

**Inconsistencies of Political Movements in Nepal: An Overview**Dilli Raj Gautam ^a ✉✉ dilligautam411@gmail.com^a Dhawalagiri Multiple Campus, Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal**Article Info****Abstract****Received:** May 7, 2024**Accepted:** October 29, 2024**Published:** November 19, 2024

Using qualitative, analytical, and historical research methodology, this article examines the inconsistencies of the political movements that occurred in Nepal for the institutionalization of a democratic system of governance. For many years, the political movement for social change in Nepal has struggled against the immediate government's authoritarian rule. The majority of people have organized together and revolted over time for the attainment of democracy, freedom, equality, and the rule of law in addition to human rights. There have been several turmoil observed between the social revolution and the political movement. It scrutinizes the origin, nature, dynamics, and mobilization of political movements as it was targeted to transform prevailing dominant social, economic, and political disorder. Every political shift ought to be in the best interests of millions of people. The study has extensively been more historical, descriptive and analytical. This paper suggests ways to solve the expectations of the people awoken after the political transformation in different stages with the critical study and analysis of historical and legal primary and secondary sources manifested by the political forces pre and post-political transitoriness.

Keywords: Contentious politics, liberators, Marxism, mobilization, post-modernism, social movements**Introduction**

Modern social life is significantly influenced by political movements. A political movement is an intentional group effort that involves a revolt, reformation, or revolution against the status quo social order. In other words, an organized group of people who are committed to enacting wide-ranging changes in the current political or social environment. A political movement is an organized effort by a number of people to alter societal norms or governmental policies that are currently in practice. Political movements are frequently linked to a certain ideology and are typically against some aspect of the status quo. There is no consensus among academics about the precise definition of political movements because different researchers describe political movements in accordance with their own ideological preferences and core principles. Political opportunity theory, national integration theory, social movement effect theory, and resource mobilization theory are the primary sources of inspiration for political movements. Political or national integration is a topic covered by social science theory. Marxists have long held the belief that these movements are a byproduct of class conflict and a transitory stage of capitalism (Brich, 1978, 325). But the minority nationalists' movements and theories of integration emphasize on resource mobilization issues.

Social movements can be broadly divided into two groups: established social movements and emerging social movements. While working class ideals and class consciousness served as the inspiration for earlier social movements, contemporary social movements strive for social justice and democratic equality on behalf of underprivileged and socially excluded groups (Sugunkararaju, 2012). There has been an inherent linkage between social movements and social transformation aspired by the political actors. The American war of Independence 1776, French Revolution, 1789, Soviet Revolution of 1917, Indian Independence War, 1947 and Chinese Revolution of 1949 are notable example in this domain.

An extensive knowledge of Nepal's history is necessary to comprehend the political processes within the country. Historians distinguish four primary categories of Nepal's political history. Ancient, Medieval, Modern, and Postmodern are the four periods in question. Based on the dynasties that governed Nepal at different points in time, these periods are further separated into several categories. Six dynasties ruled Nepal in its ancient history. They are known

as the Gopal, Mahispala, Kirata, Licchavi, Videha, and Shakyas dynasties. In a similar vein, Nepal was first split into three states during its medieval history. These were Doya State, Malla State in the Kathmandu Valley, and Khas Malla State in Western Nepal. They were then split up further into the eastern Nepalese states of Baise, Chaubise, and Sen. Similarly, two dynasties ruled over Nepal during the modern era. They were the Rana and Shah dynasties. The King, the head of state of the Shah Dynasty, the Nepali Congress Political Party, and the Communist Party Nepal, Marxist and Leninist (CPN UML) formed the first coalition that controlled Nepal throughout the post-modern era. Later, after gaining independence, Nepal was mostly governed by three political parties. The Maoist Party, the CPN (UML), and the Nepali Congress are the political parties (Kafle, Dhungel, & Ghimire, 2018). The study illustrates Nepal's theme history as well as associated political contradictions. These political parties bear both the responsibility and the credit for political progress.

Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study is to understand political movements held in different junctures and to trace out the condition of Nepal during ancient, medieval, modern, and post-modern periods in thematic order. It also aims to suggest possible measures to institutionalize democratic credentials achieved through political transformations.

Literature Review

The review of literature has dealt with various concepts, theories and empirical studies on political movements occurred in the past in Nepal. This section has attempted to reveal major academic works carried out by scholars based on chronological political movements of Nepal. According to Rose & Scholz (1980), at least 2500 years ago, Nepal (Kathmandu Valley) had a close association with the history of Lumbini. Oral traditions state that the *Kirati* dynasties that had previously dominated the valley belonged to the *Kshatriya* caste and were eventually supplanted by the Rajput clan of *Baishali* (P.11). It sketches the early history of Nepal.

