of their ideological and strategic moorings do not show wide divergence. The communists maintained National level prominence because of continued support from the peasants’ and workers’ organizations. The country’s poverty and deprivation offered a fertile ground for the communist ideal. The split in CPN went on widening because of personality clashes between leaders and factors like parochialism and regionalism\textsuperscript{16}. 

\textsuperscript{14} As mentioned in Arjun Karki and David Seddon, No.9, P.11.
\textsuperscript{15} See Deepak Thapa, No.10, P.26.
\textsuperscript{16} As mentioned in Lokraj Baral, Oppositional Politics in Nepal, (Abhinava Publication, Delhi, 1971), P. 83.
Various factions of the CPN were brought together by CPN (ML) in 1989 to join with the Nepali congress and to bring an end to the Panchayat regime. As early as 1990, seven communist parties made an alliance and came to be known as the United Left front (ULF). However, two factions of the CPN named Mashal and Masal did not join the ULF. They instead launched their own anti-panchayat agitation with other smaller left parties under the banner of United National People’s Movement (UNPM). But the UNPM also soon fell apart. A new alliance between the CPN (Fourth Congress) and Masal and the CPN (Unity Centre) was formed. The Unity Center was later joined by a splinter group from Masal headed by Baburam Bhattarai. The political branch of the Unity center which contested in the General election after the 1990 revolution emerged as the third largest party. In 1994 there was a split in the Unity Center and a faction led by Pusgpa Kamal Dahal (Prachand) advocated an armed struggle. In March 1995, the Unity centre (Prachanda faction) renamed itself as the Communist party of Nepal (Maoist) and formally adopted the doctrine of armed struggle. On 4th February 1996, Baburam Bhattarai presented the Nepali Congress led government with a forty point demands. The letter contained an ultimatum that the government should initiate positive steps towards the fulfillment of its demands by 17th of the same month or else they would be forced to resort to an armed struggle against the state.

The Maoists of Nepal struck on 13th of February 1996 before the expiry of their deadline. Since the emergence of the Maoists in Nepal till the year 2005, there had been loss of life and property. The political instability caused by the Maoist could dethrone the centuries old monarchy. The outside observers of Nepal believe that the reason for the emergence of the Maoists in Nepal attribute the political instability in Nepal. The Nepali government itself thought
that it was a law and order problem. This chapter seeks to understand the emergence of the Maoists in Nepal taking into consideration of factors like Social, political and economic.

One of the major demands which the Maoists of Nepal included in their forty point demand was the question of the social disparities in Nepal and the economic inequality. The social structure in Nepal is highly hierarchical. The castes like the Bahuns (Brahmins) and the Chetris (Kshatriyas) dominate the social structure where the tribals like the Tharus, limbus, Magars and the Indian origin yadavs living in the terai region of Nepal are considered as the second class citizens of Nepal. For centuries Nerpali as a language has been imposed as a national and official language on the above mentioned tribals and non-Nepali speaking populations. But for centuries Nepal has been a state dominated by the Hindu rulers. The Buddhists and the other sections of the religious belief did not have much of a say in the affairs of the state. Hence the centuries old domination by the Hindus caused the oppressed ethnicities and other religions to support the Maoist insurgency.

Secondly, the social hierarchy replicates the economic uneven distribution in Nepal. Since the military and the civil servants are based at the Kathmandu valley development programmes were Kathmandu centered. In addition to this, the western regions of Nepal are among the poorest regions in Nepal. While the terai region is suitable for agriculture there is a little scope for agriculture in the western and the mid western regions of Nepal. As mentioned earlier, there is a concentration of wealth and the political power in Kathmandu valley. Hence, it created an economic divide between the rural and the urban areas. The economic divide does not necessarily limit itself to the village, town or geographical regions. Rather it goes to the urban
development pockets. These rich poor socio-economic disparities in Nepal promoted the emergence of the Maoist insurgency in Nepal.

The fourth chapter is an attempt to deal with the ideological dimensions of the Maoists in Nepal. In the process of analyzing the ideological stand of the Maoists in Nepal it deals with the ideas advocated by Lenin on ‘Revolution’ and Mao on ‘People’s war’. Maoist Insurgency, as the name suggests, claimed to follow the ideas of Mao to the most in their struggle against the state of Nepal. They also claimed to have followed Lenin’s ideas on revolution to a great extent. In the course of the Maoist insurgency the Maoists also developed some of the ‘revolutionary’ ideas keeping in mind the specificities of Nepal. This is what they call as ‘Prachanda Path’- Prachanda ways. Since the Maoists of Nepal claim that the political-economy of Nepal was the theoretical background of their revolution, this chapter also deals with the political economy of Nepal as addressed by the Maoists.

