

The Maoist Crossroads in Nepal: 'Postponing' New Democracy or Sensing Limits of Agency?*

By

Chaitanya Mishra

Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu

mishrachaitanya@gmail.com

Introduction

October 15, 2011. Puspa Kamal Dahal aka 'Prachanda,' (henceforth Dahal) the chairman of the Unified Communist Party of Nepal (henceforth UCPNM or Maoists), told an audience of his party workers that it was not possible, in the immediate future, to implement the political program of New Democracy (ND) (*Republica*, English-language daily published from Kathmandu). He added: 'things have undergone a sea change since the launch of the people's war in 1996. We therefore have to adopt a [new] policy as per the changed context.' He further said that, 'If any of the comrades refuse[s] to acknowledge this reality and insists on going for a revolt, [s/he] may choose to quit the party.' Dahal appears to have traversed a full circle. The 1996 decision to push through a 'people's war' was justified precisely on an ostensible 'historical necessity of implementing a New Democratic revolution' in a 'semi-feudal and semi-colonial' Nepal. Implementation of the ND would be possible only by seizing the state by means of a revolt and not by acquiring political power through constitutional means. It could thus be argued that the latest declaration by Dahal implies that the decade-long 'people's war' may not have been necessary. A *mea culpa* is rare in political life but, with the current shift in political thinking, Dahal has come very close to that. On another recent occasion, he noted repeatedly that he had taken on a 'huge risk' in 'finally' agreeing to conclude the peace process and to finalize the constitution. The implication here was that he was resisting hard not attempting to seize the state through armed revolt. Dahal may also have been telling the audience that he had decided, for the time being, not make an immediate move to implement the ND program but to postpone it. It may be noted here that during the 'people's war' years of 1996-2006, approximately 18,000 persons were killed and a similar number seriously injured. In addition, approximately 100,000 persons were reported to have been displaced. In alliance with liberal democratic and social democratic forces, the 'people's war,' during its last phase, did succeed to bring a politically and militarily active monarchy down and to usher in a republic, as also to politicize the citizenry with respect to the nature of the society and state.

The political program of ND, of course, was originally formulated by Mao Zedong during the 1930s and 1940s and implemented by him during the immediate post-revolutionary, i.e. 1949-1956, People's Republic of China (PRC) (Mao 1965: 339-84). The ND, as Mao framed it, in

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented to seminars at the University of Kyoto, Kyoto, Japan in May 2012 and South Asian University, New Delhi, India in September 2013.

essence, was a political project calling for the implementation of hegemony of all 'revolutionary classes,' i.e. the proletarian workers, the peasants, and the 'national capitalists' under the banner of a single, centralized and powerful communist party. It was an interim program for implementing 'capitalism' sans the capitalist. It was a program in which capitalism would be implemented by the state which would itself be organized under the communist party. The ND program was, among others, intended to leapfrog over the capitalist phase. Such leapfrogging, following an interregnum, would enable the state and society to enter a socialist stage. It might be noted that despite his earlier call for a fairly long interregnum, Mao cut short the ND phase of the PRC and declared, in 1956, that the PRC was immediately ready for the socialist phase. Whether the Maoist program of ND was primarily of a nationalist and anti-imperialist bent or a state/party-capitalist one is something that has been debated since. What is certain, however, is that the ND short-circuited and invalidated Marx and constituted a fundamental departure from Soviet marxism, thus standing both on their heads, as it were.

The new declaration by Dahal could be of colossal significance to politics in Nepal—which involves the conclusion of the comprehensive peace agreement (CPA) and the finalization and implementation of a new constitution following the 11-year long armed revolt. It could also, in much more than a symbolic manner, be of powerful significance to the immediate future of Maoist politics the world over. It must be noted that the global ideological headquarters of Maoism, the Revolutionary International Movement (RIM), relied on the Maoists of Nepal to further the cause of 'people's war' during 1992-2006, i.e. immediately following the arrest of Sendero Luminoso ('Shining Path') leader Abemael Guzman 'Gonzalo' in Peru. In consequence, the radical-left sites in the Web are currently awash with the trading of charges and countercharges on the 'revisionsim' of the Maoists of Nepal and what this implies for the theory and practice of Maoism and 'people's war'.

Dahal has, however, over the years, flip-flopped on several issues several times. He has alternately sided with 'the go-slow-on-ND' 'pragmatist' and the 'ND-now' 'hardline' factions within his party at least since 2003. He was part of the 'hardline' faction at least till December 2011. That he has not elaborated 'the changed context' since makes his latest position somewhat suspect as well. Further, as of yet, it has not been altogether clear whether the UCPNM willingness to get out, for a historical stretch of time, from the ND program constitutes an authentic strategy or a mere tactic of political negotiation with other parties. In between the 2003 predilection to at least temporarily get off the track of ND and the present declaration of Dahal, on the other hand, he has made innumerable ND-friendly declarations and exhortations. So have the 'hardline' Maoist leader Mohan Baidya as well as the 'revisionist' Babu Ram Bhattarai. This see-saw could well be a result of (a) a tussle between the radical and centrist/reformist factions within the party, (b) a 'realization' that the radical ND option is, for now, impractical to implement because of various tactical considerations, and (c) a 'realization' that the radical ND option is, in this specific world-historical phase, and the political-economic conditions in the immediate region, invalid. It could be an exercise in opportunistic expedience, not the least to undo one another, by the three top-ring leaders of the UCPNM as well.

However, that the policy shift may be real this time around is evidenced by sharp reactions from a sizable 'hardline' faction within Dahal's own party. It has, contrarily, been welcomed by most other parties in the constitutional assembly. In addition, and in an ideologically more telling manner, Prachanda and the UCPNM has been vehemently castigated by the Maoist Revolutionary International Movement (RIM), the Revolutionary Communist Party of the United States (RCP, USA) (see RCP-USA 2009)—which is, in a curious twist, the dominant partner within the RIM—and most other Maoist parties of the world, including the Communist Party of India-Maoist. In addition, that he is pursuing a new political line is further buttressed by the fact that he appears unwilling to pursue struggles within his own party on very many disparate issues in the belief that such disputes are fundamentally rooted in a divergence of encompassing political-philosophical principles. He appears to be readying himself to battle with 'hardliners' within his own party at that level. Further, Dahal's initiatives on the long-delayed implementation of the CPA—which concluded the decade-long 'people's war'—and the final drafting of the new constitution appear to be closely tied to the 'peace and constitution line'—rather than the ND line.