The early history of Nepal is shadowy and there is an absence of reliable written documents about ancient Nepal. Thapa (1981) relates, Nepal must have experienced the Stone and Copper Ages, just as Northern India. However, historical events are not presented in a methodical chronological manner. Because of trustworthy recorded sources, legends and fiction are entwined with the strands of history, making it difficult to discern reality from fiction. It is assumed that excavations and researches will one day may bring to light many dark chapters of the early history of Nepal. Likewise, Sugunkararaju (2012) recounts, human rights concerns are closely linked to both historical and contemporary social movements. They are connected to the issue of fundamental human rights in one way or another. He adds that issues like livelihoods, social exclusion and cultural prejudice, environmental degradation, and other issues have been brought up by modern social movements. He highlights the question of human rights comes to be a central issue for political transformation.

Bestowing to Marxian theory, the state that protects the owners of the means of production has the power in society. In feudal or capitalist societies, workers fight for their class protections when there is no separate legislation or agenda for individual rights in their movements. They assert their rights against the owners of the means of production and the state (Kumar, 2009, p.984). In contrast to the Marxist theory, the liberal theory places the locus of power on the leaders of the state, and all other types of power that deprive a person of their freedoms are attributed to them. Power is decentered in postmodern theory. The state and the dominant class no longer hold the reins of power. There is power in commonplace, ordinary circumstances. The movement's significance lies in its ability to identify and address the specific complaints of its constituents and resolve them in a way that makes sense. Likewise, Thapa and Sharma (2015) assess "The democratization process was particularly difficult in Nepal due to weak institutions, contentious civil society, and indecisive elections" (p.53). They suggest strengthening strong institutions, responsible civil society, and determining elections.

The political transformation is an outcome of immediate motions that occurred in pre-movement existing society. Pavithran (2016) concludes "The anti-Rana revolution of 1951, the success of UCPN (Maoist) in 2008 and the adoption of a new constitution in September 2015 and *Madhesi* agitation against it, are all major landmarks in Nepal's political evolution which influenced the content and contours of political transformation in Nepal" (p. 245). He ignores the people's movements of 1990 which had a significant role in the restoration of democracy. The political changes and movements carried out in Nepal have played a historical role in keeping the territorial and political sovereignty of the nation intact (Saroja, 2021). The words of Saroja emphasize the nationalist theory of political movements.

Sara Shneiderman (2016) argues that the post-Maoist movement is a reflection of multiple long-term contemporaneous trajectories, including democratization, identity-based mobilization, constitutional nationalism, international intervention, territorial restructuring, issues with the inclusion of marginalized communities, and the emergence of ecological and other new forms of consciousness. It expresses the multifaceted character of political movement and its transformation.

Palacio (2015) evaluates the *Madhesi* movement in Nepal in light of federalism, demonstrating the close relationship between the two. While a federal system based on ethnicity may ensure the representation of historically marginalized ethnic groups by establishing their right to self-determination, it can also lead to new issues, such as an increase in ethnic tensions and conflicts and a decrease in group interaction. He suggests that the ethnically based state could also have some limitations. Thapa (1993) summarizes that “whatever expectations were hoped by the people during the movements in Nepal are not fulfilled when it is over. So general public are anxious to doubtful towards the issues of coined by the political parties for further changes” (p.39). It is imperative to exercise caution before to initiating any form of movement. Khadka (1993) precisely warns to the driving forces of every new movement that “the dream of democracy should not be a vehicle for rich and educated people to govern the poor and uneducated.” He suggests that the ruling party must apply reason before embarking on major decisions that would affect the socioeconomic fabric of the country. All these literatures reviewed above do not make a thematic analysis of major the political events held in the past for the democratization and social transformation of society after math of the historic movements. Hence, finding this gap this article has attempted to make a subjective outline of the political trajectories of Nepal.

Research Methodology

This article employs qualitative, analytical, and historical research methodology all together. The qualitative data are collected from library sources and online sources. Such secondary data are categorized according to their nature and themes were prepared. After that the data are presented in descriptive and analytical methods. Official statements and contracts have served as the main sources of information. Additional data and insights about Nepal’s political movements have been gathered and employed from secondary literature sources, including published research works, approved books, journals, articles, and pertinent websites. Following the collection of the data and literature, they are analytically explained and descriptively examined under five thematic headings; Political Movements for Social Transformation in Nepal, Ancient Period, The Medieval Period, The Modern Period and Postmodern Period.

