

Nepal and communist strategy in the First World: anti-imperialism, not watery "communist" unity

Maoist Information Web Site

In "[Addendum to "Note on organization and science"](#)," MIWS writes:

"If an organization has state power, there may be questions involving that organization's practice that need to be answered; although, those questions may not necessarily result in new general knowledge if the organization doesn't have a scientific practice of adapting to experience, the experiments of previous revolutions."

MIWS has a science-building focus and concentrates on making material available that will be useful long into the future. MIWS does not normally comment on daily events, but an anti-monarchy party claiming to uphold Maoism is reportedly headed to win a parliamentary election in Nepal.

MIWS does not focus on making judgments about individual organizations, but instead on disseminating general knowledge that people can use to do their own reasoning and make their own judgments in appropriate contexts. When an organization has had some demonstrable political success, though, there may be a question of whether there is anything to be learned from that particular organization's practice. The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is unusual in claiming to uphold Maoism and having apparently won a national election by nearly a majority. The extent to which the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) has state power is a matter of debate, but the most operative part of the above quote for this article relates to whether the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is actually building on previous communist practice and science.

The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) carried out armed struggle for many years before demobilizing its army. "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) has confirmed that an anti-monarchy party that has used "Maoist" language can win an election after some violent struggle.

Verbally agreeing with some "Maoist" positions and using some "Maoist" phraseology, and actually upholding the revolutionary scientific ideology and practice

called "Maoism," are different things. The international communist movement has developed to such a point that so-called Maoists maintaining certain orientations have become revisionist and representatives of exploiter and oppressor interests. The history of Marxism and revisionism, which develop together as communist struggle progresses, and recent struggles involving the use of "Maoism," gutted of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism's theory of imperialism and contradiction, to promote accommodation and capitulation to imperialism, are important for people new to learning about Maoism to understand. It is not simply the case that anyone calling themselves Maoist is Maoism, no matter how popular or publicized they are.

The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" has exhibited a lack of science on major questions of class and contradiction in the world today while disseminating accommodationist and capitulationist ideas internationally. Whatever difficulties it may be having or may have had, the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) does not deserve an international reputation as a Maoist or scientific-communist party. It is possible that by trying to survive or pursuing one goal in a certain way, one can become revisionist. Regardless of how the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) and other appendages of a First World socialist-imperialist movement became revisionist, spreading the First World proletariat myth, while globally spreading arguments against people's war and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and advocating neo-colonial economic policies, is a capitulation to imperialism. In addition, through its membership in and continuous outspoken support for the "Revolutionary Internationalist Movement" (RIM) -- which persists in diverting opposition to u.\$ intervention in Islamic and Muslim countries by promoting anti-Iran chauvinism and spreading anti-united front ideas in the First World and globally -- the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) promotes collaboration with u.\$ imperialism in invading Iran to overthrow the Iranian government. The international proletariat is not served by calling the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) a genuine Maoist party.

Non-Marxist parties have previously won elections after armed struggle. In this respect, the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) has not proved anything new. Non-Marxist parties in a nation have also cooperated to abolish monarchies.

Support for the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) from a "Maoist" perspective alternately emphasizes the so-called Maoist party's strategic and tactical

and theoretical creativity, adherence to Maoist orthodoxy on New Democracy, or both. Nepal may be in a bourgeois stage. There is nothing in communist science against a bourgeois organization's trying to overthrow a monarchy. However, new democracy is a joint dictatorship of revolutionary classes, excluding pro-feudal and pro-imperialist elements, and is led by the proletariat. The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) as it has been presented by not just the media, but the party's own so-called-leftist supporters, is not a proletarian party, and this is a key thing for people outside Nepal interested in Maoism to understand, or revolutions outside Nepal will be diverted. The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is not a scientific-communist party is not on the road to communism. If there is not clarity on this internationally, the bad example of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) will be duplicated.

Much of contemporary revisionism involves a refusal to engage with Marxism's theory of capitalism and imperialism in depth and in a concrete way. There is no such thing as Marxists who deny the centrality of surplus value to class formation and class dynamics under capitalism. "Marxist" and "Maoist" leaders who reject the Marxist labor theory of value except as rhetoric expose themselves as charlatans.