Yet, it is important to emphasize once again that this is not the first but at least the fifth time that the UCPNM and two of its top three leaders have seemed receptive to a graduated, i.e. classically Marxist, notion of sequential succession of modes of production, and thus, of political strategy. Baburam Bhattarai, a relatively politically weak 'third man' in the party, seemed to favor such a line as early as 2003 (Mishra 2007: 81-146). Indeed, chastened by the king's unconstitutional putsch in February 2005, the UCPNM central committee meeting that year largely came to such a conclusion and agreed to multi-party democracy. While the declaration was somewhat equivocal, the ND-friendly idea of a one-party, i.e. a single communist party, political form was, at the very least, watered down. It also withdrew its old demand for a political form which called for 'multiple cooperative parties' which, in effect, implied parties that engage in politics under the tutelage of a powerful communist party under which the entire state is organized. The watershed 12-point agreement reached in November 2005 among the Maoists and the major parties represented in the parliament which, for the first time, brought the two sides together against the 'third power,' the king, would not have been possible without such a shift in the Maoist politics. (It would not have been possible had the parties represented in the parliament stood by the monarchy either.) The encompassing and longer-run political program of the 12-point agreement, in turn, was broadly of a social democratic nature. It was, certainly, far from a Maoist political program. The 2006 CPA between the at-war UCPNM and the government, which concluded the Maoist 'people's war' and which paved the way for the entry of the UCPNM in politics, did not envisage a Maoist program either. Such an agreement would have been impossible had that been the case. There have been many other agreements with other political parties and in the constitutional assembly since. None of such agreements explicitly backs an ND program.

And here we are for the fifth time. Dahal's public justification for postponing ND, till a new phase of history and a new round of history-making, has been that such a position is necessary in order to faithfully implement the peace agreement with the government and the parties, complete the task of negotiating new constitution in the constitutional assembly which includes

very many other political parties, and to transform the UCPNM 'in tune with the new times'. Standing firm on the program of ND would have rendered peace and constitution impossible. Insistence on ND would prohibit the UCPNM from correctly judging and 'coming to terms' with the 'new times'. On the other hand, the 'decision' to postpone ND (and to collapse the implementation of ND and the socialist phases together at some future date) is Dahal's alone. This momentous shift has not been approved by an all-powerful party convention, a plenum (which includes hundreds of senior party leaders), or even by the UCPNM central committee (or its subsets the politburo or its standing committee). Dahal, in essence, and despite his popular charisma and highly powerful presence within his party, is treading on an unauthorized and, therefore, infirm terrain. Interlocutors within his party have begun shouting that Dahal is rapidly moving against the fundamental political principles of the party.

It is highly probable then that the top hierarchy within the UCPNM, both as a party and a party-in-government, might have been teasing out the limitations of the ND and even considering revising specific ND components for some years. This would probably be the case for the Bhattarai faction and, later, for the Dahal faction as well. The Baidya faction, which is the more radical and far more ND-friendly, on the other hand, has been charging the Bhattarai faction, and to a lesser degree the Dahal faction, of 'revisionism, reformism and pragmatism' since at least 2003. Under such doctrinaire onslaught, the less radical UCPNM leaders may have found it extremely risky to question even the relatively fringe components of the old party platform. It is, from the point of view of the faithful, a *communist party faithful* in particular, a political sacrilege to do so. Besides, questioning the principal political platform is fraught with great personal and political risks. Such questioning would inevitably have led to broader scale and intensified factional struggles which would be laden with risks for all concerned.

Nonetheless, it appears, particularly since the November 2011-end successful 'disbandment' of its 'People's Liberation Army' soldiers through integration in the national army (or paid rehabilitation and retirement) that the UCPNM, as a party, stands on the cusp of postponing or closing-off the ND political program. What structures and processes may have been pushing the UCPNM toward postponing its longstanding political principles? Has the quintessentially Maoist agency hit a 'brick wall' of history and structure? Finally, will Maoist agency now take a detour?

History and structure

All political parties, communist parties in particular, have very often eschewed history and structure in favor of agency. Agency, indeed, is what political parties are for. Marx was himself, as an eminent intellectual *and* political leader, torn between the objective and the subjective, between analyzing and doing, between comprehending the resolution of contradictions and flows of history on the one hand and seeking to force, by means of agency, history and structure in particular directions in order to pursue revolutionary goals. Political parties in general, particularly those which have recently acquired a measure of success, can easily misread the frame conditions. The historical and structural context, in such a situation, is viewed extremely summarily and in a manner which suits the principles of the party and the predilections of the leadership. This has particularly been the case with communist parties and its leaders. The agent, i.e. the party and its leadership, almost always assumes paramount

importance over history and structure. The larger-than-life wall hangings and statues of top communist leaders as well as the ubiquitous and sacred imagery of martyrdom and martyrs is a product of this exaltation of the agent who carries out the otherwise humanly impossible tasks. The ideal communist political leader, in particular, seems to be one who promises the impossible and makes it seem like that he/she will deliver it. The historical communist leader is imaged much larger than life. Witness the images and statues of Lenin, Stalin, Mao, and even of Abemael Guzman. The leader is nothing if not a super-man.

The result of eschewing history, on the other hand, has very often been a mess in the short run and a failure in the longer run. It has also involved huge human, material and historical costs. This has largely been the case both in the Leninist and Stalinist Soviet Unions and in the PRC till the denouement of the Cultural Revolution. Immense centralization of power in the central committee and in the persona of the chief of the party, a decided and sustained tilt in favor of centralism as against democracy within the party, and a high level of secrecy and in-transparency surrounding political decision making have been some of the costs. De-politicization of the citizenry, the trade unions and almost all other organized social groups, and a consequent stifling of public opinion are additional costs. The agency of the communist party and its leaders, on the other hand, become so elevated, heroic and near-divine that they alone—and not history, structure, other political-economic forces and citizens—were seen to be able to 'move mountains'.

The emphasis on agency, instead of on history and structure, has been pronounced within the UCPNM since its creation. The party was formed after exactly one-half of the members of the mother party quit on the grounds that Nepal's historical and political-economic structure was not, in the mid-1990s, ripe for the implementation of a people's war. Partly in consequence, the party did not receive support from any of the other communist parties right till the 2003 putsch by the king to usurp power from the legitimate government and sideline the elected legislature and other representative bodies. The emphasis on agency is also apparent from the crystallization, during the war years, of the Prachanda-ism (*Prachandapath*), a Dahal/UCPNM-synthesized corpus of political-military program and strategy which was claimed to be nearing the status of a universal truth, and had to be honored and followed by all UCPNM cadre and leaders during the 'people's war' years. It was also an initial but hugely significant step to elevate Dahal, the chief of the UCPNM, to a pedestal just immediately below that enjoyed by the Marx-Lenin-Mao triumvirate not only in the context of Nepal but also in the global Maoist pantheon. It is noteworthy that Dahal has recently, during the ongoing tussle within his party, publicly rued that it might have been premature to suspend *Prachandapath* and, by so doing, weaken the power to remain unquestioned, un-criticized, and flatly obeyed.