Ancient Period

Ancient Nepal’s political history is marked by the rule of small, independent kingdoms and confederations, often centered in the Kathmandu Valley. The earliest known rulers were the Kirats, who reigned from around the 7th century BCE to the 1st century CE, followed by the Licchavi dynasty (c. 400–750 CE), known for promoting trade, culture, and Hindu-Buddhist harmony. The Malla period (12th–18th century) was a golden age of art, architecture, and culture, with several competing Malla kings ruling the valley’s principal cities, including Kathmandu, Patan, and Bhaktapur. This era of political fragmentation continued until the 18th century when King Prithvi Narayan Shah unified Nepal through a series of conquests, founding the Shah dynasty and establishing modern Nepal.

The rule of *Kiratas* and *Lichchavis* come under this category. “After the Ahir dynasty, the Kathmandu valley was occupied by the Kiratas who had invaded the country from the east” (Thapa, 1981, p. 10). The *Kiratas* had straightforward manners and traditions. *Kirata* rule might be taken for true indigenous self-governance. The *Kirata* period is the first significant turning point in the long march of Nepalese cultural history. Another wave of Hindu invaders named *Lichchavi* destroyed the last *Kirati* King, *Gasti*.

The *Lichchavis* were a well-known *Kshatriyas* clan living in Videha with Vaisali as the Capital at the time of Gautam Buddha. The political, economic, religious, and social conditions during *Lichchavi*’s period were very good. At that time there was peace and prosperity in the country and the people were very happy. The country had commercial relationships with the big neighbors India, Tibet, and China. The financial condition of the government was very sound. The *Lichchavi* period is aptly called the golden age in the history of ancient Nepal (Thapa, 1981, pp. 24-25). The *Lichchavis* was substituted by the *Mallas*.

The Medieval Period

The *Malla* kings ruled Nepal valley for 568 years after which the king of Gorkha Prithvi Narayan Shah unified the country into a greater Nepal (Thapa, 1981, p. 33). The early *Malla* monarchy was based on the divine right of

kingship who assumed the title of *Virada*, incarnation of *Bishnu*. The Kingship was hereditary. They had the feudal type of administration were called the *Samantas*, *Pradhans* or *Mahamatyas* having powerful *defacto* rulers. The internal conflict among the *Mallas* led them extinction. Even ministers were absolute and all in all. There were plots and conspiracies among the chiefs, nobels and courtiers (Thapa, 1981, p. 73). Jealously and hatred with in the descendants of *Mallas* themselves brought an end of *Malla* Dynestry. Thus, when Nepal was shuttered into pieces, there emerged a small and youngest principality which shouldered the burden of merging the divided political units into one bigger state. That burden was borne by Gorkha (Vidhya, 1994, p. 193). The political change brought by Prithvi Nnrayan Shan was guided by national integration theory. Unlike this few scholars conclude as it was due to the compassion of power. One of the principalities, Gorkha, governed by the Shah family, started to impose itself as a dominant force in the hills and even to confront Nepal Valley around the beginning of the eighteenth century. Weakened by internal strife and pervasive social and financial unrest, the *Mallas* proved to be no match for the legendary Gorkha emperor Prithvi Narayan Shah. After capturing the valley in 1769, he quickly shifted his capital to Kathmandu, laying the groundwork for the creation of the modern state of Nepal.

The Modern Period

The political modern history of Nepal begins in 1825 BS (1768 AD) and continues till the present. Modern Nepal refers to the period from that point onwards. It began when Prithvi Narayan Shah, monarch of the Shah Dynasty, conquered Kantipur in 1825 BS (Rose & Scholz, 1980), and Kathmandu was designated as the new capital of the united Nepal. From 1737 to 1813, Nepal transformed not only as a political entity but also as a powerful nation. This was made possible by the leadership of notable figures such as Prithvi Narayan Shah, Rajyalaxmi, Bahadur Shah, and Bhimsen Thapa, as well as the selfless sacrifice of countless, devoted soldiers who helped to shape the country's modern history. The Shah monarchs were the most important and notable figure in the creation of Nepal. Instead of making Gorkha his capital, "Prithvi Narayan Shah had made Kathmandu to assure the people of valley. So the people of the vanquished area remained happy with the new ruler" (Vaidhya, 1994, p. 196). This evident justifies the concept of good governance aspired by the great king.

