



A Structural Analysis of Nepal's Maoist Movement and Gen-Z Struggles through a Large-Scale and Long-Run Perspective

Sindhu Gyawali

Assistant Professor

Birendra Multiple Campus, Bharatpur

gyawalisindhu@gmail.com

Received: August 14, 2025

Revised & Accepted: October 28, 2025

Copyright: Author(s) (2025)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Abstract

The paper seeks to account for the Maoist Movement in Nepal and the recent Gen-Z activism through a macro-sociological perspective grounded in Pierson concept of long-run processes and Mishra's analysis of large-scale structure of social change. It argues that both of these movements are repercussion against deep social inequality, weak accountability and persistent political instability. Using a comparative and historical approach, the study shows that while the Maoist movement ended the monarchy, it could not transform the underlying structural roots of inequality and paving the way for new forms of protest. The Gen-Z movement reflects a renewed search for justice, accountability, and social transformation in Nepal. From a Large scale and long run perspective, the Maoist movement was not a product of immediate or dramatic causes but must be understood with a broader historical and structural context. Nepal's structural transformation thus remains an unfolding process, moving from one generation of insurgency to another form of civic reform.

Keywords: Political transition, large-scale and long-run perspective, social transformation, Maoist movement, Gen-Z movement

Introduction

Nepal's modern history has seen the social and political upheaval and revolution for the socio-political change. From the Maoist insurgency (1996–2006) to the recent rise of Gen-Z activism, each generation has sought to challenge structures of inequality, exclusion, and unaccountability embedded deep within the nation's socio-political fabric. While the monarchy has been dismantled and a republic established, many of the promises of justice and equality remain unfulfilled. The persistence of corruption, weak governance, political instability has aroused a sense of frustration and dissatisfaction among Nepal's youth.



This paper seeks to understand these two moments of transformation, the Maoist Movement and the Gen-Z activism through a macro-sociological perspective, drawing on “Paul Pierson’s concept of long-run processes” and Chaitanya Mishra’s framework of large-scale social structures. These theoretical lenses emphasize that historical change does not occur through isolated events but through slow, cumulative processes shaped by structural conditions. The Maoist insurgency, therefore, is viewed not as a sudden revolt but as a culmination of long-term inequalities rooted in feudal agrarian relations, caste hierarchies, and the centralization of power since the unification of Nepal in 1769.

Using a comparative and historical approach, this study explores how these structural contradictions have extended across generations. It argues that while the Maoist movement successfully overthrew the monarchical system, it failed to dismantle the deeper institutional structures that sustain inequality and elite domination. In contrast, the Gen-Z movement represents a new mode of protest emerging within the post-republican structure.

The central argument of this paper is that Nepal’s transformation is an ongoing long-run process, where each generation redefines and confronts historical contradictions within evolving structural contexts. The Maoist and Gen-Z movements, both are part of the same enduring struggle for justice, accountability, and inclusive transformation.

The paper proceeds as follows. The Section 2 introduces about the meaning of large scale and long run and outlines the theoretical framework; Section 3 details the methodological approach; Sections 4 situates the Maoist Movement within the large scale and long run framework, emphasizing how structural inequalities, state weakness and historical grievances triggered revolutionary conditions and section 5 present the Gen-Z case analyses; concludes with reflections on Nepal’s continuing transformation.

Methodology

The study adopts a comparative, historical and structural approach (Skocpol, 1979; Pierson, 2004; Mishra, 2009) inspired by large scale and long run macro sociology, to explore how structural continuities and ruptures have shaped Nepal’s two generational movements: the Maoist insurgency and the Gen-Z activism. The Maoist Movement in Nepal (1996–2006) is examined as a case within a longer historical trajectory of Nepalese state formation, agrarian structures, and political conflict. The study relies on secondary data, including historical accounts, academic works, and scholarly analyses of Nepal’s social and political transformations.

The Research Design is comparative as it has examined two generational movements under distinct socio-political contexts and historical, tracing long-run processes of state centralization, class inequality, and political exclusion since the unification of Nepal in 1769. It is also structural, focusing on how macro-level institutions condition collective agency and movement trajectories. The study relies on qualitative secondary data, including: Historical and sociological literature; Government and institutional reports, Media and journalistic narratives of the youth movements.



Theoretical Framework

The macro-sociological perspective represents a distinct mode of sociological inquiry that views society from a broad and comprehensive vantage point. It emphasizes the study of social structures, institutions, and long-term historical processes that shape individual and collective life. From this perspective, individuals are seen primarily as products of overarching social and historical forces rather than autonomous agents acting in isolation.