There is no socialist country in the world today, but social-imperialism and the labor aristocracy from previous upsurges have left a legacy of revisionism world-wide. Oppressed nation people have a right to elect anyone they want, including revisionists, without imperialist interference. The masses become more advanced through struggle. But the interests of the oppressed are not served by calling a revisionist party Marxist. "Revisionism" means Marxism-in-name-only. In thinking about communist strategy in the First World, this -- opposing imperialism and supporting oppressed nation sovereignty while recognizing and opposing revisionism -- is crucial.

Some cannot imagine supporting an oppressed nation whose government has an ideology they degree with. Yet, united fronts are not based on ideological similarity. It seems like a pretty uncontroversial idea, but in practice many people implement another idea. Consequently, there are Liberalism, watering, adoption of backward ideas, and loose organizational practices. It is possible to oppose imperialism in an imperialist country, and imperialist interference and militarism, without agreeing with the ideology of a certain party in an oppressed nation or uniting with it on a "communist" or "socialist" basis.

The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) has internationally disseminated a line favoring bourgeois democracy, Liberalism, and First World living standards. If the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) acts as a pro-imperialist party, there may not be a question of defending the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) from imperialism without agreeing with the CPN's ideology; the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) may itself be an ally of imperialism despite being against the monarchy. Imperialism has relations with China even though the Chinese government claims to uphold "Mao Zedong Thought."

Nonetheless, the Nepalese election raises the question of whether to oppose imperialist intervention in an oppressed nation with non-Marxist leaders. More important than the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) at the moment is the question that concerns about imperialist interference in an election, in which a "Maoist" party is a contender, raise about communist strategy in general.

The principal contradiction is between imperialism and the oppressed nations. Diverse forces, Marxist and non-Marxist, are opposed to imperialism, because classes are opposed to imperialism. The united front is based on the existence of different classes opposed to imperialism. The united front is not mainly an alliance of First World and Third World parties calling themselves Marxist or socialist, or even mainly an alliance of Third World parties calling themselves Marxist or socialist.

The world revolutionary struggle is in a complicated stage. Imperialist nations and oppressed nations overlap greatly with the international bourgeoisie and the international proletariat. The international bourgeoisie is concentrated in imperialist nations. The international proletariat is concentrated in oppressed nations, though Russia has a proletariat and is not an oppressed nation. At the same time, the struggle against neo-colonialism is in an ebb stage. Revisionism is anti-proletarian, but in these circumstances one may expect Marxist or communist ideas to appear in bourgeois parties as the proletariat spontaneously struggles to express itself within the existing bourgeois framework. Communist ideas may appear in bourgeois parties in a united front either because entire oppressed nations have been proletarianized or because the Third World bourgeoisie seeks to divide the proletariat in the face of advancing proletarian struggle. Openly bourgeois or non-atheist forces in the Third World with Marxist ideas are less problematic in ways than revisionist "Marxist" parties. The principal contradiction, between imperialism and the oppressed nations, and the

extent of parasitism, make it possible that bourgeois forces in the oppressed camp may point to a more correct view of class structure than revisionist parties in the imperialist camp.

To some extent, the proletariat may even infiltrate the bourgeoisie consciously, but bourgeois parties do not need to call themselves Marxist. Without clear examples of Marxism and scientific communism, the species is doomed to eventual extinction; without a capable and equipped proletarian movement, imperialism will remain in place until it ruins the species. Third World bourgeois parties alone cannot defeat imperialism. The proletarian struggle is at a low point even in the Third World, but proletarian leadership is crucial for leaving imperialism behind.

Watery "Maoist" or "communist" unity with revisionist parties actually hurts the proletarian movement; it does not help it. Revisionists are effectively pursuing a different goal than communists', and so uniting with revisionists because of a supposedly common goal only holds back the struggle against bourgeois ideas. Revisionism represents the bourgeoisie in the communist movement.

First World public opinion struggle: National sovereignty or communism?