The Maoists of Nepal claimed to have followed the ideas of Lenin in relation to revolution against the state apparatus. According to them to compare the political situation of Russia during the period of 1871-1905 and the political situation of Nepal during 1990s one would find many similarities. Like Russia was ruled by a Czar and there were no democratic institutions Nepal was ruled by a king. Although there were some similarities yet there were some differences in the case of Nepal. For example the parliament elected by the people was in the place. But the Nepali king enjoyed absolute power. One can say that the parliament and other democratic institutions were for the namesake. The Maoists of Nepal had the similar kind of stand against the political parties like Nepali Congress and CPN (UML) the way Lenin criticized
the social democrats of Russia. For the Maoists of Nepal political parties mentioned above believed in political conspiracy with the political elite of Nepal led by the king. So far as the violent struggle was concerned, the Maoists of Nepal were of the opinion that the liberation of the proletariat was not possible in a peaceful means in Nepal. Initially the Maoists of Nepal tried to influence the king and the other political elite in Nepal to accept certain demands from the peasants and workers peacefully. They did not succeed in their efforts. The Maoists tried to join the political mainstream by contesting the elections held in 1994 general election. But they failed to get the recognition as a political party. They were not only not recognized a political party but the government tried to suppress the demands of the Maoists. This prompted an armed insurgency which the Maoists claimed was in tune with the Lenin’s idea for the revolution.

The Maoists of Nepal were influenced by the doctrines of Mao besides Lenin. This is confirmed by the fact that, thirteen years of insurgency the Maoists made use of strategy and tactics given by Mao for a revolutionary war. Maoists of Nepal believed that the ideas of Mao are extremely suitable for Nepal. In the Maoist literature of Nepal, it has been constantly and consistently maintained that, Nepal is an agrarian society where the mode of production was overwhelmingly feudal. A majority of the Nepalese population was dependent on agriculture. There existed small scale business and other source of income other than agriculture. Given the situation the Nepali Maoists characterized Nepal as a semi-feudal country. Mao’s revolution through a people’s war was directed against Japanese colonialism, comprador bureaucratic system, feudal lords and the reactionary classes of China. Similarly, the Maoist of Nepal claimed to fight against the Indian colonialism, reactionary class/ elite led by the monarch, supporters of the comprador bureaucratic class like Nepali Congress and against the revisionists and reformist
communists of Nepal like Communist Party of Nepal (United Marxist-Leninist). Nepali history experienced once colonization by the British during the Rana regime. British withdrawal from India in 1947 ultimately put an end to its colonization over Nepal. Since then Nepal has not been colonized by any country ever. But according to the Maoist leadership, though Nepal was no longer a colonized country they regard Indian Influences over Nepal as colonization. As examples, the Maoists mentioned, 1950 Treaty of Peace and Friendship, various water projects dominated by India, India’s big brotherly attitude interfering in internal affairs of Nepal. The Indian manipulation in these aspects is characterized by the Nepali Maoists as India’s Colonization over Nepal. In addition there exists a great social, historical and cultural similarity between India and Nepal which according to the Maoists India uses them for its advantage. For example India characterizes Nepali King as the re-incarnation of Vishnu-the god. They regard Nepal as the only Hindu kingdom in the world. They want the Nepalese to believe in this logic and obey the monarch or show deference to him. Thus, according to Maoist, a semi feudal and semi-colonial country like Nepal, with agrarian societies dominated by the rural society, exploited by both colonial power like India and the feudal power is suitable to apply and follow Mao’s doctrine of people’s war against these.

In addition to the adoption of the doctrines of Mao and Lenin, the Maoists of Nepal also developed a set of ideas to fight against the Monarchy and to bring about socialism in Nepal. The new set of ideas developed by the Maoists in Nepal in the course of their movement was known as the ‘Prachanda Path’\(^\text{17}\). According to the Maoist literature these ideas were developed keeping in mind the specificities of Nepal. However, this set of ideas- Prachanda Path- is an