Hoult (1969) defines macrosociology as the “study of total social systems, particularly entire societies,” in contrast to microsociology, which focuses on segments of these systems. Similarly, Gurvitch (1957) describes it as the study of the “total social reality” in all its structured forms, while Ford (1972) highlights its concern with global aspects such as states, cultures, and large-scale institutions.

Macrosociology, therefore, seeks to understand society as something greater than the sum of individuals. It asks fundamental questions such as: What holds societies together? How are norms created and maintained? What drives social change, and what are its consequences? This approach emphasizes how large-scale and long-run structures such as class, caste, economy, and state institutions shape individual choices and social outcomes.

The macro perspective assumes that meaningful social understanding becomes possible only when individual actions or institutions are interpreted within the broader structural and historical contexts that produce them. Separating a social process from its encompassing structure, in contrast, risks producing partial or distorted explanations of social life.

The relationship between the so-called micro (individual) and macro (structural) levels has long been central to sociological thought. Mills (1959) bridges these approaches through his concept of the sociological imagination, which connects “private troubles” to “public issues of social structure.” This means understanding individual experiences such as poverty or exclusion in relation to broader historical and structural forces like feudalism, caste hierarchies, or authoritarian governance.

Mills emphasized that personal predicaments are historically constituted, suggesting that exploring the relationship between individual and structural levels such as family and economy, citizens and state, or consumers and markets is essential for sociological understanding (Mishra, 2009). In Nepal, this linkage reveals how historical processes of exclusion and inequality shape contemporary social realities.

From this standpoint, large-scale and long-run processes constitute the foundation of political, economic, and cultural life. They influence phenomena such as ethnicity, democracy, migration, revolution, and even the formation of individual identities. Feminism, Marxism, functionalism, and conflict theory are all macro-level approaches because they analyze how broader structures influence social dynamics.

As Mishra (2011) observes, “each of us is a product of a deep history and encompassing structure manifested through family, gender, class, caste, and ethnicity.” The individual is thus not separate from, but rather embedded within, global and historical processes. The micro, in this sense, is the construction of the macro.



The macro-sociological and historical-comparative approaches are therefore indispensable in understanding Nepal's social and political transformations. Although micro and macro analyses are often presented as opposites, they are in fact complementary. As Alexander and Giesen (1987) argue, the distinction between them should be treated as analytic rather than absolute. They caution against reducing complex social phenomena to a simple "individual versus society" dichotomy.

Classical theorists such as Marx, Weber, and Durkheim also sought to connect individual and structural dimensions. For instance, Marx's concept of alienation links the subjective experiences of workers to the broader relations of production and class conflict. Similarly, Durkheim's idea of "social facts" as external and coercive realities demonstrates how individual behavior is rooted in collective structures (Durkheim, 1895/1982).

Alexander and Giesen (1987) note that after decades of separation, efforts to bridge the micro-macro divide have become central to sociological theory. They argue that a balanced view integrating both structural forces and individual actions offers a more comprehensive understanding of social life.

Applying this framework, the Maoist Movement (1996–2006) can be seen not as a discrete insurgency but as part of a broader historical continuum. The movement emerged from centuries-old feudal relations, exclusionary state practices, and entrenched socio-economic inequalities that gradually produced revolutionary conditions. From a large-scale and long-run perspective, Nepal's 2006 transition from monarchy to republic was not a sudden event but the structural outcome of deep historical contradictions. This framework also helps interpret contemporary Gen-Z mobilizations as a continuation of the same structural transformation. While the Maoist movement was a reaction against centuries of exclusion, Gen-Z activism represents protest against corruption and democratic failures in the post-republic era.

The Maoist Movement of Nepal: Large scale and long run perspective

The Maoist insurgency (1996–2006) should be understood not merely as a political revolution but as the outcome of centuries-long structural contradictions in Nepal. Drawing on Paul Pierson's (2004) notion of long-run processes and Chaitanya Mishra's (2009) framework of large-scale social structures, the movement represents a tipping point in the historical continuum of exclusion, agrarian inequality, and state centralization that originated with the unification of Nepal in 1769.

Unification, Feudalism, and the Deep Roots of Inequality

The unification under Prithvi Narayan Shah (PNS) established a highly extractive agrarian regime, consolidating political power and land ownership among the hill-based aristocracy and upper castes. The raikar and birta land tenure systems institutionalized feudal hierarchies, embedding economic dependency and social servitude. According to Mishra (2007), by the mid-20th century, less than 10% of households controlled over 60% of cultivable land, while the majority of peasants remained landless or indebted tenants. These feudal structures persisted despite post-1951 political changes, illustrating what Pierson (2004) terms path dependency, the persistence of historical institutions that continue to shape present outcomes.