MIWS will raise some scenarios now for consideration, not that they necessarily reflect the true situation in Nepal. The exact extent to which the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) has capitulated, and the extent of imperialist involvement in Nepal, MIWS does not know; what MIWS does know is that the so-called Maoist party's and other phony "Maoist" parties' stated line, if implemented internationally, would be capitulation.

The united States has an anti-monarchist reputation that it would like to keep for chauvinist, nationalist and warmongering purposes under the banner of democracy and Liberalism. In opposing u.\$ interference in a country getting rid of its monarchy, taking advantage of the united States' anti-monarchist self-perception is an option. Even if the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) were Maoist, there is no communism-favoring proletarian majority in the united States that would be a basis for supporting that so-called Maoist party's struggle as a communist one. There is no proletarian majority in the united States to begin with, but a junior bourgeoisie made up of a labor aristocracy and middle-class professionals who are all exploiters of proletarian workers outside of the united States. The communist public opinion struggle to oppose u.\$ interference in Nepal would not emphasize the merits of Maoism and communism, but more likely national sovereignty. It would be

delusional to think that promoting communist unity in the united States with Nepal's "Maoists" would be central in an effective public opinion campaign against u.\$ interference.

Some in Britain are embarrassed by the anti-monarchy movement in Nepal, not just the so-called Maoists' electoral victory. Britain still has a monarch. Again, this would present an opportunity to divide exploiters, using anti-monarchy sentiments, to defend Nepalese sovereignty. Some British do not want to appear more monarchist than their country already is. Appealing to bourgeois internationalism on national sovereignty could work to discourage some support for interference in Nepal.

The counterargument to what MIWS is saying is that existing public opinion in the united States and Britain supports monarchy, and so raising the monarchy issue in the united States and Britain might actually be counterproductive for opposing interference in Nepal. Not only is there the Princess Diana phenomenon and fascination with British royalty; the Dalai Lama, popular in the West, is himself known as a god-king. And the West is sympathetic with last emperor of China Puyi in spite of Puyi's self-criticism during the Chinese revolution. In this case, national sovereignty would need to be separated from anti-monarchy in public opinion struggle and prioritized.

Some "Maoism" is genuine, but international "Maoist" unity largely has no role to play except as a diversion from the broad anti-imperialist united front that is needed. "Maoist" unity is usually a revisionist unity or a mashing of Maoism with revisionism. It also reflects an overemphasis on party-building, as if recruiting for Maoism in the First World or public outspoken radical militancy took precedence over dividing First Worlders by carefully utilizing contradictions between them. Promoting public support for Maoism in the First World or watered-down Maoism should not take the place of anti-imperialist work appropriate to First World conditions.

In terms of any united front against u.\$ imperialism, united fronts by definition include different classes, not just different supposedly proletarian organizations. Some alleged Maoists are willing to unite with revisionist parties in the Third World, but not institutions in Islamic countries targeted by u.\$ imperialism. It is either chauvinism, neo-colonialism, or a twisted attitude toward party-building as somehow involving mashing with revisionism. Scientific communism is unifying, not divisive. Opposing revisionism is necessary to unite the oppressed against imperialism,

capitalism, and patriarchy. It is the practice of the bourgeoisie to divide the oppressed, offer selective deals, and obscure the scientific and practical importance of struggle within Marxism and against revisionism.

The extent to which Nepal and Palestine will be treated differently by so-called leftists will be revealing. Hamas was democratically elected, but an emphasis on "Maoist" or "communist" unity would exclude them. All u.\$ interference should be opposed, not just interference in a country with a "Maoist" or "leftist" electoral victory or government.

Economic questions will be another likely area of inconsistency and double standard, as the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) has welcomed further integration with the imperialist economy, while fake Maoists have criticized Islamic and nationalist forces in Islamic and Muslim countries targeted by imperialism for not delinking from the world economy.