The creation of the party in the mid-1990s, the decision of the party to abandon the legitimate route to power through the general elections, and the decision to implement 'people's war' made during 1993-1996, i.e. at a time when it was the third-largest party in the legislature, surely took place in a context of intense rethinking within the radical left in Nepal. But the final decision to go to 'people's war' was made under the direct agency of the RIM, the world-organ of the Maoist left (Mishra 2007: 81-146). The RIM, it may be noted, was in 'visceral need' of a

Maoist war in the aftermath of the arrest of Comrade Gonzalo in Peru. The RIM could not justify its own agency in the absence of a viable Maoist theatre in some corner of the globe. Indeed, Gonzalo was so put forward in the limelight in media and wall posters in Nepal in the mid-1990s, i.e. after his arrest and just before the decision of the UCPNM to implement 'people's war,' that it gave two social scientists a distinct premonition that Peru could be reenacted in Nepal (Mikesell 2003, Nickson 2003). The two lands and states of Nepal and Peru are far from each other and most of the political-economic 'parallels' between the two are tenuous, notwithstanding both Mikesell and Nickson. What is not to be doubted, however, is the agency of the RIM in both the instances. Mikesell (2003: 35) reports:

The London staff of the International Committee to Defend the Life of Abemael Guzman ... has been astounded by the volume of mail received from Nepal in support of him. From nowhere in the world has such a large number of letters been sent by so many members of a national legislature, to say nothing of common citizens.

Street walls in Kathmandu and even the smaller towns in Nepal were awash with posters of Guzman in the mid-1990s as well, seeking his release and denouncing 'imperialism' and the Peruvian 'imperialist lackeys'. Not that many in Kathmandu were informed about Guzman or Peru or imperialism. Neither was this an isolated event in the annals of the activism and agency of the world radical left. Witness McClintock (1989: 83):

Senderistas [of Peru] consider themselves Gang-of-Four Maoists. They are so fanatically Maoist that they paint slogans on Andean village walls proclaiming 'Death to the traitor Deng Xiaoping,' despite the fact that most Ayacucho peasants have never heard of the Chinese leader.

The across-the-world circuit of the Maoist agency route is clear enough: Old Maoist Beijing to RIM to Lima to RIM to Kathmandu. In between, it surely travelled to London and New York, and according the UCPNM itself, Turkey, Iran, the Philippines, and so forth. It is not only the agents of capitalism who have globalized themselves. Of course, there was also, in the 1960s and 1970s, a much shorter and direct route to Kathmandu from Beijing mostly via the Naxalites in the neighboring eastern region of India. On the other hand, neither the RIM nor the Naxalites have been known to review the course and contradictions of the political-economy of Nepal. A couple of the Maoists in Nepal have done so but the reviews do not necessarily lead to 'people's war'. (See, in particular, Bhattarai 2003a, Bhattarai 2003b.)

In the meanwhile, the sense and accomplishment of agency within the UCPNM, following its tumultuous arrival in Kathmandu for the signing of the CPA with the government, was sky high. The CPNM had successfully raised a powerful army, engaged in sustained insurgency against a much larger state-security force, commanded guerrilla fighters who roamed across the expanse of the country and often temporarily controlled major chunks of the territory, ran a shadow government in many localities and regions, eventually forced a stalemate not only against the against the security forces but also the king and the political parties in the almost defunct old parliament, achieved success in the general elections—where it won more than 40 percent of

the seats, which was more than the seats won by the parties which came out second and third-- and placed its chief into the position of the prime minister of the country. Indeed, given the manner in which it achieved one huge success after another, one could as well come to the conclusion that the heightened sense of agency it imbibed may well have been deserved. The UCPNM found itself completely vindicated. The 'people's war' had not only been 'justified' but it had also proved fruitful. The prime ministership, which came later, was the jewel in the crown.

Limits of agency

Agency, however, can go only so far. As we have been reminded by Karl Marx, 'Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered from the past' (Marx 1852/1970). Man—and an organized and consciously-willed body of men—is a history-making agent, but this agency does not get to operate in an infinitely yielding historical-structural platform. Charles Cooley's deservedly famous line, 'individual and society are twin-born,' and C Wright Mills' admonition to link biography with history and individual with society both serve to hint at the limitation of agency. Historical-comparative and macro social science also underline the fact that one can unwarrantedly and illegitimately emphasize the significance of agency over that of history and structure. The long-run-and-the-large-scale necessarily shapes the nature and dynamics of the shorter run and smaller scale even as the latter, within the framework of a dialectical relationship, continually reconfigures the former.

Much more directly, that agency may not an adequate platform for successful group conflict, collective action, insurgency, civil war, or revolution has also been clear enough after Moore (1967), Skocpol (1979, 1998), Wickham-Crowley (1992), and many others, notwithstanding the psychologized, subjectified, agent-and-motivation dominant ahistorical interpretations such as those of Gurr (1970), Gilligan (2000) and Huntington (1998) who, respectively, center stage relative deprivation, shame and humiliation, and clash of civilizations), as well as some versions of the 'greed and grievance' explanation (cf. Collier 2000, Ballentine and Sherman 2003). The history and structure of social relationships among different social groups and political and economic forces, rather than the ideological, organizational, political, military and other attributes of the insurgent forces, play a foundational role in shaping the nature and outcome of an insurgency. At the very least, and even as there is a definite space for agency, this specific space is product of contradictions among many components of a structure. (I make a preliminary attempt to bring structure and agency together to account for the ongoing political transition in Nepal in Mishra (2007: 1-34). That is, the most encompassing structure itself is a product of very many mutually interrelated and contradictory constituent sub-structures. In addition, and despite the image that somehow conjures up before our eyes, a solid, mountain-like, and unmoving 'structure' is merely a heuristic device; it does not really exist. Structures are, in fact, always more or less fluid and, therefore, always on the flow. Further, the extent of fluidity of a structure is not something that is given but historically determined. A structure is more fluid in certain specific historical contexts than in others. Transitional structures, which are also most often rife with political, economic, ideological, etc. contradictions, are much more fluid than the rest.

Political, Military and Economic Structure in early-1990s Nepal

We can now enter into the nature of changing political, economic and military structure of Nepal during the early 1990s, the immediately formative period of the UCPNM. The political, economic and military structure during this period was much more fluid than it had been during the preceding 40 years. The fluidity of a structure is related with the expanse and depth of contradictions that have been developing within it. Within a world-systemic political economy, it is also related with the expanse and depth of contradictions with structures in the neighboring and other powerful states. A contradiction-ridden structure is more fluid than one in which contradictions are in their early stages. A relatively fluid structure, in turn, opens up greater latitude for the rise and play of agency. Structurally fluid periods are the 'turbulent times' that we hear of from politicians and historians. Those are the Durkheimian anomic times and also the times when Weberian charismatic leadership becomes imminent. It was precisely during such a time that the UCPNM formed itself and started to implement 'people's war' starting off with a rather bookish and time-worn 40-point declaration.