Moreover, state formation after 1769 entrenched caste, ethnic, and regional exclusion. The state bureaucracy, army, and education system were dominated by high-caste elites from the central hills, creating enduring structural inequalities. Peripheral regions such as Rolpa, Rukum, and Jajarkot remained economically stagnant, with limited infrastructure, education, or markets. It was precisely in these regions that Maoist mobilization first took root, revealing how long-run exclusionary patterns formed the basis of rebellion. So, it's essential that we excavate our deeper history first.

Prithvi Narayan Shah and the Structural Logic of Unification: Excavating Deep History

In this light, the unification of Nepal should not be viewed merely through the micro lens of heroism or conquest. From a macro-historical standpoint, Prithvi Narayan Shah was not an isolated architect of unification but a historical agent shaped by specific structural conditions. Mishra (2010) emphasizes that Nepal's unification was driven by broader spatial-historical forces: the regional economic downturn across South Asia, the fragmentation of local polities, and the expansion of the British Empire in India. These global and regional processes created the material and political vacuum within which Nepal's unification became possible. PNS thus appears not as the sole unifier but as the handmaiden of history, ie, a product of larger structural imperatives rather than their originator.

Professor Chaitanya Mishra cautions that many micro and agency-focused perspectives confine analysis to the immediacy of the present, what he calls the "here and now." Such approaches, while illuminating short-term agency and local experiences, often romanticize and mystify social accounts by turning individuals into heroes or enemies, thereby obscuring the deep structural roots of transformation. Focusing only on immediate, rapidly unfolding events prevents scholars from reaching into the deep root, deep history, and deep structure of social change.

In contrast, a macro-historical perspective transcends the confines of immediate causation and excavates the long-term structural and historical connections shaping political and social transformation. As Pierson (2003) reminds us, "many important social processes take a long time, sometimes an extremely long time to unfold" (p. 178). By privileging temporally contiguous causes and outcomes, scholars risk overlooking these slow-moving yet fundamental forces. A long-term lens therefore warns against reducing historical change to proximate causes and insists on tracing the deeper structural sequences that shape contemporary outcomes.

Therefore, understanding Nepal's transition from monarchy to republic requires more than focusing on the 2006 People's Movement (Jana Andolan II) or the peace agreements that followed. Such an approach, Pierson (2003) argues, carries a "high analytical price," as it overlooks the centuries long processes of exclusion, class restructuring, and state formation.

The Maoist Movement as Structural Reaction

Within this structural context, the Maoist movement's call for a People's War (Jana Yuddha) emerged as a form of agency generated by systemic crisis. The rural poor, bonded laborers, and lower castes transformed their structural grievances into revolutionary consciousness through Maoist ideological framing. In Pierson's (2004) terms, this was a reactive sequence, a historical



moment where accumulated tensions within entrenched structures produced an alternative trajectory.

Professor Mishra interprets Nepal's 2006 People's Movement as the culmination of long-term structural and historical changes rather than a sudden political event. He argues that the weakening of pre-capitalist institutions and the gradual rise of capitalism reshaped society by commodifying land, marginalizing rural households, and eroding the authority of headmen, kinship groups, and feudal hierarchies. Simultaneously, new institutions, such as savings groups, NGOs, women's collectives, and forest user groups emerged, allowing women, Dalits, and ethnic communities greater participation in education, politics, and labor markets.

These shifts created new kinds of individuals with aspirations extending beyond traditional boundaries, challenging the authority of families, communities, and ultimately the monarchy itself. Mishra situates the 2006 transformation within a longer democratic continuum beginning with the Praja Parishad in the 1930s and extending through successive movements in the 1950s, 1980s, and 1990s. The Maoist insurgency (1996–2006) deepened this process by linking personal grievances to broader state-level injustices. Thus, while the royal coup, the SPA-CPN(M) alliance, and civil society activism acted as proximate catalysts, they were themselves products of these deeper historical and structural transformations.

From this large-scale, long-run perspective, the 2006 political transition appears as a historical tipping point, the visible culmination of centuries-long transformations in production, class, caste, gender, and social structure. Mishra (2007) thus concludes that Nepal's political transition was driven not primarily by individual actors or alliances, but by history and structure, with agency emerging from within these long-term processes. Yet, while the Maoist insurgency succeeded in dismantling the monarchical-feudal order, it also reproduced new hierarchies within the republican state.

