

# Outcomes of Democracy in Nepal

Hari Roka

*Paper prepared for the Project on*  
**State of Democracy in South Asia**

as part of the Qualitative Assessment of Democracy

**Lokniti (Programme of Comparative Democracy)**

**Centre for the Study of Developing Societies**

**Delhi**

## Introduction

Nepal has entered in modern political process in 1951 after the over-through of autocratic Rana Regime. The change of 1951 was an incomplete revolution. Under autocratic Rana Regime, Nepal remained a semi-peripheral country in various aspects. Therefore, a democratic revolution was not possible without help and aspiration from outside. The political change of 1951 was also a by-product of international liberation movement. Which was flourishing before and after Second Great world War. At the moment there were three powerful forces, King (with powerful Indian Backing), Rana with state power and Nepali Congress with new revolutionary carders and with broad international political support and solidarity.

As we describe above as a semi-peripheral state Nepal, which is land locked by India from three parts and had a great geo-political and security interest on Nepal. To fulfill the interest newly born India was not in favour of complete revolution in Nepal. The main reason was to avoid the greater influence of China's Revolution in Nepal that was established in northern boarder. The second reason was Indian interest, which preferred to deal on monopolistic term with neighbours and third world states. In such background India preferred to manage negotiation among the three conflicting Nepali forces. It was fulfilled under its recommendation, which is known as "Delhi Samjhouta" (Delhi Negotiation among King, Nepali Congress and Rana autocratic regime).

However, the change of 1951 comprised an extrasystemic change, which radically transformed the political process and pattern of political behaviour. It had amplified the range of participation in the state politics of peripheral elites for the first time in Nepalese history. Although, the political process had not begun comfortably in Nepal as new Nepali political elites were thinking. The political leadership of the state were lacking knowledge on extensive intension of the King who wants all political power of the state in his hand, those elites who entered in to the national politics were divided in two faction basically, in favaour of Nepali Congress and second category those who were jealous with Nepali Congress gathered under the umbrella of King. There were several reasons. At the moment, first Nepal had lack of proper political institutions, secondly, there were lack of commitment of the Royal palace on the past negotiation and democracy and lastly, there were lack of politically motivated critical masses<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, King Tribhuvan and his son Mahendra gradually consolidated state power on their grip. Many thinkers in Nepal had an idea that the political change of 1951 would lead towards the capitalistic path of development. But this did not happen in Nepal due to two major reasons. The first reason was the political leadership and its motive towards capitalist development. Secondly, Capitalist development needs unleashing of productive forces. Due to lack of progressive productive forces requires an acceleration and intensification of the process of capital accumulation. It was not possible to achieve without the total socio-economic and political transformation. The government which was established in 1959 under the leadership of Nepali Congress had a compulsion of such transformation through radical reform such as, land reform, more expenditure on social things to improve health, education, various kind of trainings and so on. But new as well as old elites were not favourable for such transformational activities. The king also beneficial from the popular view of government was fundamentally authoritarian, in the orthodox Hindu interpretation where high caste people only can rule the other. It means the given situation had been heavily emphasized the symbolic position of the ruler. In this background, when King Mahendra throne in 1955 after the death of his father King Tribhuvan then the Nepali politics gradually turned towards regression. The king avoid the election of constitutional assembly, which his father had promised to conduct after the change of 1951, and handover new constitution of his own in 1959, in which all sovereign power had reserved himself. Political parties accepted the given constitution hoping they will gain in parliamentary process later (Baral: 2004).

King Mahendra and royal forces had a ambition of an active monarchy keeping in mind that, King is the real authority of the state, because his forefathers had unified the country so role of the monarchy symbolizing as 'saviour', 'unifier' and 'integrationist' force in the country thus, he and his successor born in this country to rule the entire people (Kumar Dhurba: 2004). When the first elected government tried step forward for some radical change then the elite including Royal palace thought that they were loosing everything thus they could not wait even single term of the governance of Nepali Congress. King Mahendra dismissed the B.P. Koirala Government on 15 December 1960 with the help of Royal Nepal Army, and sabotages all political and fundamental human rights of the people. The 18 month- long experiment of semi-parliamentary system ended by force (ibid).

After assuming all power of the state through Royal army coup, King Mahendra formally established absolute Monarchy in practice. Through several proclamations he consolidated the state power on his own grip and band all political activities of the parties who were based on the wide principle of pluralism and

multiparty system. He already proclaimed that those who involved in Party system and belief on parliamentary politics are "anti-national." Thus, the character of participation of the people in the state politics became non-ideological and non-political. Basically, individualism and loyalty towards Royal family becomes 'ideology' for those who entered in to the Panchayat politics. Thus their 'party-less democracy' completely destroyed the word power of 'democracy'. They forgot the actual definition of 'democracy' that is the name of political form in which people have power. However this system existed for three decades because the cold war, antagonistic relations between India and China, and the attitude and conduct of bilateral and multilateral development agencies all combine to provide implicit and explicit backing to this autocratic regime (Roka: 2004).

The exclusion, torture, inequality, non-distribution of state wealth, nepotism, favoritism, corruption, lack of minimal human right, mass level unemployment and under employment and over all under development in every aspect of lives had become the main characteristics of the party less Panchayat all over three decades. Political and economic dependency had increased. So-called land reform programme excluded most of the tenants from the land. Then, mass level under-employment non-employment had massively appeared. The over all growth rate of national economy remained in near about one percent, while population growth rate was more than 3 percent. Which grew massive frustration among the Students, teachers, social workers, employers and farmers. In such situation all the class and creeds realised massive political movement. The underground political parties tried to educate their carders for mass agitation. Then the small and large movements were gradually flourished; the student movement of 1979/80 compelled the king for referendum, which gave the pace for the political parties. The non-violence movement of 1984, which was conducted by NC, and political agitation programme of five-left parties open the space for future unified action. In February-April 1990 band political parties under the leadership of Nepali Congress and Left Front (seven moderate communist Parties) commenced the 'people's movement' in which United National People's Movement (UNPM) (five radical communist splinter group) separately participated, which was successfully carried out. This movement was the accumulation of past experiences and was the final struggle for restoration of Parliamentary Democracy that was highjacked by the monarchy on 1960. After fifty-seven days of struggle of people and parties then King Birendra, realised the power of the people and life to death struggle. Which ended three-decade-old Panchayat System (1960-1990) and compelled the king to restored multiparty system.