Even as a 'people's war' had been a dream and a duty of the Maoists in Nepal since the 1960s, and one such bout played out (led by the now 'tamed' Communist Party of Nepal--Unified Marxists-Leninists, which now is the third largest party in the constitutional assembly) and quashed by the royal government during the early 1970s, the early-1990s provided a fertile political, military and economic ground for a re-enactment of Maoist politics. The early 1990s were a period during which popular and monarchical forces had not yet fully reconciled together following the 1990 democratic movement that swept away the autocratic powers of the king and brought him within the ambit of a constitution and parliament. This lack of reconciliation was particularly sharp with respect to control over military matters over which the monarchy continued to assert *de facto* control. Monarchist forces also had not absolved themselves of political ambition, and continued to dream of the day when the king would once again assume the executive role and run state affairs. The UCPNM, on the other hand, was trying to delegitimize and overthrow both the parliament and the king at a single stroke if at all possible and sequentially if that were to be more expedient. It was also astutely and alternately playing the monarchical forces and the political parties against one another. In this regards, the play of Maoist willed agency regard approached perfection. The monarchist-parliamentary-Maoist triangle remained relatively stable until the king disagreed to follow up on a request by the elected government to mobilize the military against the UCPNM in order, in this instance, to secure freedom of a large number of policemen the UCPNM had captured. The power triangle, within a short span of time, became undone when the king was killed in a palace massacre which was, on the surface, unrelated or only marginally related to state politics. The replacement was the king's brother who had been extremely uncomfortable with the 1990 political transition and wished to go back to the pre-1990 dispensation. The new king, within a couple of years of his rule, sidelined the elected legislature and the prime minister and assumed executive powers himself. This was unacceptable to the democratic forces. The CPNM itself, by that time, had found the king weaker than the democratic forces, and thought it best, for the time being at least, to form a front with the democratic forces. Such a front, after a 19-day movement in early 2006, heralded a historic end to the 240-year-old monarchy.

Monarchy also came to a close, however, also because the governments of India and China, as well as those in Europe and the US, did not support an autocratic monarchy. Thus, monarchy, by the end of 2005, had gained enmity not just from the Maoist and democratic forces within Nepal, but also from neighboring and other 'significant' countries. The monarchical regime had reached a stage of collapse. Its writ was not longer honored by the citizenry and the bureaucracy. Eventually, during its last days, it has been argued that even the military resisted the orders of the king.

It can be argued, however, that the collapse that Nepal's monarchy suffered in 2006 was not of the Skocpolian kind (Skocpol 1979), in which an old regime collapses largely because of 'internal' structural weaknesses, i.e. other than the ones forced by the revolutionary political forces (and international pressures). Of course, to the extent that rapidly evolving structural contradictions that a regime suffers from are often precisely the ones that the insurgents seek to inflame and sharpen, i.e. when the structural weakness of a regime is cultivated by the agency of the insurgents as their strength, the argument that a regime falls not because of insurgent action but because of a regime's 'internal weaknesses' becomes tenuous. Even as the historical-structural argument that the subjective/agency angle does not, by itself, provide a valid and adequate explanation of insurgency remains correct, and while reductionism must be avoided, it is invalid to argue that the agency vantage point and the historical-structure vantage point constitute mutually contradictory, irreconcilable or incommensurate angles of vision. Rather, it is a more fruitful strategy to let the two vantage points intersect one another, and to order the two at two analytically distinct but interpenetrating levels of explanation. On the other hand, Skocpol's explanation might be valid to the extent that the monarchy might have saved itself had it not forced a schism between itself and the parliament, non-Maoist political parties, and other democratic forces.

Further, the 1990s started a period when political association and organization, freedom of speech and media freedom, and similar other democratic freedoms, almost for the first time in the history of Nepal, were guaranteed by law and protected by courts. The rise of non-state and commercial media at once expanded the public domain and helped to develop a sense and structure of citizenship. But the new media also had a conspicuous 'tabloid mentality,' purveying 'what people liked,' i.e. whatever 'news' could be sold, among them the 'newsworthy' Maoist political and military battles. In addition, the media also highlighted the gap and contradiction between the law, the policy and the promise made by the state on the one hand and the practice and delivery on the policy and promise on the other. Further, a host of imaginations of 'alternative and ideal states of Nepal' which, at times, bordered on the 'anti-state' or 'counter-state,' e.g. a Nepali state which was corruption free, maintained very high human-rights standard, etc., had been taking shape, the factual absence of which tended to delegitimize the state which was actually in existence.

Human rights programs are an example of this. The new 1991 constitution, the new generation of laws and court decisions--as also the broader 1990 political compact--explicitly agreed or consented to a host of internal and international safeguards to human rights. Many of these, however, went unimplemented. The fluid political context also increased the frequency of

violation of human rights which went un-remedied and unpunished. So also with women's rights, rights of ethnic groups and region-based groups, children's rights, rights of the disabled and so on. Similar was the case with the promise of social service provisions, where the gap between governmental promise and delivery was large.

Expanded and contentious claims of new and democratic citizenship were of a scale that was more than enough to overwhelm the state and state resources. Such claims by citizens and citizen groups often found populist support from one or the other political party, not to speak of bilateral and multilateral organizations. In such cases, the claim suddenly acquired a powerful resonance. The din occasioned by the failure of the government to honor such claims was heard nationwide. These were then seen as gaps between promise and delivery, which is a huge political liability at the best of times. In the context of a historical moment created by the sudden rise of democracy, these gaps were enough to substantially erode the legitimacy of the government among a substantial section of citizens. In essence, the 1990 bourgeois-democratic compact encouraged multiple voices and 'a million mutinies' which the political system failed to synthesize and address. The compact gave rise to political forces that the state had not anticipated and could not tame.

One cannot often write about politics in Nepal without at the same time bringing in India, which borders Nepal on the south, east, and west, and which has extensive economic, political, and cultural ties with Nepal, into the discussion. The nature of Indo-Nepal relationship before, during and following the interlude of Maoist 'people's war' has been no exception. It is a fact acknowledged by the UCPNM that its top leaders lived in sanctuaries in India for most of the 'people's war' period. The Indian government, from time to time, imprisoned some of the UCPNM cadre and leaders. Among the captured were two of the most 'hardline' UCPNM leaders, who continue, to this day, to insist on the validity of the ND political program. It was during the period when the two leaders were in jail in 2005 that the UCPNM formulated a non-ND strategy. It is almost impossible to imagine also that the India government was unaware of the sanctuaries that the UCPNM kept in Indian towns and cities. Whether this information was limited only to some specific and lower-level segments of the Indian government or whether the top Indian leadership turned a blind eye to the sanctuaries in order to negotiate favorable security and water-resource related bargains with the government of Nepal, as it did during the cusp of the democratic movement in 1989-1990, is not entirely clear. The prospects of such a design are high, however. There have been several instances in the past in which the Indian government has sought economic benefits from the government for helping to quell a political rebellion in Nepal. As often, successive governments in Nepal have acceded to the demand of organized and powerful rebel forces (or even individual leaders) before the rebellion became a serious bone of contention in Indo-Nepal relationship.