One significant turning point in Nepal's political history is the Kot Massacre of 1846. This incident cemented the monarchy's demise for over a century, as the powerful Junga Bahadur Rana, who first established the Rana system of hereditary prime ministers and then emerged as a dictator, ruled Nepal until 1951 under a series of kings who were little more than symbolic figures (Shah, 1990, p. 200). The hunger of consolidating sole power within the Rana kingship alone resulted into the very demise of the regime. Consequently, the Rana regime was overthrown.

The political movement in Nepal was a synthesis of several movements and political efforts from the 20th century that supported the formation of a multiparty political system, representative democracy, and the end of the monarchy in Nepal. There are three main movements in it: the 1951 revolution, the united movement for the restoration of democracy in 1990, and the *Loktantrik* movement, which brought back multi-party bicameral democracy and moved Nepal closer to being a republic.

The first phase of democratization that started in 1951 with "the end of century-long autocratic Rana Regime (1846-1951), giving way to an assertive monarchy" (Thapa & Sharma, 2015, p. 34). The nation's 1951 inauguration of democracy was the result of the people's protracted agitation. The limited monarchy and multiparty democracy of the new political structure that succeeded the Rana oligarchy enabled common Nepalese citizens to participate in national development for the first time. The political party leaders who were instrumental in the uprising grew more determined to seize control of the government. Their incessant bickering went against the monarchy's perception of its own honor and party leaders. The army, the strongest force in the country, was still under the jurisdiction of the monarchy, which maintained its absolute authority under the new political system. Though awkward, it was Nepal's first move in the direction of democracy. The country witnessed five different governments before the first general election was conducted in 1959. With the help of the Nepali Congress, which was elected with a two-thirds majority, Prime Minister BP Koirala of the Congress was elected. However, Nepal's hopes for democracy were not realized. Just a year later, "in 1960, King Mahendra staged a coup, banned political parties and set up a party-less panchayat rule" (Giri, 2021, p. 1). After the leaders were elected by the people for the first time, the king assumed direct control of the administrative authorities.

It required thirty years for the monarch's direct reign to end before the Nepali people decisively protested in 1990 to bring democracy back to the nation. In 1990, Nepal drafted its constitution to establish a multiparty system, a constitutional monarchy, guaranteeing freedom of expression, and other civil and political rights. The resumption of

political competition after the foundation of multiparty democracy in 1990 resulted in the formation of numerous new parties, including the RPP, NSP, NC, CPN, and UML. After three general elections in the 1990s, the NC and CPN (UML) became each other's main rivals and influenced each other in the polls that followed. The main objectives of the movement of the 1990s were to eradicate all forms of socioeconomic inequality and enact democratic reforms across the country. However, they were not fully transformed into action.

The people's expectations were not met by the parties who were elected to power. Leaders paid little attention to individuals and were more preoccupied with narrow partisan concerns. Following the 1990s movement, there was political instability in the years that followed. There were frequent changes in administration, internal party conflicts, and concerns over the new democratic constitution's lack of representation for all facets of a multicultural society. Apart from these differences in the system of government, the Maoist insurgency also sprang from complaints about poverty and the ideological conflict between proponents of political change and those who favored the status quo in 1996.

Six years into democracy, the Nepali Maoist communist party engaged in military resistance against the government, claiming that its goal "was to establish the rule of the people" (Ghimire, 2022, p. 4). The Maoist movement gained impetus from the major political parties' lack of success. The nation descended into profound uncertainty. Amidst this, King Gyanendra undermined democratic establishments, leading political factions, such as the Maoists, and individuals from diverse backgrounds to come together in opposition to Gyanendra's totalitarian regime. The conflict was started by the Maoists in 1996 and lasted until 2006. By the time it was over, hundreds had vanished and suffered injuries, and at least 17,000 had perished (Giri, 2021). The movement against the Gyanendra regression in 2006 lasted 19 days. Twenty-six warriors of this peace movement got their martyrdom.

People's power once again triumphed over King Gyanendra's attempt to revert to autocratic rule. The groundwork for establishing a federal republic in Nepal was also laid, and multiparty democracy was reinstated. Additionally, the identity movement emerged from the 2006 movement. "The *Madhesh* uprising in 2007, which took place on the foundation laid by 2006 movement, prompted the country to be federal. The widespread street protests of 2006 forced to step-down the monarchy" (Thapa, 2024, p. 2). As a result, political differences between the Maoists and the parliamentary political parties minimized and the way for elections to a constituent assembly in 2008, tasked with creating a new constitution, was cleared. It set up a favorable atmosphere for writing a new constitution. Writing Nepal's permanent constitution was made possible by the 2007 Interim Constitution of Nepal, which provided for the election of a Constituent Assembly.