## **II: New Constitution, Social structure, Citizenship and rights and rule of Law:**

Restoration of Democracy was the only one agenda of the struggling forces in 1990's people's movement. But, the king initially was interested in only a few minor political reforms within Panchayat system. The Nepali Congress was primarily concern with the lifting of the ban on political parties. The left Front wanted a total dissolution of the Panchayat and the establishment of full multiparty democracy. The United people's Movement Coordination Committee (UNPMCC) represented an extreme left position. When consider for negotiation only the representatives of ULF and Nepali Congress were invited and UNPMCC was not part of the negotiation process with the King (Hacchethu: 1994).

On 8 April 1990, Royal announcement proclaimed and removed the word "Party less" from the existing constitution and initiated the process of establishing a constitution Amendment Recommendation Committee. This showed that the intention of the King was to carryout reforms from within the existing constitution. The representatives of the political parties specially left parties were severely criticized by their own rank and file and strongly denounced by the UNPMCC. On 9 April tens of thousands of people came out on the streets to celebrate this 'victory' although, ordinary people sensed suspicious intention in the royal proclamation. The popular pressure led to a meeting between Nepali Congress and Left Front on 11 April at which 8-point list of demands was finalized for submission to the king by Ganesh Man Singh the, then supreme commander of the movement at their scheduled meeting on 13 April. These demands included the dissolution of the National Panchayat, and Chand Cabinet (cabinet under Lokendra Bahadur Chand), the dissolution of all provisions in the existing constitution that contravened the fundamental doctrine of multiparty democracy, the release of all political prisoners and the formation of a Constitution Recommendation Commission with proper representation from both Nepali Congress and the Left Front (ibid). After great debate and huge public pressure King had announced the formal dissolution of the Panchayat system, including all its core institutions. This paved the way for the formation of an interim

government led by the Nepali Congress and including representatives from the ULF and independents and a royal nominee (Roka: 2004).

Drafting new Constitution was the next challenge for political forces. King initially wanted only to some amendments in Panchayati constitution, and even in new constitution, palace wanted to keep the king as the sovereign power in the constitution. The palace had, in the face of popular political pressure, to renounce this agenda and agree to constitutionally asserted sovereignty of People. It was the compulsion for the palace to accept the new constitution king's autocratic regime had been lost its legitimacy. The new constitution was endorsed by Nepali Congress, reluctantly by the palace, critically by the CPN (M-L) the precursor of today's CPN (UML) and rejected by the extreme left parties. Nilamber Acharya, chair of the then Cabinet Sub-committee on the constitution, recalls that a royalist just after the release of the new constitution said that this constitution too would become defunct one day<sup>2</sup>. However, the constitution of 1990 was a great achievement of Nepali people and for the first time in Nepali history. This constitution demoted monarchy to the titular head of the state by transferring sovereignty to the people and power to the elected representatives of parliament, *"where as, we are convinced that the source of sovereign authority of the independent and sovereign is inherent in the people, and, therefore, we have, from time to time, made known our desire to conduct the government of the country in consonance with the popular will"*<sup>3</sup> (The Constitution of The Kingdom of Nepal 2047: 1 (1990)) was included in the constitution for the first time in nation's history. But even realizing the Kingdom as multiethnic, multilingual, democratic, independent, indivisible, sovereign, the constitution of 1990 keep the clause of 'Hindu Kingdom'. Similarly, Nepal has several caste and creeds, they have their own languages, religion and culture but in new constitution inclusion Nepali Language in the Devnagari script is the language of nation of Nepal and the other Nepali language as shall be the official language, however, it accepted all the language spoken as the mother tongue in the various parts of Nepal are national languages of Nepal. However, Chhetri, Brahman and hill Dalit people are the major stakeholder of Nepali language which only covered 15.80, 12.74 and around 10percent respectively of the total population, where as other more than 61 percent people have their own language and script, thus majority of the people are feeling discrimination, similarly on the side of religion lots of indigenous people have their own religion and other religions such like Buddhist and Muslims, and natural religious group were also discriminated while state announced 'The Hindu kingdom' in its new constitution. In the given constitution Part-2 clause 9 has accepted the right of citizenship of the people in following condition (1) whose father is a citizen of Nepal and (2) Whenever any territory is acquired by way of incorporation in to the Kingdom of Nepal, every person having his domicile with such territory shall become a citizen of Nepal. But in Nepal there is very difficult to find out the citizenship for those who cannot speak and write the Nepali language and whose father does not have had citizenship and relevant matter. They are benevolent citizen of Nepal living traditionally but not having a piece of land neither home, like agriculture workers in Tarai, but they are not getting citizenship. It is calculated that more than 3.4 million people still not having citizenship<sup>4</sup>.

The constitution has addressed the fundamental rights of the people. But, rulers and elite of the state mechanism whatever have been practicing, not giving full confidence to the people. In every field they are feeling discrimination. Various commissions were building and lots of political parties had fought in parliament but nothing improved and implemented in real practice.

According to the Constitution of 1990 when the political party secured at least 3 percent of the total vote cast in general election would be known as national party. There are no other provisions to become a national party. How much it would be realistic and justifiable where multiethnic, multi religious, multi-caste, multi- cultural, regional and multi-linguistic people lives together in the society but they do not have sufficient organizational inclusiveness in the party structure? According to famous columnist C.K.Lal, "Political circumstance in liberal democracy always offers to the disadvantaged people -who do not have any kind of privileges from the state- 'opportunity is here, come struggle and take the share'. Simultaneously he says "Janajati Pradhanmantri, Madheshi Jarnel, Dalit Pradhan Nayadhish, wa Mahila Mul -Purohit Akalpaniya Lagdchha bhne tinlai tyha samma Purayune Partikharu Dekha Pareka Chainan"(It is unimaginable that Prime Minister from Tribal community, General from Tarain community, Chief Justice from Dalit, and main priest from women, and still no symbols or institutions are appeared to brought them in to the position) (Lal: 2058: 17).

The structural composition of the central committees of the Major political parties Nepali Congress and CPN (UML), which shows the clear picture of non-inclusiveness of the minorities. In the last convention of the Nepali Congress which was held in Pokhara there were gathered 1404 representatives from 71 districts in which 57.83 percent were main stream Khas and Brahamin, 19.94 from Madheshi, 7.12 percent from the Newar, 0.51 percent Dalit, 14.60 percent Janjati. In Central Working Committee that was elected by the

convention members were 88.89 from the mainstream Brahmin and Chhetri and rest of all others, in which there are no representatives of Dalits. But Dalit represents more than 14 percents of the total population {(Kumar Yatra: 2058:384-85 (2001))}. The composition of the Communist Party of Nepal (UML) is not more different than Congress, where, 71.4 percent are Brahmin, 17 percent Chhetri, 5.7 percent Newar, 2.85 Janjati, and 2.85 percent Madheshi. In the case of women in Nepali Congress there is 9.6, in UML 5.7, and in RPP there is 7.2 percent. This leadership structure clearly shows that there is no proportional representation according to ethnic composition and in the case of gender among the distributed population; it means the party structure is not representing the majority of the population.