On the other hand, it is also possible that the Indian government allowed a Maoist sanctuary in India in order to contain the actions of the UCPNM leadership and to eventually goad the UCPNM leadership towards legitimate electoral channels, and to cite this transformation as the only respectable and secure outlet possible to Maoist insurgents in *India*—an insurgency which Prime Minister Man Mohan Singh has often characterized as the most serious security problem

India is facing. It is possible that the Indian government was in a wait-and-see mode as long as it was successful at containing the Nepali Maoists. Providing sanctuary was simply the most effective and efficient tactic for containment. Eventually, however, and beginning in 2005, it did try to gradually nudge the UCPNM toward a negotiated settlement that veered away from a ND political program. The end result of this was the rather well-known 12- point plan agreed between the UCPNM and the government of Nepal in 2006.

Further, on economic and livelihood fronts, the land-labor contradiction was peaking. Very small scale—where 70 percent of the farm households operated less than 0.5 ha of farm—and low-productivity, low-marketability agriculture was pushing household poverty to 42 percent and more. The population growth rate was very high at upwards of 2.6 percent/year and the level of unemployment and underemployment was extremely high. In addition, this was the first generation in which a substantial proportion of the young had been to school and had become eligible for non-rural and non-agricultural jobs. Schooling and education clearly hinted at the prospects of nonagricultural, urban, 'settlement-unbound' possibilities and expectations. Finally, schools were also sites where political parties carried out training and recruiting and, in the course, politicized the students. It may be emphasized that political parties had been banned during 1961-1990 and, in part as a consequence, political work was centered in schools and colleges and among students and teachers.

Post-1980 history-structure conjuncture: Organization of production, livelihood, and politics

In the mean time, a definite set of transitions in the organization of production and livelihood—as well as power and political relationships—was taking hold. At the micro level—at the level of individuals, households, settlements and communities—a variety of processes which were uprooting old economic and political structures and regimes were at work. Some of these were linked to 'internal' democratic and capitalist spurts that the 1990 political transition had encouraged. Many ascription-based structures and values had weakened. Hereditary village headships and other hereditary community positions were dying out because of a variety of processes, not the least because the 'village' was no more a secluded entity. 'Village life' was being hollowed out and dominated by urban, industrial, commercial, nonagricultural and non-rural domains and processes. Indeed, the new generation, more adept to the new world, was often dominant over the older. This reordering of social relationships was also taking place within households where young sons were ascendant over their parents. The village was under the overpowering influence of the town and the city. Capitalism had won out over various pre-capitalist structures and values. This was the foundational platform for the demise of the monarchy as well. Monarchy has, in part, in Nepal and elsewhere, been based upon stable, 'tradition' and heredity- valorized, and ascription-centered agricultural political, economic, and cultural foundations. The king was often the symbolic, if not semi-legal or legal, owner of all the landed and other resources of 'his dominion'. The residents of the dominion were 'his people'. It was also based on politically and legally unquestioned control of the monarchy over the security apparatus of the realm. Post-1990 Nepal was at odds with these structures and values. New sources of information and knowledge were being created and new world views were being crystallized. New sources of employment, income and wealth were being created. Household wealth and income was surely important. But individual achievement was becoming

prized as well. The scale and rate of physical and labor mobility had become very high. Political organization had become not only legal and free but being part of such an organization was often prized. Freedom of speech and media was becoming highly valorized. The king was no longer able to control popular organizations and voices. Monarchy had grown incommensurate and counterproductive in the new world, including in rural areas.

Beginning the late 1980s, Nepal was increasingly a product of the globally new, Asia-centered world-capitalist growth cycle, which came to a partial rescue of the land-labor contradiction that was becoming severe. It should be noted that unlike in some suppositions, the micro and the macro are not levels that are sealed against each another. Instead, not only is the macro the obverse of the micro but no process can work out exclusively at one of the levels but not the other. New processes which start to work at one of the levels of a society send in, as it were, successive homologous waves, and enforce and encounter homologous contradictions, within and across all other levels. Equally importantly, levels, like structures and substructures, are heuristic devices; they do not actually exist. As such, the notion that a particular level of society exists independently and apart from the rest is a fallacy. Levels of sociality are seamlessly integrated to one another. The polar ontological and epistemological stances, i.e. (a) the 'derived' macro is a conglomerate of very many independent, separate and 'real' micros *a la* Coleman (1987), which was itself based on the rational-choice model of human social(?) behavior, and (b) only-the-social-but-not-the-individual is real, which is sometimes approximated by Durkheim, have to give way to a stance which posits a simultaneous and dynamic interpenetration of different levels of sociality within the limits of an encompassing-yet-differentiated-as-well-as-changing historical whole. This has been clear enough at least since the diverse essays published under the editorship of Alexander et al. (1987). There can be no ahistorical and astructural agent as there can be no society without willed human action and, thus, consciously acting human social beings. The positions of Marx, Giddens, and Bourdieu are not very different from this position either.

The organization of production or the manner in which a society—and, therefore, individuals, households, communities and so on—generates its livelihood has a fundamental bearing on the nature of a society and the way it changes. We have known this for at least 150 years through Marx's Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, which came out in 1859 (Marx 1978: 3-6). Seen from this vantage point, the organization of production in Nepal was entering a period of rapid change beginning the late 1980s. Nepal had long been drawn within the capitalist world-system (Mishra 2007: 47-80)—notwithstanding the characterization of Nepal, in slavish plagiarism of Mao, as a 'semifeudal and semicolonial' state. It could not have been otherwise: Nepal was created, fought against, 'lived' alongside, and remained, under the shadow of the most powerful capitalist-imperialist world power, i.e. Britain, for approximately 200 years. Widely based, although unequal, ownership of productive resources, principally agricultural land, and the development of wage labor as the predominant form in which labor is organized on the one hand and marginalization by industrial, urban, capital-intensive, etc. economies, in particular those in India on the other, continue to peripheralize the country and make it more dependent within the capitalist form and within the world-capitalist system.

There has been a rapid transition in the organization of production and, thus in the mode of generation of livelihood during the last 40 years, the last 20 years in particular. The structure of production has seen a large shift such that agriculture now contributes approximately than one-third of GDP, in contrast to nearly 70 percent 40 years ago. While the significance of agriculture remains high, it is a primary occupation to a successively smaller proportion of households. There has been considerable diversification within the agricultural sector as well, such that part of the production is geared to the market, particularly in locations served relatively well by road head. The road network, seasonal road network in particular, has been expanding rapidly across the country.