Postmodern Period

The concept of 'postmodern' ideas has been emerged in the fields of politics, philosophy, sociocultural, economy, art, and literature following World War II, and it has become more complicated, wide, and perplexing today. Following the 2006 people's movement, postmodern consciousness is showing itself in all of the events and developments throughout the history of Nepal's transitional period (Upreti, 2007). The People's Movement II 062/63 has not been the only factor in the social and political transformations.

The postmodernist idea is spreading throughout Nepal for a variety of reasons. Of them, two primary causes are: Prithivi Narayan Shah, the man credited with founding modern Nepal, first brought the nation together geographically while suppressing the diverse and plural nature of Nepalese society when its heterogeneous features were not adequately addressed. Secondly, the Maoist movement, which cultivated identity politics and implanted it alongside the voices of various ethnic groups, accompanied these voices. Furthermore, the Mass Movement II's changes to political activities as well as the effects of globalization, postmodernism, deconstruction, and other Western intellectual phenomena have transformed Nepalese society in a way that is challenging for traditional analytical paradigms to understand and assess (Upreti, 2007). Ultimately it led Nepalese society towards a postmodern direction reflecting it in a newly drafted constitution of Nepal (2015). The idea of postmodern culture and society as well as the consequences of its globalization are additional significant factors that have shaped Nepalese society as it is today. The Interim Constitution of Nepal 2007 set up a favorable atmosphere for postmodern political rights.

Furthermore, the influence of the Western postmodern conception of the state and administration, which supports pluralism and the democratic republic, can also be seen in the Mass Movement II. In other words, the new constitution of Nepal, which was formally adopted as a compromise document, implicitly reflects the globalization of such postmodern conceptions of state, government, society, and culture as the other factors that have determined the structure of Nepalese

society at this time. It incorporates the opinions expressed by various ethnic groups and societies. The rights of women, child rights, rights of *Muslims*, *Madghesis*, transgender, and guys' rights are also ensured. The issues of sexual/racial/religious/ethnic/linguistic minorities have been materialized in the constitution. Thus, the Nepalese society has entered into a postmodern society after these legitimate arrangements. The constitutional provisions of the National Women Commission; National Dalit Commission; National Inclusion Commission; Indigenous Nationalities Commission; *Madhesi* commission; *Tharu* commission and Muslim Commission are notable examples of inclusiveness and acceptance of postmodern democratic values under the new political order.

Major Inconsistencies of the Movements

Since the founding of Nepal Parjaparishad in 1936, the political movements headed by various political parties have grown to be a contentious topic in Nepal. To topple the Rana Regime, the Nepali Congress and Nepal Communist Party were later founded. Except Prajaparishad, these two parties operated out of India. All of the agreements reached following Nepal's historic movement-the Delhi Compromise of 1950 and the Agreement of 1990, for example-remained incompatible because they failed to fully actualize and empower the country's democratic ideals and national sovereignty by not letting them reaching their intended goals.

With the emergence of multiparty democracy in 1990, political rivalry was once again allowed to flourish, leading to the formation of several political parties such as the Nepal Sadbhawana Party (NSP) and the Rastriya Prajatantra Party (RPP). However, these political groups were unable to fulfill both their own promises and the sacrifices made by the participants in these movements. From 1990 to 2006, the period of parliamentary democracy and constitutional monarchy was largely fruitless. Unhealthy and careless political party rivalry encouraged Maoist uprisings and paved the way for King Gyanendra's totalitarian dictatorship. The sabotage of the political institutions by the king prompted political parties, including the Maoist, and people from different walks of life to unite together against King Gyanendra's absolute rule. It was a great lesson for the political parties.

The movement against Gyanendra continued for 19 days. Finally, the surrendered in front of the people and democracy was restored. It was a great turning point for restructuring Nepal. The Interim Constitution of Nepal 2007 was introduced and avenues of drafting a new constitution through the Constituent Assembly were released. As a result of long exercise and compromise among the political forces, a couple of constituent assemblies gave birth to the Constitution of Nepal (2015). The nation became a republic, and the Hindu Kingdom gave up its long-standing centralized form of government to become a secular state and a federal structure. The acceptance of inclusionary concepts inside the state apparatus was facilitated by the United Revolution of 2006. Article 42(1) of the Constitution of Nepal (2015) ensures that "the right to participate in the state machinery should be based on the principles of inclusion" (LBMB, 2016, p. 24). Principally, inclusion means uplifting marginalized groups.