Even in the General Election of the national legislation of 1999 where there are only 12 women elected, hill tribal group 12, Newar 7, Madheshis 17 and other 1 but there were no Dalits elected out of 205 (Baral: 2001:49). In top brass of the state or constitutional body the representation of the Hill ethnic, Madheshi, Dalit are negligible in judiciary, Hill tribes represents 4, Madheshi 18, Dalit zero out of 235; In constitutional bodies Hill tribe 2, Madheshi 3, Dalit zero out of 25; in the last house (both houses) Member of Parliament were 36, 46, and 4 respectively out of 265. Simultaneously, in the bureaucracy the representation are so insignificant of the minorities. In the top brass secretaries of the ministries there were 3 Madheshies no Dalit and hill tribe out of 39, in the secretariats of the ministries and Royal palace non-are there out of 28, Special secretary and co-secretary level there were 1, 3, 0 respectively out of 94. In police force 2, 0, 0, respectively out of 7 and in Army generals and above 2, 0, 0, respectively out of 5 (Bhandari: 2001: 184-85, Samaya Weekly 10 Manshir 2061:30-32). This over all pictures clearly indicates that the inclusiveness of all people in the present state structure is negligible.

However, the Constitution of 1990 had open the windows for the people adopting several fundamental rights such as, Right to Equality, Right to Freedom, Press and Publication Right, Right Regarding Criminal Justice, Right to Information, Right against Preventative Detention, Right to Property, Cultural and Educational Right, Right to Religion, Right against exploitation etc. But in real practice it was not seriously implemented.

The interim government formed under the leadership of Krishna Prasad Bhattarai in 1990. It had two assignment first drafting new constitution and second to holding general election within one year. The government fulfilled these two heavy tasks within its time frame. But it compromises with King on various issues, within constitution making and compromised on not taking any action against those culprits who were engaged on previous state system and those who were stand against people's movement. The one-man commission had made under ex-jurist Janardan Mallik who had presented commission report to the government too but Prime minister Bhattarai did nothing. It was due to internal compromise with king. Even it is said that the commission could not deal with Royal Army and Nepal police who were severely involved in mass killings, tortures and other unsocial activities were not submitted in the commission report, because government was not enthusiastic to help Mallik. It was the main reason that retrogressive force have a chance to unite and formed the party named Rastriya Parjatantra Party (RPP) and exist as a fourth force in Parliament on first General Election and become third in other two mid term elections. RPP culturally dominated later in both houses, House of Representatives and Upper House. Lokendra Bahadur Chand and Surya Bahadur Thapa (both were leaders of RPP and ex-Prime Minister in Panchyat System) became Prime Ministers turn by turn with the help of Communist Party of Nepal (UML) and Nepali Congress respectively.

The palace and RPP has got chances to maneuver both largest parties. There were fundamental ideological differences between Nepali Congress and CPN (UML). Nepali Congress did not consider CPN (UML) as 'democratic party'; similarly UML did not consider Nepali Congress as nationalist and democratic socialist. After second general election RPP divided in to two factions living within same party. The faction led by Chand known as Nationalist and secondly, Thapa faction led as democratic. CPN (UML) makes associate with Chand Faction of RPP and Congress make alliance with Thapa faction in the later days.

Nepali Congress who had adopted neo-liberal political economy as its principle, where as CPN (UML) was in confusion on its basic principle of Communism due after the collapse of Soviet Union and demise of Eastern European regimes, although the hangover of revolutionary feeling and dream of radical change always suspected by Nepali Congress on UML belief on democratic value and norms. These all were the main reasons that Nepali Congress, when it was reached in state power with simple majority thought and behaved that only it represent the democratic interest of the entire nation and CPN (UML) and other left parties who were in main opposition and oppositions seeking power are thus often placed in the position of appearing to be, at best, obstructionist of progress or, at worst, enemies of the country. When Nepali

Congress was in power in first phase after 1991 it suppressed carders of the left opposition. Hundreds of political carders were detained in falls cases and tortured severely in police custody.

The culture of non-ideological political alliances and repression over opposition parties grew frustration in the first phase. It encouraged dirty politics of non- political and non-programmatic alliance among the forces for seeking power. All kind of malpractices, corruption, horse-trading of parliamentarians for majority became common phenomenon. These all activities of the establishments and main opposition encouraged the third group to turn to extremist measure.

On 16 February 1996 Nepal Communist Party (Maoist) declared 'people's war'. First of all they started to kill policemen, destroying police posts with heavy bombardment, then abduction, torture and killing of opposition political carders on charge of spying and in the name of class enemies, mainly they killed and tortured the carders of Nepali Congress. Maoists are continuing their people's war since 1996 to till the date. In counter and encounter between Unified security force and Maoists killed more than fifteen thousands people, several hundreds disappeared in the name of Maoist militants, spy and class-enemy, thousands wounded and more than one million people affected more than one hundred thousands displaced from their native villages (Human Rights Year Book-2004, Human Right Watch, Vol.16 No 12 (c)).

Since the deployment of the RNA in anti Maoist operation the number of disappearances of the people has been increasing dramatically. According to the UN Working Group on Enforced and involuntary Disappearances, Nepal has the largest numbers of enforced disappearances in the world. National Human Right Commission (NHRC) documented six hundred sixty two cases of enforced disappearance involving joint security forces between November 2000 and November 2003 (NHRC December 2003). The breakdown of the last ceasefire on August 27, 2003 -hundreds have been detained or since abducted since then, and many remain missing (HRW, Vol.16, No.12 (c)).

Government had introduced Terrorist and Disruptive Act (TADA), which came in to effect in April 2002, in which security force can arrest without warrant and detain for sixty days for investigation and up to ninety days in preventive detention, without producing the detainee before a court of law. Now the government has extended the duration of time from ninety days to one year for detain through Royal ordinance-2004, however several Human Rights and legal Organizations draws flak from all sides (The Kathmandu Post Nov-2, 2004).

Maoists are also abducting people not signally, in hundreds and even in thousands some time from the villages and schools in the name of training, it is to show their strength and influence among the people and for the nomination in their organization and to make whole Timer (WT) activist as people's militia for their people's war purposes. Thousands of people even old children and women are fleeing from their native place leaving foodgrains shelters and cattle's towards unknown destinations.

Today's Nepal it is too much vulnerable, militarizing process has growing highly. Judicial proceedings and regulatory institution are undermined. This armed conflict have been provoked a complete paralysis of the political process. So the political vacuum is increasing widely. Besides Maoist's peoples war there is growing possibilities of tough conflict on caste, religion, regional linguistics-based may galvanize tomorrow. Which would be provocative for further disaster and culmination of the statehood.