amalgamation of the Chinese model of protracted People’s War and Russian model of urban insurrection. The aim of the PP was to use the people’s war in order to expand the Maoist base in rural areas and to use this as a platform from which to invoke a mass uprising at the urban areas in order to overthrow the existing government in Nepal at that time. According to the Maoists the Prachanda Path passed through three different phases in the course of the Maoist insurgency in Nepal. The first phase was political and military line of Nepalese revolution that was adopted in the Third expanded meeting of CPN (Maoist), held in 1995. The second phase was the ideological synthesis of the rich experiences of five years (1996-2001) of Great People’s war that took place in the historical Second National conference of CPN (Maoist) in 2001. And the third phase was the process of development following the second national conference of 2001. While the Maoist insurgency adopted PP as one of its main ideological basis for the ‘revolution’ at the same time the Maoists of Nepal also followed the doctrines of Mao to the maximum extent. Mao, in the course of the Cultural Revolution, advocated some strategies and tactics for a revolution. The strategies advocated by Mao are: Strategic defensive Phase, Strategic equilibrium phase and Strategic offensive phase. The Maoist insurgency carried out their military operations in accordance with the above mentioned strategic phases.

Apart from the above mentioned ideological affiliations of the Maoists of Nepal, this chapter also deals with the theory vis-à-vis, political-economy of Nepal that rationalizes the Maoist insurgency in Nepal. These theoretical ideas are developed by the Maoist leader, Baburam Bhattarai. Baburam in his book “Politico-Economic Rationale of People’s War in Nepal” deals with the aspects like Indian imperialism, expansionist policy of India, and the

various reasons that led to the poverty of Nepal since 1950s. By doing so he gives a theoretical basis for a ‘revolution’ of Maoist kind in Nepal.

The fifth chapter of the dissertation deals with the responses from India and China towards the Maoist Insurgency in Nepal. Ever since the emergence of the Maoist Insurgency in Nepal, there had been questions regarding the role of these above mentioned states in relation to the Maoists in Nepal. Because both India and China have their strategic and security interests in Nepal. Disturbances in any form in Nepal are in a way create concerns for both India and China. Both India and China’s paramount concern in Nepal is related to security and stability. For, China, Nepal is just below Tibet, a geographical continuity of China. Moreover, Nepal has a considerably substantial number of Buddhist populations, having historical cultural ties with the Buddhists in Tibet. Nepal’s close relation with India worries China. A porous boundary, people to people contact, centuries old cultural, social and historical ties between India and Nepal also makes China concern over Nepal. China’s take over on Tibet has made Nepal more vulnerable for India of its security interest. So any disturbances in Nepal would have spillover impacts on both the countries. So far as the Maoist insurgency in Nepal is concerned, the state of Nepal became even more vulnerable to both the countries, India and China. Throughout the Maoist insurgency in Nepal, one would find that, the Maoists perceived china as a source of ideological support, where as India was perceived as band wagoning the imperialist forces. The Maoists borrowed the idea of ‘people war’ on the basis of Maoist ideology and claimed their tactics had been similar to those used by the Chinese communist party fifty-five years ago. The communist movement in Nepal in general and the Maoist insurgency in particular were influenced by the communist movement in India. Various insurgency movements in India, especially left armed
struggles in different states of India, in a way boosted and had links with the Maoists in Nepal. Unlike China, India has been suffering from similar kind of insurgency movements for years. So, another similar kind of insurgency at neighborhood with linkages with insurgency groups in India is definitely a matter of concern for India. It is important to mention that, Nepal is a buffer state for both India and China. With the emergence of the Maoist in Nepal, the strategic and security interests of both the countries had been affected to a great extent. The presence of super power like US and UK, in the name of fighting against the global terrorism has definitely become matter of great worry for India and China.

So far as the responses from India towards the Maoists in Nepal is concerned, this chapter divides them into three parts. The first part deals with, the response of the Indian government in relation to the Maoists in Nepal and their links with the similar kind of groups in different states in India. As it has been mentioned earlier the communist movement of Nepal was influenced to great extent by the communist movement in India. Similarly the Maoists in Nepal had been influenced by the groups like PWG, MCC and other Maoist groups in India. The formation of the CCOMPOSA, led by Maoists of Nepal developed a suspicion in the minds of the Indian authorities regarding the growing relation between the Maoists of Nepal and the similar kind of groups in India. CCOMPOSA- Co-ordination Committee of Maoist Parties and Organizations of South Asia- was believed to be formed with a combination of nine violence espousing reds of South Asia in West Bengal in July 2001. The aim of the formation of the very committee was to “declare their principled unity and conscious determination to hoist the Red Flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and Communism in all its splendor from the silver summits of the Himalayas
and throughout the region”\textsuperscript{19}. The Maoists of Nepal with the likeminded groups planned to have a compact revolutionary zone (CRZ) from Hyderabad to Kathmandu taking Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Jharkhand into their area of influence with the help of other rebel outfits.\textsuperscript{20} However, the growing relation between the Maoists of Nepal and the similar kind of groups in India was a major cause of concern for the Indian administration.