Most importantly, however, and mostly within the last 20 years, the longstanding contradiction between land and labor has found a fairly large scale, even if temporary or cyclical, resolution. Such a contradiction in the Hills region had historically found two sizable resolutions in forest clearance and cultivation (a) in northeast India beginning the 1850s, and (b) in the southern Plains region since 1950. The new resolution encompasses certain features that run parallel to the previous two but also contains certain novel features. The new regime, like the earlier ones, is unmistakably tied to the expansion of the world capitalist system. The first regime was a product of the East India Company-organized and plantation-mode economy which cultivated coffee, tea, etc. The second was an outlet provided by the expansion of markets in north India and the expansion of the rail heads there, right along the border to Nepal, which made export of agricultural commodities to other parts of India and beyond possible. But it is also the case that the new scale of labor migration is much larger than in the previous two regimes. It is estimated that approximately 2.5 million young persons from Nepal are working in West Asia and Southeast Asia alone. The number working in India is estimated at about 1.5 million. The number of labor migrants to India is almost certain to grow rapidly to the extent that the fast-paced economic growth—and the consequent growth of the middle and upper classes there—will lead to a demand for less expansive labor, particularly in the personal service, social and construction sectors. In addition, several millions have moved in the course of labor and other streams of migration within Nepal. The most visible result is that more than 56 percent of all households realize some income through remittances. Official data indicate that remittances account for 23 percent of the GDP. Because not all remittances flow in through 'official' channels, the actual proportion may be considerably higher. It may be that the proportion comes close to the contribution of agriculture to GDP, particularly if new commercial agriculture, e.g. those related to dairying, green vegetable farming, etc., are accounted for separately from 'traditional' agriculture. Even if official data are valid, and if the current trend continues, remittances may soon surpass agriculture as the largest contributor to the GDP. Remittances can well become a resource that no political program, a ND political program in particular, could do without or go against. In addition, the service sector and independent small-scale producers and traders have been generating much of domestic production, none of which may fit well within a ND political program.

This does not, by any means, imply that the land-labor contradiction has been resolved. The extremely small scale and underdeveloped forces of production—a very small ancestral farm

and a couple of heads of livestock for a majority of the households, a dwindling 'cottage industry' which was in vogue till the penetration of urban-industrial economy, a very small manufacturing base, a growing but small communication infrastructure, small-scale private investment, inordinately small public revenue to finance infrastructural, social sector and social security expenditure, etc. mean that the productive forces are too small to provide employment to most of the youth or to provide them with social security. The existing agrarian regime, thus, is likely to throw up and thus dis-attach more youths from itself whenever other nonagricultural and non-local work and income opportunities become available. As noted, a sizable body of the youth now finds work in and outside of the country. Youths who are thrown off the old regime of production and mode of generation of livelihood *and* who cannot attach themselves to new forces of production in and out of the country, on the other hand, find themselves drawn to radical political parties and/or became part of the growing bands of lumpen proletariat inhabiting large and small towns and along the highways. The size of such youth has grown by a great deal.

'Youth surplus' has an additional dimension. Most of this body of youth, unlike in the previous generation, is literate and schooled, thanks to the educational initiative of the early 1970s, which led to the expansion of the school system all across the country. While it is a crude indicator, the literacy rate increased from 3 percent in the early 1950s to 65 percent in 2011. Much of this rise in literacy rate took place during the last three decades. Notwithstanding, most youths today do not possess an immediately marketable skill. But they do not expect or aspire to keep farming the old ancestral farm (or go back to it if they are already out) either. Education—which is, except in Kathmandu and a few other towns, of a generally low quality—is highly prized both by students and parents.

The severe land/resource-labor contradiction is not only an objective reality but is also a cornerstone of everyday discourse of sorrow and high uncertainty among youths, households, and communities. Schooling is widely seen as a way out of this contradiction, as a facility which can help access opportunities for non-rural and nonagricultural jobs. Parents are aware that seeking and securing such jobs may take their children away from them. Nonetheless, parents 'push' their children to schools and, later, to locations wherever employment is potentially accessible. The youth, to the extent that they can access such jobs, then shun the old routines of rural and agricultural self-employment and court continuing prospects of urban, industrial, service sector and other nonagricultural and non-rural jobs almost all of which require movement away from home and community. This has been the singular novel motif of generation of livelihood during the historical conjuncture since the 1990s.

Such jobs often do not, however, provide a platform for dignified or stable employment. Most terms and conditions of work in West Asia and Southeast Asia approach the conditions of indentured, and in a significant proportion of conditions, trafficked labor. An employer invariably takes away a migrant worker's passport, which is the entire instrument of identity in a distant and foreign land, and where the worker most often lives out a subordinate existence, is poor, and cannot speak the local language (and few locals speak languages other than their own). The worker cannot freely choose whom to work for. The worker cannot weigh the costs

and benefits of a job and cannot engage in collective or individual bargaining. In addition, the laborer very often works at a very low wage rate. Cheapness is often, although not in all cases, the only reason why employers in West and Southeast Asia hire labor from Nepal and similar other locations. Job security remains at the mercy of the employer. At the meso scale, job security of the migrant laborer is also tied to intricate, labyrinthine, corrupt, and oligopolistic interests among layers of labor contractors, between the contractor and the employer, and between the contractor and the often highly rent-seeking employment agencies as well as government officials. At the macro scale, of course, job security remains at the mercy of short, medium, and longer term cycles as well as the world systemic hierarchies inherent to capitalism. .

In a replay of the classic notion of the commanding power of capital over labor power, this specific historical and structural conjuncture exerts a pull that dis-attaches the youth from household and community based modes of livelihood. It also exerts a pull that dis-attaches them from self-employment as well as relatively stable and orderly rural and agricultural means of generation of livelihood. It then intermittently attaches them to much larger scale, impersonal, semi-proletarian, fluctuating, and cyclic urban and industrial means of generation of livelihood. Livelihood is semi-proletarian, in the Wallersteinian sense (cf. Smith and Wallerstein 1992), inasmuch workers themselves and their dependents derive part of their sustenance from the agricultural sector as well as the labor of other members of the household.

In essence, and given the immensity of the land-labor contradiction and the consequent mammoth scale of unemployment and under-employment, only a political-economic structure and policy-set that can sustain itself at least over the medium run can create conditions which can articulate land and other resources on the one hand and labor on the other. In addition, part of the outcomes of land-labor contradiction can be addressed with an expansion of social security, in particular of the highly vulnerable households. Some headway has been made, during the last 15 years, to help the elderly. This, however, has to be expanded to include the younger age groups and to augment the scale of benefits which accrues to a beneficiary. (it may be noted, however, that the social-democratic agenda of expanding social security initiative was not one actually implemented by the political left but by the political right, whether in Germany, Britain or Japan; see Ferguson 2009: 200-24). Expanding employment and social security can be possible only with a state which enacts measures to valorize both labor and capital. Agrarian reforms which encourage tiller ownership but also augment cropping intensity, together with effective agricultural and marketing support structure can be vital initial step in this direction. The state also can develop wide-scope policies and programs to valorize self-initiative as well as expanded investment of private capital which bears much greater potential, compared to government investment, to generate both growth and employment. Government initiatives to promote public works, which self-target the poor, also bear great potential to meet seasonal scarcities among such households. Such policies also reduce inequality in as much as the poor can market their labor. The new stance of Dahal which is directed at postponing ND may constitute the necessary first step in this direction.