### **III: Economic Rights**

The movement of 1990's opens the door of political freedom and promote for the process of participating in the decision-making procedures on several fields. But in the economic field there was a consensus among the major establishment forces like Nepali Congress, Royal palace and majority of the intellectuals in favour of market-oriented approach to development. Most of them believed on a competitive free market and the dominance of private entrepreneurial activities enable more efficient allocation of resources. This has lead to the adoption of a range of economic policy reforms: involving stabilization, structural adjustment, liberalization and deregulation. This policy reform programme was the continuation of stabilization programme that had introduced in 1985 and was sponsored by the IMF and the World Bank.

Twenty-five years of autocratic regime under the leadership of Royal Palace had started modernization making balance between the positions in the mobilization and reconciliation system. Late king Mahendra

symbolized complete power; he had the state personified; he had the personal lord of every citizen and the relation between king and subject had direct and immediate. King Mahendra did what David E. Apter characterized the modernized autocracy in 'Political Strategies of Development' as (a) hierarchical authority; (b) exclusivism (c) strategic flexibility; (d) unitarism; and (e) neo-traditionalism.<sup>5</sup> In these political circumstances the goals of economic development were filtered through the screen of traditional institutions. Economic policies were adopted that traditional elites wanted. The so-called Land Reform failed, agricultural production declined and industrial production could not grow as it was expected. If we look at the major economic trend of the decade on 1971-80 period then we found that the real GDP growth was only 2.1 percent, in which agriculture was just 0.5, non-agriculture was 7 percent, where agriculture contributes more than one-half of the households' incomes, provides employment to the 80 percent of the population (NDR 1998). This ominous sign of economy was reflected in revenue and foreign exchanges, which were declining sharply. In 1984, the foreign exchange reserves were just sufficient to meet many import requirements for four months. To meet this requirement, the autocratic regime of King Birendra agreed to implement a stabilization programme. The IMF and World Bank, who were the champions of the programme, had a simple diagnosis only on the 'balance of payment' and 'inflation' difficulties. In the first phase they prescribed government spending, devaluation of the currency and positive real domestic interest rates. In the second phase they introduced a longer term Structural Adjustment Programme without any structural changes in the state's traditional mechanism, which is popularly known as neo-liberal economic policy (Skerry et al 1992 and Roka: 2003).

After the restoration of democracy, the Nepali Congress won with a clear majority in the general election of 1991 and formed a single party government. This government also accelerated the same agendas of neo-liberalism. Previously, the champion of democratic socialism defined their 'socialism' as not guided by the 'orthodoxy' type, where the state dictates. In the Eighth Plan document they stated that "the supportive role of the state will bring about social and economic justice through increasing production, creation of employment and special programmes directed towards the upliftment of the socially and economically deprived poor people who were left out of the mainstream of the development". They further stated with the failure of socialist countries -USSR and European countries- the traditional state directed socialism was no longer suited to the existing global economic scenario. "The policies will be adapted to carry out development through a free market oriented liberal economic system" (Eighth Five Year Plan Document - 1992-97; pp 85). Under this policy government enhanced the privatization of the state-owned forms, opened all the barriers for the liberalization of the economy for the foreign direct investment which means connecting the national economy to the globalized world without preparation.

It was not much more different what Lucian W. Pye analyzed 28 years before. He proclaimed, "The elite who dominate the national politics of most non-western countries generally represent a remarkably homogeneous group in terms of educational experience and social backgrounds. Indeed, the path by which individuals are recruited into their political roles, where not dependent upon ascriptive considerations, is essentially an acculturation process" (Pye 1962: 520). In Nepalese perspective it was the same what our political leadership repeated in the same manner in our transitional politics.

The neo-liberal economic policies were not the demand of the majority of the people in which the role of the elite and neo-class effectively presumed. The policy was not productive in such circumstances where rampant poverty, illiteracy, low level of educational accomplishment, unemployment and underemployment, inter-household economic inequality were present. Where the majority of people are dependent on agriculture and there was a vast contrast in terms of land ownership and income and sharply discriminated economically, socially, politically and culturally since the unification of Nepal by its own rulers.

The state was completely waiting for structural changes. The majority of the people, nearly 71 percent, are under the absolute poverty level; nearly half of the national income was in the hand of the richest 10 percent, more than 60 percent of the total population are illiterate, more than 90 percent of the population lives in rural areas and 81 percent of the labour force is engaged in backward agricultural occupation, and where 10 percent are completely unemployed and 60 percent of people are underemployed and around 43 percent of holders owning less than 0.5 hectare of land accounted for only 11 percent of cultivated land. The top 11 percent of households owning 3 hectares and more accounted for the around 42 percent of cultivated land (Bhattarai 2003:117-18 and Nepal National Census of Agriculture 1991). In addition, poverty is noticeably more prominent among the lower caste, especially in the Dalits comprising of Damai, Kami and Sharki caste. It ranges from a lowest of 65 percent of Sharki, to a highest 68 percent in Kami. Next to Dalit tribal groups are prominent. Among tribal groups, poverty varied from a lowest of 45 percent among the Gurung to a highest of 71 percent among Limbu, Newar (25 percent), Brahmins (34 percent), Muslim (38

percent), and several groups from the Tarai (40 percent), are the social groups with low level of poverty (NDHR, 1998). But neo-liberal economic policies which implemented by the state could not address economically deprived and politically, socially and culturally suppressed people.

It does not mean nothing happened in the tenure of democracy. In the decade of 1990s Real GDP grew by average annual rate of 4.8 percent in the 1992-2000 period compared to 4.6 percent during the 1982-91 periods. The non-agriculture sector grew at a greater rate in the 1990s 6.5 as compared to the 1980s 5.0 percent. Manufacturing sector's growth rate increased from 6.6 percent to almost 10 percent, in the review period. But agriculture sector growth lagged behind in the later period by 2.5 percent annually compared to 4.0 percent in the 1980s.

The improvement in the external sector was also encouraging in 1990s, Export GDP ratio which virtually remained stagnant during the second half of the 1980's (due to Indian barricades), increased 5.0 percent in 1991 to 13.2 percent in 2000. Current account deficit remained around 5 percent of GDP and foreign exchange reserve equivalent 11 months of merchandise imports. However external outstanding debt has increased by more than two hundred percent between 1991 and 2000 (National Planning Commission: iii, May 13-20, 2001). Government for the first time since 1994, provided three hundred thousands to 5 hundred thousands rupees to every VDC per annum for the development purposes, where elected personnel can spend for the village development.