Unlike the legal provisions, the political parties and the government have always been hesitant to ensure the representation of women and other communities. Hence, it is said that the political transformation alone makes no sense unless every section of society feels that there is a state for the people to look after them. The empowerment of the people is the only way that democracy can flourish. The political parties have been squabbling over power for too long, which is betrayal. They've had multiple chances to perform throughout history, but each time they've failed catastrophically.

The constitutional system that has been adopted for the representation of all walks of life through proportional representation in parliament has become a doom due to political instability. Indeed, it appears to be evaluated using modifications to the constitution. If not, no party will be able to take control of the legislature and be able to implement its agenda. It is painful to report, however, that the political parties disregarded the will of the people to govern with a majority and the seats in parliament that they had won in the general elections of 1992, 1999, and 2018. All of these changes were abused to hastily dissolve the elected legislature. The nation has failed to instill democratic ideals in our society, despite holding regular elections, maintaining a free press, and incorporating various human rights measures into the new constitution and political system. Our political, social, and economic circumstances have been getting worse every day as compared to the worldwide situation.

The first three decades of Nepal's seven decades-long political trajectory toward institutionalizing democracy were devoted to upholding the benefits of the feudal system. The defense of self-serving interests has dominated politics for the past four decades, and this individualist phenomenon has given rise to anti-social attitudes. The only way the socialist impulse will materialize is if the government prioritizes security over individual interests. Every new government

has been encountered with frequent protests, a sign of the public's growing annoyance, discontent, and disappointment with the ineffective administrations. People's resentment and disappointments could become a widespread protest that challenges the political system if they are not properly handled efficiently.

In the elections of 2022, there appears to be a growing tendency of voters to support independent candidates and newly formed political parties, indicating that the established power structure of traditional leaders is coming under increased pressure. This pattern was demonstrated by the overwhelming success of the recently formed Rastriya Swatantra Party, which won 21 seats in the House of Representatives, and the municipal elections, in which 385 independent candidates were elected (Chaulagain, 2024). Under the federal system, Nepal has held two rounds of elections. Depending on past trends, people will likely continue to choose leaders in future elections depending on their needs and goals. To institutionalize democracy and protect the gains made by democratic movements, this is a normal process of democratic growth and development. Political forces should be adamant about these gains to make the institutions stronger once they are established and better equipped to adapt to shifting ideals. It would not be wise for Nepal to investigate an alternative system given the political parties' exclusive dedication to the fundamental principles of the 2015 constitution, including republicanism, federalism, secularism, and inclusivity.

The traditional major political parties keep emphasizing their out-of-date, ridiculous, and fictional promises rather than what is feasible. Instead of making grand promises, the political parties ought to prioritize workable ideas and agendas that have the potential to significantly improve people's lives (Mandal, 2023). Policy measures such as free health care, free education, proper implementation of constitutional provisions, proper implementation of fundamental rights including postmodern privileges enshrined in the constitution, resolution of citizenship and farmer concerns issues, corruption elimination, job creation to stop youth emigration, and prioritizing socialist-based economic policies for a financially sustainable government should all be kept at the top of the agenda to win over extremely frustrated people.

The globalized world is witnessing an increase in interdependence. No nation is able to handle all of its problems on its own. But a nation's sovereignty could be threatened by excessive dependency. It is therefore imperative that all stakeholders, particularly political actors, consider ways to increase the nation's level of self-reliance. It is ridiculous to constantly change the agenda without allowing enough time for a system to be successfully experimented with, as this does not provide individuals with a sustainable relief. Let's pledge to uphold the federal democratic republican system, which has been gained through hard work, and wait for the public benefits from it. Nepal's success in achieving lasting democracy depends on its internal governance, external relations, economic restructuring, and addressing the various social fault lines. The country currently stands between democratic consolidation and crisis, with the risk of slipping into a hybrid or defective democracy if political actors prioritize power over long-term democratic stability.

Findings

The transformation is a perpetual process of the nature. The natural world is always changing. Thus, nothing in the world might stay unchanged. Over time, a political society evolves. All facets of national life must alter and adapt to address emerging issues and difficulties.

Good governance for sustainable human development is a complex, multidimensional process that encompasses the socioeconomic and political transformation of societies. Its primary goal is to promote comprehensive human progress, including the expansion of political and economic freedoms. To support this, educational institutions such as schools, universities, and colleges should implement programs on good governance, emphasizing peaceful transformation and conflict resolution. These programs would help instill values of citizenship, the principles of a civil society, and responsible ethical behavior.