The new state, in addition, can decide to utilize the historic and colossal opportunity that has emerged right in its neighborhood. The unprecedented growth of India and China, the two immediate neighbors of Nepal, raises the possibility that economic and employment growth in Nepal can be hitched to the success of its neighbors. The state can utilize this opportunity that has re-presented itself after 300-600 years. All three countries, in addition to several others in the region, had a level of productivity and prosperity that was among the highest in the world during the 13th and the 18th century CE. At that time, regions and locations in Nepal, among others, benefitted immensely from Indian and Chinese prosperity, which gave a push to manufacturing and services in parts of Nepal as well as India-China trade, much of which passed through Nepal.

The ND political program, on the other hand, may not resolve the land/resource-labor contradiction and, thus, may contribute neither to economic growth nor to social security. It is unlikely to motivate self-initiative among farmers who, under an ND program, will be commanded by party workers. Self-initiative among peasants, like in 1917-1922 Soviet Union, may also be low and going down due to the fear and uncertainty among the peasants that their farm may be collectivized. It may not resolve such contradictions also because a capitalism driven by communist party cadres would be, if not a contradiction in terms, extremely bureaucratic, cumbersome and irresponsible. It would not, by its very nature, possess either the democratic ethos, laws, instrument of check-and-balance, etc. which are necessary components of self-initiative, nor the policy foundations necessary to encourage private investment and entrepreneurship. It will, therefore, be unlikely to contribute to rapid economic growth and promotion of employment. Such a political economy will certainly be unable to generate enough income and wealth which could be taxed and utilized for social security. In addition, the ND political program may well block the historical possibility of moving in tandem with economic growth in India and China. On the other hand, by enlarging the already huge economic gap between the neighboring countries on the one hand and Nepal on the other, the program may push political, demographic, military-security related, and irrigation water and hydropower related bilateral problems to a stage where their resolution becomes more problematic than it already is.

Agency failure and agency renegotiation

The UCPNM, till 2008, had acquired a long string of stellar political and party-related successes piled up. However, successes became rare and failure began to accumulate after the UCPNM assumed the prime ministership. The president disagreed to follow up on the recommendation of the UCPNM prime ministers to fire the army commander-in-chief. The UCPNM also failed to seize Kathmandu and the Nepali state as a whole by enforcing an 'indefinite strike' in 2010. The UCPNM cadre did descend on Kathmandu in large numbers, possibly in excess of 200,000. But no cadre was willing to sacrifice farming and other modes of generation of livelihood as well as other routines of life for long. The 'indefinite strike' petered out within a span of five days in another great humiliation for the UCPNM. Both the recommendation to sack the commander-in-chief and the initiative to enforce an 'indefinite strike' may well have been seen within the UCPNM as an initial step toward the implementation of ND. Nor did the UCPNM chief's ultra-nationalistic spit-fire and 'back-to-the-trenches' speeches against India succeed in wringing

concessions from the Indian government. If anything, it backfired against the UCPNM and its principal leader. It should be noted that Dahal was at the forefront of all these mis-initiatives.

There have been several significant UCPNM agency failures, too, in negotiations within the constitutional assembly and with other political parties and in the UCPNM chief's effort to assume prime ministership a second time around. The UCPNM's stalling of the peace process was the principal reason for the latter failure. The UCPNM has also generally failed at including ND-friendly resolutions and clauses in various draft sections of the constitution.

The UCPNM chief has been none too successful within his own party either. Unprecedented political differences appear to have broken out within UCPNM, not the least over the validity of the ND program. His two stalwart deputies, who do not generally agree among themselves, have banded together, weakened his authority, made him anxious about his future and agreed together not to help him to prime ministership. Faced with disunity within the party, among others, the UCPNM chief may no longer be as sanguine about the old venerated political program of ND. The UCPNM chief may also wish to project a more stable political persona for himself, one that does not periodically oscillate between the radical left faction and the 'pragmatic, revisionist' faction. He may decide to become his own man.

Given the new structure that is under formation and the failures of agency action geared toward pushing ND forward, the UCPNM chief may orient himself toward a political program which aims to postpone ND. Many of the events during last five years indicate that such a course is likely than any other. The 'disbandment' of the PLA and its integration within the national army (or the paid retirement or rehabilitation of the rest), above all, can be taken to indicate that the peace-and-constitution line, rather than the revolt and ND line, may have won the day. Reorienting the party as a whole to postponing ND now seems to have become the principal priority for the UCPNM chief given the fact that the shift constitutes a fundamental political U-turn. This reorientation, however, will have to be renegotiated with the party, the cadre and, in particular, with the faction which remains wedded to the ND program. The UCPNM and its chief—given his charisma and command—may walk away with a reorientation. But the renegotiation may be bruising.

Conclusion

Agency, by itself, does not furnish an adequate explanation for human social action. Explanations of insurgency and its resolution in terms of the intentions and actions of insurgents and revolutionaries, as such, remain inadequate and invalid. Agency itself is historically and structurally conditioned, facilitated and constrained. There can be no ahistorical and astructural agent. But not all agency is historically valid and structurally commensurate. History and structure make available a broad-scale latitude for agency within which an agent is relatively free to choose. Because the agent is a specific kind of historical-structural creature himself or herself, the choice, in effect, is often limited. The latitude for agency, in addition, is not constant or given. Such latitude is itself a historical product. It is broad scale in certain phases and less so in others. In particular, during periods of historical transition, such latitude is

much broader than in others. Greater latitude, in turn, invites multitudinous, diverse and contradictory agencies. Times of turbulence encourage a 'million mutinies'.

The UCPNM started to implement a 'people's war' during a highly politically turbulent time, and one in which the resource-labor contradiction had become broad and sharp. Politically and militarily, it utilized contradictions among the king, political parties and civil society to the hilt. It also pushed to the hilt the associate contradictions between the police force and the military, political parties, and fractious leaders within a single political party. It played the media card astutely as well. On the economic, business and labor fronts, it grasped the contradictions well but could never develop a resolution except those of undefined 'revolutionary land reform' (or 'scientific land reform) and social justice. The expansion of world and regional capitalism, the loss of political strength of the rural and agricultural sectors, and the rise of the capitalist, urban, industrial, and global and regional sectors diminished the salience of the Maoist political program and agency. The death of the old king as well as the demise of the monarchy—to which the UCPNM made a powerful contribution—weakened the justification of an ND program. Indeed, and paradoxically, the end of monarchy, i.e. the 'third leg' of the monarchy-political parties-Maoists political triangle, may have sounded a bell for the fall of radical Maoism inasmuch as the UCPNM could no more play the monarchical card against the political parties. So did the election to the constituent assembly. A Maoist revolt, to the extent that it could sustain itself, would have been far more legitimate before a general election to a constitutional assembly than following it. In addition, as Wickham-Crowley argues, insurgency is less likely in a democratic or military-dominant than in a patrimonial political regime. Furthermore, rapid capitalist growth in India and China will make them less tolerant of an ND regime in the immediate neighborhood of Nepal. More broadly, Nepal has a far greater opening to world-systemic processes which make ND a historically invalid political option. Nor can the extremely narrow nationalistic stance that ND demands be cultivated in this historical period and in this location.