But, without structural change basically in landownership and redistribution of wealth the problems of the country was not possible to be solved. The majority of the population highly dependent on agriculture, but food production is fluctuating from a high growth rate 5.0 from 1981-85 to 2.2 in 1991-95 and 2.5 percent in 1996-2000. The per capita food availability that had been growing at 2.1 percent in 1981-85 but government was able to redistribute only 1.5 percent of agriculture land in the following 30 years. Nepal has seen the highest growth in agriculture-land use during 1990s: the agricultural land grew at an average rate of 2.42 percent between 1990-99, while growth in the eighties was only 0.12. The total percentage of GDP, the share of agriculture is 39.6 in 2003 while it was 60.3 in 1993 but in the case of transformation of labour is almost non-existing during the period 1960-1998: the share of labour employed in agriculture declined from 95 percent to 94. Similarly, as a percentage of GDP, the share of agricultural export has declined from 93.8 in 1970 to 10.1 percent in 1990. But the labour force employed in agriculture grew at an average annual 2.15 percent in 1980-89 and 2.54 percent between 1990-99; however, the average annual growth rate of productivity was only 0.05 during 1990-99.<sup>6</sup> Due to slow growth of agriculture sector owing to the high population growth and low productivity, Nepal experiencing a deficit of food production and has turned in to net importer of food: 45 out of 75 districts in the country are clarified as food deficit. It imported 46 thousand metric tones of cereals during 1999. For the small farmers there has limited access to water, credit, fertilizer, and other resources as compared to large farmers and land owners and lower access to these resources leads to low incomes and consequently, food insecurity in the rural areas. Equity in the distribution of resources is, therefore an important factor influencing food security. The consequences, the divide between the rich and poor is widening in Nepal following the adoption of liberalization policies. One research article shows that inequality of consumption in Nepal, as a whole measured by Gini coefficient is 0.43. However, there is a big difference in the degree of inequality between urban and rural areas: as high as 0.43 compare to 0.31 in rural areas. The Gini coefficient across countries typically lies in a range between 0.2 and 0.5. In this context, the degree of inequality in the two sectors is striking (Roka: 2003 and Human Development in South Asia -2002). In conclusion, there has no equitable access and in democracy too government did not try to redistribution of the wealth.

CPN (Maoist) had started their people's war which they have had such kind of structural causes with other political background. Now they are proclaiming that they are on the stage of strategic offensive. They are not only killing class enemy and security forces also damaging personal and state property. Still there is no actual data of damages, in one calculation the cost of property damage more than \$ 5 billion within 2003. Simultaneously, through the bank robberies, kidnapping, and extortion, they have gathered significant resources -estimated to total from \$30 to \$ 100 million (Palmer: 3 October 2003, Report for USAID). To counter the Maoists, government has increasing defense budget every year curtailing the allocation of social and development budget since 1997/98 to 2004/05 periods. In 1995/96 the budgetary allocation for security sector Rs.4.24 billions while it was allocated in the financial year 2004/05 by Rs.14.75 billion s, which is 3.48 times higher (Budget Speeches 1995/96&2004/05). According to Dhurba Kumar an eminent security specialist and political scientist working in CINAS under Tribhuvan University "these budgetary figures should be read only as the maintenance cost of the core security sector. The RNA is pursuing for a role with increased recruitment of the armed personnel and weaponization with sophisticated gadgets ... the army has recently proposed for an additional budget of Rs. 13.86 billion to enhance the security

situation in the country. For the current fiscal year 2004/05, the RNA has stipulated the current need of an additional Rs.6.13 billion and rest for the two subsequent years (Kumar 2004).

When Prime minister Sher Bahadur Deuba dismissed the Parliament on 23 May 2002 then the development function deteriorated. Similarly he did not extend the terms of office of the thousands of Village Development Committee (VDC) and District Development Committee (DDC). Instead of elected body, he replaced them with officials appointed by the central government then other two King's nominee Prime Minister also followed the same. Then the country lost all the hope of not only development but also all kind of democratic process. This process followed by King Gyanendra on 4 October 2002 who dismiss Prime minister Deuba and his cabinet and take up all the power of the state since then his puppet governments and he himself exploiting the state resources vehemently.

The periphery of the country has already been separating from the district towns, cities and center due to conflict between Maoists and Joint security force. The presence of the government is lessening. The consequence, the revenue from the periphery is also curtailing at the same proportion. However, Nepal is getting much more remittances from its citizens. It is expected that Rs.75 billion is coming yearly through banking channel. Three years before the contribution of the remittances in foreign exchange reserves was 26.3 now it has increased and reached 30 percent in the fiscal year 2003-04 (Nepal 2004). But, the displacement and temporary migration of youth and energetic hands from the country is ruining the productivity of the agriculture sector.

## **IV. Institutional Arrangement**

### **Role of Political Parties:**

In the period of 1960 to 1990 political parties were band. Therefore the roles of political functionaries were also concentrated in specific areas where most of well educated and critical masses lives. Thus, basically the political movements against government were also concentrated in the city centers and in the capital. Till the decade of 70s most of the leaders were either in prisons or in exile in India. When King Birendra declared national referendum in 1979 after forceful student's movement then the political dialogue spread all over the country and among the general masses for the first time after 1960, although, there was no space for political parties for functioning after Panchyat triumph in the referendum. Therefore there was lots of ignorance of functioning and emergence of political institutions. Political leadership had no real ideas what people want and need.

Krishna Hachhethu an eminent political scientist referred G.P. Koirala, the first elected Prime Minister of Nepal after 1991 that " At a time, when I became prime minister, I did not have clear idea about the powers and functions of Prime Minister ...the popular aspiration remain unmet due largely to visionless political parties, which were instrumental in restoration of democracy. The political parties knew democracy was their single point agendas" (cited from Krishna Hachhethu from his article 'Parties in Parliament: Role of Prime Minister published in Political Parties and Parliament; edited by Lok Raj Baral2004). We can assume today that the position of the political parties at 1990 and there after was lack of knowledge and information about country's real situation and their agendas. Even in the goal setting of the political parties were very different. Nepali Congress as we describe above was only ascribing democracy, but what kind? How they will fulfill the aspirations of the people? What kind of transformation they will manage in the socio-economic and political fields? How they will finalize the methodology for over all participation of all people in mainstream political and socio-economic development agendas? All questions were unanswered. Neo-liberal socio-economic polity replaced the ideology of Democratic Socialism of Nepali Congress, which was endorsed by world capitalism after the collapse of Soviet Union and Eastern European Countries.