The discussion proceeds amicably if the changes are approved by the immediate authorities. Coercive methods are used for social and political change if the ruling class refuses to make the required adjustments. According to Marxian theory, the working class of society moves ahead to save their colleagues liberated from the suppression and exploitation of the ruling class. The movements of the early history of Nepal are driven by power theory. The *Kiratas*, *Lichchhavis*, and *Mallas* of Nepal were displaced to establish the political system of conquerors. Modern Nepal has faced significant political turmoil, beginning with the overthrow of the autocratic Rana regime in 1951, which led to the establishment of a constitutional monarchy. The introduction of the Panchayat system in 1960 further consolidated monarchical power, until popular protests in 1990 restored multi-party democracy. A decade-long Maoist insurgency (1996-2006) aimed at

abolishing the monarchy resulted in thousands of deaths and culminated in Nepal becoming a federal democratic republic in 2008. Despite these changes, political instability persists, marked by frequent government changes and challenges in implementing the 2015 constitution.

Nepal's democratization is complicated by the tension between the old social contract, rooted in tradition, and the new one, based on democratic norms and values, which has yet to fully take hold. The socialist-oriented economy, as enshrined in the new constitution, is progressing slowly, and economic inequality continues to widen, as resources remain concentrated in the hands of a few. Despite these challenges, Nepal is comparatively better positioned than many South Asian nations like Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka etc. in its democratic consolidation efforts.

Discussion

Nepal's journey toward building a stable democracy has made significant strides since the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of a national democratic government. However, the process of democratic consolidation remains a challenging and gradual endeavor, with several factors influencing its success. The fragile nature of young democracies makes them susceptible to authoritarian tendencies, and good governance is crucial for sustaining democracy.

Key factors that shape democratic consolidation include how political actors manage the process, the implementation of the rule of law, and the separation of powers. Addressing issues related to human rights, inclusion, and exclusion is equally vital. The role of non-political elites, civil society, and the media is also crucial, as is the acceptance of democratic changes within the constitutional framework by political actors, elites, and society at large.

One major challenge Nepal faces is the rise of identity politics, which creates tensions between the cultural identity of the nation and the political identity of the state. Resolving these conflicts is essential for the democratization process, as the balance between diversity, pluralism, liberalism, and nationalism will determine the country's democratic future. Furthermore, prolonged transitions could weaken state institutions, allowing strong leaders or non-state actors to exert undue influence, thereby undermining the democratic process.

Conclusion

Political development is a dynamic process involving the expansion, modernization, and restructuring of state frameworks, leading to changes in political institutions and societal values. In Nepal, this evolution dates back to prehistoric times, shaped by territorial expansions and power dynamics under the Kiratas, Lichchhavis, and Mallas. The country's political history has seen significant social movements, ranging from class-based struggles to those focused on marginalized and excluded groups.

Since its entry into the modern era in 1768, Nepal has undergone major political upheavals, including three democratic revolutions. Despite attempts to establish democracy, including the overthrow of the autocratic Rana regime in 1950 and the restoration of democracy in 1990, challenges persisted, leading to the rise of the Maoist movement and subsequent political instability. Key events like King Gyanendra's assumption of power in 2005 and the 2006 peace treaty brought about significant shifts, including the integration of Maoists into mainstream politics and the push for federalism, shaping Nepal's current political landscape.

Ultimately, republicanism, federalism, secularism, and inclusivity with postmodern values were all incorporated into the 2015 Nepalese constitution. One after another, these interruptions in politics gave rise to new political systems. Nepal's democracy has been repeatedly weakened by its inability to establish systems and institutions. Such a situation has become a good room for domestic autocrats and foreign elements to intervene. The failure of conventional political parties to perform when they had the chance to govern is what led to the spectacular emergence of new political groups and the growth of independent candidates in federal, provincial, and local elections.

Political parties should prioritize feasible plans for positive transformation, such as free healthcare, education, constitutional implementation, citizenship rights, farmer issues, corruption removal, job creation,

and socialism-based economic policies, to win the hearts of frustrated people. Hence, political parties must put the security of the populace above their self-interest and show sincere dedication to the nation's constitutional framework in both theory and practice if they want to improve Nepal's democratic credentials.