What is called national sovereignty should be genuine, not imperialist political warfare. MIWS said that the scenarios it raised, involving creating public opinion in support of Nepalese sovereignty if the united States or Britain interferes, does not necessarily reflect the situation in Nepal. First World communists may need to prioritize other struggles that do not make the assumption that the electoral victory of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" or the removal of the monarchy will result in u.\$ interference. The problem is that u.\$ imperialism often hedges its bets and has its hands in what are apparently different sides. The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is a revisionist party connected to the "Revolutionary Internationalist Movement" (RIM), whose counterrevolutionary line and activity in the service of imperialism Maoists have documented. In circumstances such as these, consistent anti-militarism and opposition to u.\$ interference, not just where a so-called Maoist party is concerned, is a guide for staying on the revolutionary course where the influence of u.\$ imperialism may be present on both sides of an international border.

It is disgusting to see those supporting the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) as a communist party simultaneously welcoming u.\$ occupation of Iran and attacking Islamic forces everywhere in the world. Obviously, the sovereignty of oppressed nations means nothing to hard-core Trotskyists posing as Maoists. Lack of consistent policies against imperialist intervention and militarism has led to an environment hospitable to imperialist political warfare and spying.

There is no dictatorship of the proletariat or new democracy in Nepal as far as anyone outside Nepal can tell using consistent standards based on previous experience. A party with such expressed problems as the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) has would have to prove its proletarian status in practice -- both by and after seizing power, because such a party would have to show how its ideology deals with a variety of problems under new democracy and socialism, better than Maoism. The ideology of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is not Maoism, but maybe Marxism-Prachanda-ism has some truth that will be put to the test. If there is no accumulation of universal truth over time, then anything is possible; nonetheless, an entirely new variant of Marxism would have to be verified through practice. The claims of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) to being a proletarian party are questionable, to say nothing of its allegedly being the proletarian vanguard in Nepal. The international "communist" supporters of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) outside Nepal purport to know the communist party situation in Nepal and purport to be able to choose the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) as the communist vanguard of Nepal. MIWS does claim to know the party or party-building situation in Nepal and does not claim to know who the vanguard in Nepal is, but First World communist strategy with respect to opposing u.\$. interference in Nepal's affairs does not depend on uniting with the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) as a communist entity.

"Communist" unity and contemporary scientific communism

This article deals with strategy, but basic line questions are involved. For those who believe that there is a revolutionary proletariat in the First World to such a degree that unity with oppressed nation bourgeois forces is not needed, or that imperialism does not exist, "communist" unity as a priority makes sense. Supporters claim that "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is the party of the Nepalese working class, and because the Nepalese people voted for the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) out of those who competed in the election, this vote is supposed to legitimize the party as a communist party. Since the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is Marxist in name only, opportunists and revisionists should be consistent and call the parties First Worlders elect parties of the working class or even communist parties. After all, all of these parties share the same stated goals of democracy and development and claim to oppose oppression. All glorify the

economic productivity of Euro-American workers and see a positive role for the u.\$. white working class in world affairs.

Scientific communism has never consisted of watery unity based on old historical questions or vaguely upholding a dead individual leader such as Mao, Stalin, or Marx. Scientific communism is living and concrete, and treats theory and an ongoing relationship between theory and practice as indispensable to achieving the communist goal. There are substantial differences of substance between forces calling themselves communist and between those calling themselves Maoist; although, in various struggles different kinds of revisionist line up in a way that expresses their similarity as representatives of exploiter interests. Some so-called Maoists were never Maoist. Treating communism as just a goal, rather than an accumulation of scientific practice, or symbolic trappings (such as red flags, M-E-L-S-M banners, and stereotyped communist language) has led to a situation where anything can be called communist. "Communist" unity joins together pseudo-communist parties that are revisionist and bourgeois; "communist" unity also mixes together revisionism and Maoism by collapsing important differences on contemporary questions.

Some, gutting Maoism of its contemporary scientific content, are trying to generate support for the the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) in particular by creating agreement on topics such as the Great Leap Forward and, to a lesser extent, the Cultural Revolution, reducing Maoism to populism and an egalitarian development ideology, and mashing Maoism with various non-Marxist trends, including social-democracy. Some would like to unite or create unity with the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) on the basis of a shared general communist or anti-capitalist goal. However, watery and mushy non-Maoist or pseudo-Maoist unity behind an allegedly Maoist communist party, substituted for real effective anti-imperialist work and exploiter-division tactics appropriate to the First World, is precisely what is wrong with much "leftist" interest in the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) specifically, as opposed to opposing u.\$. interference, intervention and militarism in general.