Nepali Congress was founded in exile in India in 1947; politically it was a movement rather than political institution. It was highly impressed by Indian National Congress. Therefore, all kind of class and creed even different ideological background people were involved in the movement conducted by Nepali Congress. In 1956 it adopted democratic socialism as its ideology (ibid). When the leadership tried to implement some radical reform agendas such as nationalization of forest and Birta (tax exempt land), legislation abolishing the raja -rajouta (small feudal principalities) system, introduction of property tax, increased budget for

education, health service and communication, and introduced high level commission for Land Reform, then most of its members of parliament were shake hand with King Mahendra after coup d'état.

Nepali congress, while it adopted the neo-liberalism as its political-ideological faith in practice then distinct political sphere were lacked, which structured units of political influence tends to be personal cliques. Party could not function institutionally. The particular pattern of political relationships among the leaders, senior carders and even parliamentarians had largely determined by decision made at the personal level. The consequences, the inner party factionalism so heavily emerged that led to the collapse the NC governments in several times such as G.P. Koirala government falls in 1994 and 2001, S.B. Deuba Government in 1997 and 2002, and K.P. Bhattarai government in 2000 and lastly, party split in 2002. Post 1990 Nepali Congress remained in power in different times approximately 9 years out of 10 years of democratic system functioning, but they never had given solemn attention on various emerging problems of the country and new dynamism of societal changes. The leadership did not gave serious attention that the ultra rightist nostalgic force and ultra left can attacked from different corners over the democratic system, which was the most serious mistake they made while they were in power.

The CPN (UML) emerged as a second largest party in the general election of 1991, it was formed in this name UML in January 1991 just before the first General election while CPN (M-L) and CPN (Marxist) merged each other. CPN (M-L) had a background of Jhapa Andolan ideologically it had a impression of Cultural Revolution of China and Naxalite uprising in India, meanwhile the Marxists were soft and in favour of restoration of multiparty democracy. However, both factions were in confusion ideologically at the mean time of merger because of the collapse of Soviet Union and demise the rule of Eastern European socialism, and neo-liberal economic policies adopted by Republic of China in the name of Market-Socialism. However, they had no faith in multiparty system while they fought election in 1991. Only they adopted system as a means to reach in to the goal of New-Democratic Revolution. But when the party emerged as second largest party in 1991 securing 69 seats in House of Representatives out of 205 and secured 27.98 percent of the total popular vote then UML becoming a supporter of multiparty system believing that they will reach in power by the means of election too and can implement radical agenda of change. It was its major turned out from its previous ideology. The party had adopted Jantako Bahudaliya Janbad (People's Multiparty Democracy) instead of Naulo Janbad (Neo People's Democracy) in its Fifth National Convention, which was held in 1993. Ideologically, it had adopted entire democratic principles guaranteeing fundamental rights of citizens, peaceful competition among the political parties, periodical election, rule of the majority party, rule of law, adaptation of liberal economic agenda including other 14 points (UML 1993). But in action it had no idea how a main opposition should play and can play the vital roles in parliament. It implemented the strategy of Sadan Dekhi Sadak Samma (from the parliament to the street). It did not wait first 100 days for the newly elected government (which is known as the norms in Parliamentary system); it supported civil servants' strike, along with the subsequent whipping up of issues concerning Tanakpur issues, and denouncing undemocratically Supreme Court judgment when it did not go in its favour (Baral: 2004).

Since the fifth convention of the CPN (UML) political ideological degeneration had commenced, there had emerged lots of confusion in adoption of strategy and tactics, and even in organization methodology. They did not try to understand the need of relative change in organizational framing in the context of its main ideological change. While they shifted main ideology of communism to pluralistic multiparty democracy they should have to change its organizational framework too. But they adopted the theory of "Democratic Centralism"- which was adopted by Lenin after October Revolution- in in organizational practices within the party, in which it was not suitable in Pluralistic forms of political ideology. This mistake led the Leadership towards opportunism. They always pretended and explored revolutionary flavor among the carders and supportive masses, which they do not really have had, neither in programme, and nor in action. Which grew frustration among the carders and supportive masses. Such confusion had seen in practice as for example they shouted slogans and make strikes in the subject of Tanakpur issues, wrote a letter to the World Bank against Arun-III projects but in similar and even much more controversial project like Mahakali Treaty and handover of Karnali Project to ENRON had not only supported by them but fully advocated. They had played most opportunistic role with making non-ideological alliances with RPP and Congress in the formation of government when there was Hung Parliament after 1994 midterm General election. Besides this ideological deterioration UML split on the eve of 1999 parliamentary election and most of its radical carders then shifted from UML to CPN (Maoist).

Nepali Congress and CPN (UML) were the largest parties who evolved in the juncture of 1990's people's movement, people gave mandate them electing in parliament as an establishment and main opposition. But they could not make general consensus on major reforms, major amendments in the constitution which

were essentials and even they could see the danger of regression move of the rightist element which had real ownership on national armed forces. They could not adopt general consensus on foreign policy matter, and could not see the danger of Maoist's people's war, which was emerging, as a dragon. Always, they make ad-hoc policies of recent benefit, which could not guide the future of the state, always did wrong and try to use other forces for and against each other to eliminate the role of oppositional politics. It was due to sharp differences on ideology in earlier and opportunism and power hunger in the later phase.

CPN (Maoists) was formed in 1995 after making split from CPN (Unity Center) under the leadership of General Secretary Puspa Kamal Dahal alias Parchand advocating the faith in armed revolution against the existing multiparty democratic system with constitutional monarchy. They had proceed protracted war since February 1996 in limited districts now it spreads all over the country and emerged as a most influential force. In present context they are claiming that they had reached on the 'stage of strategic offensive position' with the armed force, three Division, 9 brigades and 29 Battalions. They had a programme of formation of one hundred thousand (100,000) people's militias under the formation of company, under the Districts and Regional Headquarters (Press statement released by CC, CPN (Maoist) on 13 August 2004).

However, the circumstance is different than whatever they had claimed in their recent meeting. Their action of equal enmity with other potential political partners have not been given any chances of the formation of any kind of umbrella or olive branch which is the need in equilibrium balance of non winning situation. Even that strategy applied by Mao zedung in the earlier stage of Chinese revolution. They have had more confidence in military power rather than political maneuvering. General people have been beginning to resist against their forced abduction of their kids, killings in the name of spy and class enemy, looting their houses and coercive campaign of donation more than donor's capacity and coercive involvement of youths in their militia as a whole-timer, as it was recently seen in November in Dailekh District and in the first week of December 2004 at Baglung. If, political parties of the main stream come together in such self-emerged resistance movement of the people then they will have to face more dissension. In the other hand dramatically the geo-political situation has been changing, now Maoists are losing shelter, training centers in India and there is also a tight control in the supply of arms and ammunition in border which supplies from India. The government of India tightly watching and hunting their leaders too in India, more than one dozen leaders including party's second in command in Maoist's standing Committee Mohan Baidhya alias Kiran have been in prison in India since one year, two influential members of the central committee extradited to the government of Nepal. In the present context India became the largest supplier of arms and ammunitions and trainer to the Royal Nepal Army.