Second aspect of the India’s response towards the Maoists in Nepal has been a reaction to the presence of the international forces in the land of Nepal in the name of fighting against global terrorism. It is important to note that, since 1996 to the year 2001, the responses from India towards the Maoists of Nepal remained to be very casual. The Maoist problem was viewed as a law and order problem of Nepal. But after the incident of 9/11, there was the presence of the United States in the land of Nepal in the name of fighting against global terrorism. Not only the U.S., but there were other western powers like U.K., Belgium, France, etc who made their presence felt for India. Various aids and military helps by different countries were matter of concern for India. Hence since 2001 onwards, India took the matter of the Maoists in Nepal as a matter of grave concern. The third aspect of the India’s response in this regard-as dealt with in this chapter- is various measures by India government to crackdown on the Maoists link with the similar kind of groups in India, shift in policy with the change in government in India and the India’s response to various allegations from the government of Nepal.

\textsuperscript{19} For details see Sudheer Sharma, “Deep Red in the Heart Land”, \textit{Himal}, Vol.15, No.1, January 2002, P.34.

\textsuperscript{20} For details see Shyam Shrestha, “India’s Possible Role in the Future Peace Process of Nepal”, in Shiva K. Dhunga\textquoteleft s, \textit{The Maoist Insurgency and Nepal- India Relations}, (ed), (Friends for Peace Publication, Kathmandu, 2006), P.176
So far as China’s response to the Maoist insurgency of Nepal is concerned, it seems to be a general perception that, China might support the Maoist of Nepal, since they claimed to have followed the ideology of Mao-Tse-Tung, China was the first country to distance itself from the Maoists of Nepal. China never, throughout the insurgency movement, recognized the Maoists of Nepal as the ‘Maoist’. Rather the official version of China made it clear that, the Maoist of Nepal never followed the ideology of comrade Mao, and by claiming themselves as Maoist they give a bad name to great comrade Mao-Tse-Tung. Though the Maoist had tried to have support from China, they remained unsuccessful, because, in view of the amicable relations between Beijing and Kathmandu, the recognized status of the Maoists as anti-government rebels prevented it from mastering support and solidarity from China despite an ostensibly shared ideology and declared values\(^\text{21}\). However, China maintained a safe distance from the Maoists of Nepal. In fact the Government of China was very clear and firm against the Maoists of Nepal. The factors that led the China government to make its stand against the Maoists are: first, China was very much aware of the fact that US was involved in the affairs of the Nepali Government to fight against the Maoists. It was also aware of the fact that, both India and US were working together to help Nepal against the Maoists. In addition to that, recognition of India’s special relationship with Nepal by US’s Assistant Secretary of state was a matter of concern for China. Secondly, China never wanted the Maoists of Nepal to have any success over the government of Nepal. Because the influence of the Maoists, especially in the bordering areas of Tibet, may give rise to the similar kind of groups in Tibet as well. The other factor which made the Chinese authorities not

support the Maoists of Nepal was the fear that the use of sophisticated weapons by the Maoists of Nepal may find their way to Tibet.

Throughout the Maoist insurgency in Nepal the Chinese government was very much clear in its stand against the Maoists. The Chinese government never branded the Maoists of Nepal as ‘terrorists’ like India. When the official version of the Chinese government was against the Maoists, there are reports saying that the Maoists of Nepal got some help in terms of arms and ammunitions from China. There were also reports which stated that the Maoists of Nepal got support from the Pro-Maoist Civil societies of China. This chapter also deals with the various supports the Chinese government extended to Nepali government to fight against the Maoists.

Methodology
This study is largely analytical and historical. But it has the empirical content as well. Apart from the secondary sources much of the information, especially regarding the Maoist Insurgency in Nepal has been gathered by a field trip to Nepal. During the trip to Nepal the researcher interviewed a number of activists involved in the movement. A number of intellectuals who have experienced and witnessed the Maoist insurgency, mostly the Nepalis, were interviewed by the researcher.

The study gathered information through both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include government documents, CPN (Maoist) manifesto, bulletins, publications, proceedings of the international conferences and seminars, etc. The secondary sources used in
this dissertation are the books, articles and the internet sources. The books and the articles have been collected from different libraries of India and Nepal.