The principal contradiction is between imperialism and the oppressed nations. This together with the extent of imperialist parasitism mean that some left-wing forces in the imperialist countries calling themselves Marxist will be in the imperialist camp, and some "Marxist" forces in the oppressed nations will be compradors or lackeys. This will particularly be the case among those who do not recognize the principal

contradiction and end up serving imperialism through a build-up of line and strategic problems. The problem identified by Lenin of revisionism related to parasitism has become greater since Lenin's day.

The bourgeoisie thinks of things not in terms of communist principles, but so-called honesty and integrity. So, MIWS would say that the honest thing for the various intersecting grab-bag "Maoist," "communist," "socialist" and "leftist" organizations and publications to do would be to acknowledge that there is an issue in mushing together forces with major disagreements, or watering things down to a supposedly shared goal and down-playing crucial differences in theory and strategy. MIWS does not expect this acknowledgment to come. Some of these organizations, communities, publications and outlets may sometimes serve an agitational function, but they are not pursuing scientific truth.

Contemporary Maoism and phony-Maoism

Others claim to be anti-revisionist and have controversial ideas, but undermine the struggle against revisionism. Since there is a relative absence of reporting on the Nepalese election in the mainstream mass media and people may be coming to the Internet for news and information, MIWS will address mushing on the Internet. Defining what Maoism is and what revisionism is, is important, and so particularly interesting are those claiming to uphold the labor aristocracy thesis and other contemporary Maoist positions.

In any movement, there are people who take up correct positions, not because of a process of scientific struggle and unity, but because they are opportunist. A Maoist party may be the only radical party in their town, or they may be drawn to Maoism because of prestigious people's wars. The appeal of Maoism for some may just be its militancy. Or they may just dislike some alternatives to Maoism. As struggle becomes more difficult, or other things acquire prestige, opportunists show their true selves. Another form of opportunism is tolerating bourgeois ideas in the communist movement or movement-building context.

Without a doubt, some claiming to uphold the labor aristocracy thesis will opportunistically unite with the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) under the communist banner as it gains international popularity, even while claiming to be still true to Maoism and the labor aristocracy thesis. Among others upholding the labor aristocracy thesis, there are two or even one degrees of separation between some alleged Maoists and open fascists and white nationalists. MIWS has elsewhere

explained partly how the state has an interest in utilizing people claiming to uphold the correct labor aristocracy thesis.

Perhaps the point in creating an impression of Maoism as opportunist is to discredit Maoist criticism of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) and other phony "Maoist" forces. However, until recently many were rightly or wrongly willing to overlook problems of parties carrying out people's wars and people seemingly in a party-building stage. MIWS has made it clear in this article that associating and having relations with others internationally in communist fraternity, other than for clear purposes of scientific unity and struggle, has little benefit in comparison with tasks that are necessary in the First World.

As an answer to watery unity supporting the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) and phony-Maoist unity, some seem to be suggesting a new "Maoist" unity based on a return to orthodoxy or contemporary Maoist positions, such as the labor aristocracy thesis on the First World working class. MIWS's view again is that emphasis needs to be science, especially now when things are complicated and clarity is needed.

One issue is that many critics of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) are themselves non-Maoist. So, there is a need to talk about the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. At the same time, Maoism is more than just its fundamentals, and Maoist science has advanced since Maoism was born. Also, people who reject some fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism overlap with those claiming to be Maoist who appear to have fallen behind as Maoism has advanced. It is not the case that Maoism itself is non-scientific, or that parties considered Maoist until recently were necessarily Maoist, if they never systematically investigated imperialism and global class structure using Marxist methods and concepts. The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is going against the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; it may have always had a tenuous relationship with Maoism at best. Failure to grasp global class analysis and anti-imperialism, at the forefront of contemporary struggles in the international communist movement, indicates an overall failure to grasp Marxist-Leninist-Maoist science.