Other political forces have no such ground of influence in Nepalese politics however, they are fighting together against regressive role of King, making alliance with largest parties in one hand and resisting seriously against Maoist's intrusion in the other hand specially in the case of CPN (Unity Center). As we earlier discussed about UML that become a part of present King's puppet Government since May 2004 under the leadership of Sher Bahadur Deuba (the leader of splinter group of Nepali Congress) where the royalist party RPP and one faction of Sadvawana also involved.

Major political parties especially Nepali Congress and CPN (UML) have had very difficulty in finding an effective parliamentary role for themselves in present circumstance, whether in terms of legislation or analysis of the executive, their impatience at waiting consecutive period for the renewed chance for the office. Knowingly or unknowingly they have had provide more undesirable opportunity to the undemocratic and nostalgic forces. They never gave serious attention on the role of King and Army. Post 1990 was a transition period from autocratic rule to democracy where serious discourse and homework was needed to bring every thing under democratic institutions including Royal Nepal Army under civilian control. But this crucial subject never discussed in practice within parliament and among the critical masses. The massacre of the Royal family in June 2001 including King and queen the transition had a chance of taking backtrack. When the new king took all power of the state in his hand taking confidence of all nostalgic forces including the leadership of Royal Nepal Army on October 4, 2002 it was obvious that, he will move further. There were clear message that massacre take over have had some connection and related with class interest. But political leadership of the parties never analyze the socio-political and economic interest behind the series of events and other series of event like Holeri, whether Army refused to implement the order of the then Prime Minister. Series of criticism on political parties by commander-in-chief of RNA in their public functions were hinting. Naturally, the role of the political parties in national politics became narrower after the massacre. Then the new king became very assertive to take absolute power of the state, which fulfilled when major political parties did not make any kind of consensus on various critical national issues. Now the political parties are in very crucial juncture, both extreme rightist and extreme

left forces are trying to marginalize them from the mainstream politics. Though their rivalry is still going on. In present context it seems that the then main opposition party CPN (UML) had no vision and passion to understand the present reality, so UML join in to the government of S. B. Deuba who had appointed by the King under clause No. 127 of present constitution, in which king has real control over state power.

## V. Election & Aspiration:

Periodical election is the main feature of Democracy. After introducing new constitution, the then Interim Government declared periodic general election in 1991. As we discussed above that the main stream political parties had no nation-wide organizational base. Thus the political parties have had picked up the carders of Panchyat. The matured Panchas<sup>7</sup> were entered in to the Nepali Congress and young but politically unknown people attached with CPN (UML) it might be the case of romanticism. In the later case some ultra nationalist also involved while UML open the door in their organization for Royalists to reach in to the power.

In the first general election Nepali Congress won 110 seats with 37.75 percent of popular Vote; UML own 69 seats with 27.98 percent of popular vote; RPP won 4 seats with 11.94percent of popular vote; Nepal Sadbhawana Party won 6 seats with 4.10; Nepal Workers and Peasant Party won 2 with 1.25; United People Front 9 seats with 4.35; CPN (Democratic) 2 seats with 2.43 of the popular Vote and Independents won 3 with popular vote 4.17 (Election Commission, House of Representative Members, 2048 (1991). Nepali Congress came in to the power, but due to sharp ideological disagreement with CPN (UML), in various functions Nepali Congress try to isolate main opposition and simultaneously, UML disturbed the government in various issues such as civil servant s' agitation, the Tanakpur agreement and Dashdhunga accident.

After election the process of social change in Nepali societies results in a lack of continuity in the circumstances under which people are recruited to politics. Those who took part in the national people's movement against King's autocratic regime are not necessarily considered as vital leaders by the succeeding generation who are known as 'Chaite' (new-comers who joins parties just before General Election). But later they became forceful in the party politics and rank and file due to they have had access of money, muscles and having capacity of mix-up with leadership. This telescoping of the generations has sharpened the clash of views so that intellectually and programmatically there had emerged abnormal gap in political and ideological orientations, creating a potential for extreme changes in policy should the aspiring old elites to gain power.

Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala defunct parliament before the date and announced the Mid-term election in November. There were several reasons behind this defunct. First, there was the series of internal power struggle among the Party's troika leader. Secondly, the differences arose among the troika regarding political appointment and thirdly, widened that conflict when then Prime Minister G.P. Koirala reshuffled the cabinet in December 1991 entirely on his own prudence and lastly, the internal conflict led to the absence of the NC's 35 member of the Party's parliamentarians at the time of voting on the government's annual policy and programmes. The internal motive of such move was for the collapse of the Koirala's Government (Hachhethu: 2000).

The second Parliament elected in November 1994, but no parties secured clear-cut majority in the House of Representatives, it means it was a hung Parliament. The politics of shifting coalitions among the parties and too frequent motions of no confidence against the government had become the major character of the parliament. Man Mohan Adhikari became Prime Minister in UML's Minority government and Madhav Nepal as the deputy PM on 29 November 1994. Within six-month Nepali Congress parliamentarians call special session of Parliament, but PM dissolve the house and recommended for mid term poll but Supreme Court reverted the dissolved HOR, and by no-confidence motion Adhikari's minority government ousted and under the leadership of Sher Bahadur Deuba a coalition government of NC, RPP, and NSP formed. UML's MPs making understanding with the Chand Faction of RPP petitioned for a special session of the HOR for no-confidence motion but government survived in 24 March, again in 8 December 1996 102 MPs of the HOR including 11 MPs of the RPP Chand Faction petition for special session of HOR but Government again survived because of two vote shortages but on 6 March 1997 Deuba led government collapsed while ruling NC'S MPs abstained in voting, then on 12 March 1997 the next government formed under Lokendra Bahadur Chand of RPP with the coalition RPP, UML and NSP but on October 2 1997 this government ousted from the no-confident motion while Thapa faction of RPP withdrew the support, then on 6 October Surya Bahadur

Thapa became the Prime Minister. On 26 March 1998 G.P. Koirala appointed as the new PM in which splinter group who makes new party CPN (M-L) included in Koirala Government on 26 August and excluded on 10 December. On 25 December, UML included in the Koirala Government, this coalition government recommended the mid term poll for 3 and 17 May 1999.