In conclusion, Nepal's political evolution has been marked by a series of transformative events, from ancient territorial expansions to the recent embrace of postmodern values like republicanism, federalism, and inclusivity. Despite multiple democratic revolutions and the establishment of constitutional rights, the nation's political development has been impeded by frequent instability, the failure to implement democratic ideals in practice, and the ineffectiveness of conventional political parties. This has paved the way for new political entities and independent candidates to gain prominence. To strengthen Nepal's democratic framework, political parties must prioritize the genuine needs of the populace, such as healthcare, education, and anti-corruption measures, demonstrating a sincere commitment to the country's constitutional principles both in policy and practice.

References

- Bhattarai, S. (2023, January 4). Seven decades of development: Political, socio- economic reality. *The Himalayan Times*. <https://thehimalayantimes.com/opinion/seven-decades-of-development-political-socio-economic-reality>
- Birch, H. (1978). Minority nationalist movements and theories of political integration. *World Politics*, 30(3), 325-344. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2009869>
- Brown, T. L. (1996). *The challenges to democracy in Nepal* (1st Ed.). Routledge.
- Chaulagain, D. (2023). Nepal's democratic transition: Turbulent but promising. *Friedrich Naumann Foundation*.
- Ghimire, B. (2022, February 19). Nepal's democracy revolutions, and achievements and failures. *The Kathmandu Post*.
- Giri, A. (2021, February 19). Nepal's democracy challenges. *The Kathmandu Post*.
- Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. (2004). *Rethinking social movements: Structure, meaning and emotion*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Jaiswal, P. (2017). Nepal: In 3 years of the Modi Government. *Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies*. <https://www.jstor.com/stable/resrep09416.18>
- Kafle, D. R., Dhungel, B. D., & Ghimire, M. P. (2018). *Nepalese Society and Politics* (2nd Ed.). Kriti Publication Pvt. Ltd.
- Khadka, N. (1992). Geopolitics and development: A Nepalese perspective. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 19(3), 134–157. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30172158>
- Khadka, N. (1993). Democracy and development in Nepal: Prospects and challenges. *Pacific Affairs*, 66(1), 44–71. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2760015>
- Kumar, V. A. (2009). Social power and political movements: The quest for rights. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 70(4), 983-992. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42744014>
- Law Books Management Board. (2016). *The Constitution of Nepal*. LBMB.
- Mandal, G. (2023, February 18). Changing political landscape of Nepal. *My Republica*. <https://myrepublica.nagariknetwork.com/news/changing-political-landscape-of-nepal/>
- Michael, R. (2018). Women in state security provision in Nepal. Is it meaningful participation? *Small Arms Survey*. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep17653>
- Mishra, S. G. (1991). The pro-democracy movement in Nepal, 1990: Summary. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 52, 969–970. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44142738>
- Palacio, A. S. (2015). Challenges in the Nepalese constitutional process: Federalism, ethnicity and representation. *Law and Politics in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, 48(2), 165–186. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26160112>
- Pavithran, K. S. (2016). Democracy in Nepal. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 77(2), 241–246. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26575708>
- Rajan, K. V. (2016). Nepal today: Bad politics trumps good economics. *Indian Foreign Affairs Journal*, 11(2), 95–100. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45341087>

- Rose, L. E., & Scholz, J. T. (1980). *Nepal: Profile of Himalayan kingdom*. Western Press.
- Saroha, A. (2021). Changing dynamics in India-Nepal relations. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, 25(2), 126–137. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/48622924>
- Schneiderman, S., Wagner, L., Rinck, J., Johnson, A. L., & Lord, A. (2016). Nepal's ongoing political transformation: A review of post-2006 literature on conflict, the state, identities, and environments. *Modern Asian Studies*, 50(6), 2041–2114. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44158306>
- Shah, R. K. (1990). *Three decades of two kings*. Asia Book-room.
- Sugunakararaju, S. R. T. P. (2012). Social movements and human rights in India: An overview. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 73(2), 237-250. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41856586>
- Thapa, N. B. (1981). *The history of ancient Nepal*. Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Thapa, G. B., & Sharma, J. (2015). Paradoxes of democratization in Nepal: Achievements and future prospects. *Pakistan Horizon*, 68(2), 31–54. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44988224>
- Thapa, G. B. (1999). Political transition in Nepal: Whither democratization? *Pakistan Horizon*, 52(2), 19–43. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41394653>
- Thapa, S. B. (2024). The facets of political instability in Nepal: Causes and effects. *Journal of Political Science and Public Affairs*, 11(3), 1-6.
- Upreti, S. (2007). *Ghanachakkar*. Nepalaya.
- Walder, A. G. (2009). Political sociology and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 393-412. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27800084>