There are indications that some "Maoists" in the Third World have chosen not to publicize themselves as much as others have. So, one cannot easily make generalizations about "Maoism" in the world either. Much of what is called "Maoism"

today that has been heavily publicized may just be a result of First Worlders' corrupting "Maoism."

If the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) were openly bourgeois or claimed only to be anti-monarchist, there would not be as much "communist" and "leftist" interest in that party in particular in the first place. The problem is that it calls its ideas Marxist and Maoist and incorrectly names other things.

The "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) is so brazenly revisionist in its international representations of itself that it is causing a split even among revisionists and former supporters calling themselves Maoist. Yet, MIWS has suggested that underneath the CPN's revisionism may be Marxism-Prachandaism, waiting to be fully articulated and tested. Maybe the proletariat can carry out leadership and dictatorship through a parliament until communism. Maybe people's war is obsolete. Maybe there is no such thing as parasitism and imperialist super-profit except as abstractions not related to scientific concrete analysis or some occasional words in a speech or text used to deceive the masses.

Maybe George Bush really is the Antichrist. Maybe aliens have come from outer space, and maybe there is a totally new mode of production. Maybe the fundamental nature of reality has changed last time MIWS checked. After all, MIWS is just a Web site. Maybe zero plus one equals two. Perhaps Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is nothing, and one can add to it anything and call the result "Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Prachandaism."

The revisionist supporters, so-called critical supporters and critics of the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)) should call themselves "Marxist-Prachandaists," or, if not "Trotskyists," then "Marxist-Avakianists" or "Marxist-Globalizationists." "Post-Marxist" and "Marxism-influenced" are other options if one must use Marx's name. Anything other than clinging to "Maoism" would be progress.

The international communist movement has been undergoing a process of division as acute differences have emerged at important junctures, and there are competing ideas about Maoism. On the one hand, there are those advancing scientific communism. On the other hand, there are various, sometimes-contradictory forces stuck in old debates or incorrect tendencies.

Only science can unite the proletariat in the long term. Revisionism can't unite the proletariat, but it needs a glue to hold people together. That may be a cult of a dead

or living leader, religion, lifestyle, or watery "communist" unity, or a combination of things. The use of authority and the use of watery "communist" unity to cohere people who are in a movement both involve the use of non-scientific or pre-scientific tendencies. Pre-scientific people new to communism may be drawn to the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)), but the impetus for watery "communist" unity with the "Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)" (CPN (M)), blunting scientific struggle and the struggle against revisionism, partly arises from revisionism itself.

Some cults of personality may have arisen in a war situation, but people outside Nepal should not be thinking of themselves as mostly illiterate peasants following Prachanda into battle in a semi-feudal country getting rid of its god-king. Internationally, the cult of Prachanda is the same in function as the cult of RCP=U\$A leader Bob Avakian and the cult of Che Guevara and even cults of Lenin, Mao and Stalin that are disconnected from science. Cults of individuals may be too divisive for some revisionist purposes, and so there is a role for watery "communist" unity in rallying together a divergent mass of petty-bourgeois non-scientists who are not practicing communist science and inherently cannot unite on a scientific basis.

Whether it is a dead or living leader, some people with authoritarian mentalities in the imperialist countries just need to follow a leader and cannot grasp the need at the present stage of struggle for an anonymous movement unconnected to any kind of cult dynamic. Cults are useful for salvaging from crumbling revisionist movements, not for clarifying and seeking the truth. Then there are those (who may also belong to the first group) who confuse communism with socializing, a lifestyle, or a simple political identity or belief in a vision, and are attracted to a watery "communism." Experienced "radicals" consciously manipulate such people. To some extent then, watery "communist" unity clearly originates outside Maoism, but it may appear as an alternative to division tactics in the First World that MIWS has discussed, particularly where the unity would be with Third World parties carrying out people's wars or overthrowing oppressors. Communists must decide whether they are going to prioritize opposing imperialism, using tactics appropriate to majority-exploiter imperialist countries, or uniting with random publicized organizations claiming to be Maoist or communist.