The world-capitalist system has, in part, come to the rescue of a non-ND political program. Employment has been promoted. Poverty has been substantially reduced. Recent evidence indicates that inequality has been reduced as well. An expanded capitalist and social-democratic program will further undercut the rationale of ND. Underperformance on the economic growth and front, on the other hand, will undercut any political program, whether ND or otherwise. The youth can now, in terms of literacy and education, mobility, unobstructed and disciplined attention to profession and a variety of other attributes, begin to sustain such an expanded capitalist program and capitalist relations of production. Rule of law, democratic freedom, expanded private investment, social security, and a responsive regulatory framework can go a long way in developing capitalist 'forces of production'. For this world-historical phase, and particularly in the immediate vicinity of 21st century India and China, no other mode of production and mode of generation of livelihood hold a greater promise.

The ND program, on the other, and in addition, goes against Marxist notions of history and revolution and of historical and dialectical materialism. As Marx noted (1964: 57):

No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new and higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society.

It appears that the theoretical canvas for explaining both insurgency and the course of its resolution have to be sketched on a framework which is a much longer and larger historical and structural scales. Not only agency actions but even regime features such as those favored by Skocpol are inadequate to explain the nature of an insurgency and the nature of resolution. Nor can international factors that *directly*, i.e. militarily and financially, impinge on insurgency, such as those identified by Skocpol as well as Wickham-Crowley, be regarded as leading to adequate explanation. The foundational 'causes' of sustained insurgency must be traced to transitions in modes of production and distribution and, thus, in modes of generation of livelihood. The nature of class structure and class relationships, which has been viewed by almost all recent theorists beginning right from Barrington Moore as the platform which gives rise to democracy (or to authoritarianism), may no longer hold the salience it once did. The 'exchangist' and world-systemic rather than 'productionist' and nationally bound innards of developed capitalism means that class structure and class relationships--which are inherently located within the limits of a nation-state--can no longer furnish such a platform. This is more so the case for a peripheral and dependent state than for others. It is probably even more the case for states which physically lie adjacent to states with much larger economies as well as fast-expanding security interests, as is currently the case, in relation to Nepal, with India and China. (It is almost a foregone conclusion also that the India and Chinese economies and security interests will expand a great deal within the foreseeable future with large-scale and potentially decisive implications for democratization in Nepal.) To the extent that such transitions cannot, in modern world-systemic history, be linked to world and regional processes, the canvas for the explanation of insurgency and its resolution has to be widened to include such factors. Of course, the strength of the linkage will vary across cases and events. Essentially, 'nationalization' or 'methodological nationalism' is no longer an appropriate option in an increasingly densely interconnected world and region, including in processes related to insurgency. So also, we are coming to know that adequate explanations demand a search for deeper and historically longer run sequences, causes and correlates. Illustratively, had schooling not spread, in a relative sense, far and wide beginning in the 1970s, the Maoist insurgency in Nepal would most likely not have taken hold in the middle of the 1990s. Certainly, had a more developed version of capitalism taken hold in the 1950s-1980s, the Maoist insurgency may not have taken hold either.

References

- Alexander, Jeffrey, Bernhard Giesen, Richard Munch, and Neil Smelser
1987 *The Micro-Macro Link*. 1987. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Ballentine, Karen and Jake Sherman (ed.)
2003 *Beyond Greed and Grievance*. A Project of International Peace Academy. 2003. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner.
- Bhattacharai, Baburam
2003a *The Nature of Underdevelopment and Regional Structure of Nepal*. Delhi: Adroit Publishers.
- Bhattacharai, Baburam
2003b The political economy of the people's war. Pp. 17-64 in Arjun karki and David Seddon (eds.), *The People's War in Nepal: Left Perspectives*. Delhi: Adroit Publishers.
- Coleman, James
1987 'Microfoundations of macrosocial behavior.' Pp. 193-206 in Alexander, Jeffrey, Bernhard Giesen, Richard Munch, and Neil Smelser, *The Micro-Macro Link*. 1987. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Collier, Paul
2000 'Doing well out of war.' Pp. 91-11 in Mats Berdal and David Malone (eds.), *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Ferguson, Niall
2009 *The Ascent of Money: A Financial History of the World*. London: Penguin.
- Gilligan, James
2000 *Violence: Reflections on Our Deadliest Epidemic*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Huntington, Samuel
1970 *Why Men Rebel*. New Jersey: Princeton University.
- Huntington, Samuel
1998 *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London: Simon Schuster.
- Mao, Zedong
1940/1965 *Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume II*. Peking: Foreign Language Press. Pp. 339-84.
- Marx, Karl
1964 *Selected Writings In Sociology and Social Philosophy*. Translated by Tom Bottomore. London: McGraw Hill.
- Marx, Karl
1852/1970 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' in Robert Tucker (ed.) *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York: Norton. Pp. 436-525.
- Marx, Karl.
1859/1978 'Marx on the history of his opinions' in Robert Tucker (ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York: Norton. Pp. 436-525. Pp. 3-6.
- McClintock, Cynthia
1989 'Peru's Sendero Luminoso rebellion: Origin and trajectory.' In Susan Eckstein (ed.), *Power and Popular Protest: Latin American Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California. Mikesell. Stephen

- 2003 The paradoxical support of Nepal's left for Comrade Gonzalo.' Pp. 35-41 in Deepak Thapa (ed.), *Understanding the Maoist Movement in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Martin Chautari.
- Mishra, Chaitanya
2007 *Essays on the Sociology of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Fineprint.
- Moore, Barrington
1967 *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. London: Penguin.
- Nickson, Andrew
2003 'Democratisation and the growth of communism in Nepal: A Peruvian scenario in the making?' Pp. 3-34 in Deepak Thapa (ed), *Understanding the Maoist Movement in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Martin Chautari.
- RCP-USA
2009 On developments in Nepal and the stakes for the communist movement: Letters to the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) from the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA, 2005-2008 (with a reply from the CPN (M), 2006.' *Revolution*. March 29.
Republica, October 16, 2011, p. 2.
- Smith, Joan and Immanuel Wallerstein (eds.)
1992 *Creating and Transforming Households: The Constraints of the World Economy*. New York: Cambridge.
- Skocpol, Theda
1979 *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia & China*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Skocpol, Theda (ed.)
1998. *Democracy, Revolution, and History*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Wickham-Crowley, Timothy P.
1992 *Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America: A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes since 1956*. New Jersey: Princeton University.