Such formation of coalition was not on the base of ideology and programme but was on the base of opportunity and vested interest. Prof. Krishna Khanal observed in his article 'Parliament and Governance' *"To begin with, it appeared logical that the parties in Parliament were polarized on a broad ideological line, i.e., non-communist versus the Communists. But soon such an assumption proved wrong and the equation began to change due to opportunism and petty interests shown to suit the ambition of the leaders as well as individual members. Inter-party factional alliances began to prevail. In order to appease the members, the government made several offers and indulged in buying the support with ministerial berths and other undue incentives (Khanal 2004:53).*

The third Parliament started its function after the general election held in May 1999 and continued till 22 May 2002 until the dissolution. In the third general election Nepali Congress won clear-cut majority in HOR with 112 seats and Krishna Prasad Bhattarai became the Prime minister on 27 May 1999, but 15 February 2000 NC's 58 MPs filed a no-confidence proposal against him in Nepali Congress Parliamentary Party office later the number increased and reached 69, so far he resigned from the post of Prime minister and G.P. koirala succeeded him since 18 March 2000 and continued office till 18 July 2001 and resigned on 19 July due to non-cooperation by the Army on Holary incident then again Sher Bahadur Deuba appointed Prime Minister and remained in the office till 3 October 2002. On 4 October King Gyanendra by a proclamation, sacked PM Deuba and took all executive power of the state.

Near about 11 years life of the HOR, there seems little consensus exists as to the justifiable ends and means of political action. After the restoration of the democracy HOR was the most important place. People had a great expectation that the voice of the people, their problems, demands, their urge and aspiration were expected to find articulation in Parliament through its members. Further people had expectation that the members of the houses would be accountable to the people and fulfill their commitments whatever they had expressed commitment among the masses personally and through party election manifesto and they will do their best to fulfill the desire of the people. But the aspiration of the people could not fulfill. Politics became a game of economic offenders, mafias and fundamentalist. Most of the MPs treat that the constituency is their 'Mouja' (occupied land) and voters are their slaves. Therefore, as a result large sections of the people are unable to benefit from minimum rights, problems like poverty, illiteracy, child mortality, unemployment and under-employment, health, education, drinking water, have undermined the most importance of freedom of the people. On the other hand these lacking of the parliament create frustration among the general masses and the frustration of the masses encourage Maoists to turn to extremist measures.

## **Democratization:**

After restoration of democracy social mobilization was highly developed which had reflected in the electoral statistics, which help to shift of emphasis from the parochialism and internationalism of many traditional cultures. The consciousness among the masses highly increased, they have had searching their own political, social, economic identities and stakes. Within 12 years of Democratic practice empowered women, Dalits, Janjaties and Madhesies in respect of struggle for their identities and stakes, it was never happened in the prior history of Nepal since its unification.

In these twelve years muzzled press came outside. The telecommunication system highly expanded, Radio, televisions, F.M. system explore all over the country. People became informative, which brought eagerness and forced for transparency. Under private ownership Five Nepali and three English national broadsheets newspapers have been printing and several magazines and more than hundreds vernacular weeklies and daily tabloids are publishing continuously. Different voices opinions are coming outside. More than thirty-five FM stations are broadcastings news and views. Five television channels are already opened and functioning. These vigilant press still providing democratic atmosphere in this crucial stage too. Suppose they are preventing it from degenerating in to an absolute Monarchical dictatorship in the country. Even after, King Gyanendra took all executive power of the state on 4 October 2004; the process is continue, although he could not band political parties and could not success to control the media.

More than 30,000 NGOs are functioning all over the country, several Human Right organizations and their nationwide networks are busy all over the country trying to protect and help to the people from the killings, tortures, illegal detention and famine. Several social organizations are functioning even in the battlefields and rendering services to the people. The morale and resistance power of the people have been increasing so fast that every outsiders can astonished. These all are the achievement of democracy.

## Conclusion:

Today, Nepal is in crossroad. The Maoists are fighting for republicanism, King Gyanendra trying to reestablish absolute monarchical dictatorship and political parties are trying to reestablish the democracy. The Maoist's insurgency and government's counter insurgency are destroying the democratic rights and civil liberties, turning in to the adverse effects of war on development. Which is obvious consideration here is that, armed conflicts interfere with productive activity and economic growth and war related purchases displaces the civilian economy. This was also enhancing economic inequality; and creating profitable opportunities for a privileged minorities (king, high level security officers, weapons traders and speculators, while underprivileged people having to survived both with loss of earnings adult males with the burden of inflations. It is not far; Nepali people have to bear famine. This armed conflicts disrupting public services such as power distribution, destructions of public utilities offices, communications systems, sanitation facilities, transportation net works, among the worst casualties are VDC offices, health and education services.

Since the dissolution of the House of Representation on 22 May 2002 the three core function or activities represented by the three intertwined narratives - providing security, representation and social welfare process were already collapsed. Nepal as a poor country cannot afford this armed conflicts any more.

Now what should be the solution for reestablishment of peace? There are three way which Nepali state can achieve peace. First, to reach all political forces on conclusion that Nepali society is heterogeneous society, politically, socially and economically. Thus only parliamentary system can hold the country together providing sufficient space for all stakeholders of the state. Second, the political process should be beginning with reviving third parliament, which was dissolved by the present prime minister ensuring election which could not held even today after two and half years tenures of the king's direct rule. Thirdly, the house should not continue for ever, they should establish one strong multiparty commission in which they can include some potential people from out side too, to find out agendas for resolve contradiction with king and Maoists. Fourthly, with recommendation of Parliamentary commission it should obviously declared election of the Constitutional Assembly for future inclusion of vast majority of the people in the mainstream state polity, where social justice in every aspect of life should be guaranteed basically, principle of equality, promise of empowerment of ordinary people, its commitments to pluralism and dialogue to resolve disagreement should be guaranteed.

## End Notes:

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1951 approximately 98 percent of eight million people in Nepal were illiterate. There were only three hundred-college graduates in the entire country.

<sup>2</sup> In an informal talk with author on July 2004, Nilamber Acharya describes the events on that occasion when the King formally released constitution on November 1990.

<sup>3</sup> This portion has taken from the preamble of ' The Constitution Of The Kingdom Of Nepal (1990).

<sup>4</sup> This data has taken from the report of Citizenship Commission Under the leadership of Dhanapati Upadhyaya 1994.

<sup>5</sup> See David E. Apter : 1966 in Political Development and Social Change edited by Jason L.Finkle and Richard w. Gable, John Wiley & Sons, Ink New York pp 441 to 445

<sup>6</sup> The statistics on agriculture has taken here from ' The Macroeconomics of Poverty Reduction: the case study of Nepal by Sonali Deraniyagala and et.al, on 2003 for UNDP.

<sup>7</sup> Mahapanchas and Panchas were the carders of defunct Panchyat system, who were basically loyal with king but in new context they choose Nepali Congress because of its liberal and democratic attitude.