A Continuity, and the Emerging Generation

From a large-scale and long-run perspective, the Maoist movement represents not an isolated decade of conflict but the culmination of structural dynamics spanning over two centuries with agrarian servitude, caste exclusion, and state centralization. It marks a critical rupture in Nepal's political order while leaving deeper structures of inequality only partially transformed. Mishra's interpretation resonates with Pierson's insight that historical transformations are cumulative and path-dependent. Both suggest that to comprehend contemporary Nepal, one must trace the longer history of its structural evolution. Similarly, in understanding today's Gen-Z movements, and acknowledging their aspirations, frustrations, and political expressions, it is essential to situate them within these enduring historical trajectories. Just as the Maoist generation emerged from deep-rooted structural inequalities, today's youth are shaped by new global forces of technology, neoliberalism, and cultural change.

However, the republic born of the Maoist revolution faces its own crisis of legitimacy. Corruption, patronage, and weak institutions have undermined the democratic promises of inclusion and justice. The widening gap between promise and practice once again sets the stage for new demands for reform, while this time led by a generation confronting not feudalism, but the unfinished project of democracy itself.



From Republic to Reforms

While the Maoist movement dismantled the monarchy and inaugurated a republic, the promises of justice, equality, and accountable governance remain only partially fulfilled. Nepal's long history of political upheavals and shifting governance systems has fostered conditions conducive to enduring corruption. The legacy of autocratic rule and recurring political instability has embedded practices that allow corruption to persist within state institutions (Shrestha, 2017).

Similarly, Suvedi's 2025 analysis highlights how these historical legacies particularly the remnants of autocratic rule and prolonged political instability have fostered an environment in which corruption thrives. Weak institutional structures, marked by inadequate checks and balances, poor enforcement, and pervasive patronage networks, further entrench systemic corruption. Its impact on governance is evident in declining public trust, economic inefficiency through resource misallocation, and the deterioration of essential public services. Collectively, these outcomes deepen citizens' disillusionment and weaken the functioning of democracy.

It is within this context that the Gen-Z movement has emerged as a new form of political mobilization. Unlike the Maoist insurgency, which relied on armed struggle and rural networks, the Gen-Z movement were predominantly urban, digitally networked, and explicitly targeted at corruption within the political class.

The immediate trigger for the Gen-Z protests was the government's abrupt September 2025 decision to ban major social media platforms under the Directives for Managing the Use of Social Networks, 2023. The directive mandated all domestic and international platforms to register with the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (MoCIT). When major corporations such as Meta (Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp), Alphabet (YouTube), and X failed to comply within the seven-day deadline, authorities deactivated 26 platforms overnight (Kathmandu Post, 2025). Officially framed as an effort to "preserve social harmony," the ban was widely perceived by young Nepalese as an assault on digital freedom and democratic expression. For a generation that lives, works, and communicates online, this action symbolized not merely the loss of connectivity but the culmination of eroding public trust, entrenched corruption, and a political system increasingly indifferent to citizens' voices.

Beyond these immediate triggers, protesters drew attention to deeper and long-standing grievances: *The Pokhara International Airport embezzlement scandal* (Kathmandu Post, October 17, 2025), *The Bhutanese refugee scam*, and entrenched patterns of political nepotism, popularly denounced as the "nepo-baby" culture (The Kathmandu Post, September 6, 2025). Such scandals epitomized the systemic failure of Nepal's post-republican order to deliver transparency and accountability. Many young demonstrators argued that the republic born out of the Maoist revolution had itself been captured by a new political elite insulated from public suffering.

Gen-Z's anger, however, had been accumulating for years. Persistent unemployment, systemic corruption, and elite privilege had already eroded trust in leadership. The viral "Nepo Kid" campaign which exposed the extravagant lifestyles of politicians' children against widespread



youth precarity became a powerful metaphor for inequality (Kathmandu Post, 2025). When their digital voice was silenced, the youth took to the streets.

In just twenty-seven hours, Nepal's Gen-Z transformed digital frustration into mass protest. As Rimal (2025) observes, "It felt sudden, but it was not. Frustration had been marinating for decades. One in five Nepalis lives in poverty, and rising youth unemployment combined with the abuse of power left an entire generation staring at a door that never opened. Scandal after scandal convinced people that corruption was not a glitch in the system, it was the system. The ruling class had grown too greedy, and there was only one path left to take" (Rimal, 2025). The uprising was, therefore, not an isolated outburst but a culmination of deep-rooted discontent, representing a new stage in Nepal's long trajectory of social transformation.

From a large-scale and long-run perspective, these mobilizations show continuity with earlier waves of structural transformation. The Maoist insurgency structurally transformed Nepal's polity by ending the monarchy and establishing a republic. Yet, Gen-Z's mobilizations demonstrate that the republic itself is now under scrutiny for reproducing inequality, corruption, and elite dominance. The fight against corruption and impunity thus represents not merely a call for cleaner governance but a continuation of Nepal's historical struggle for justice and inclusion.

The Gen-Z movement in Nepal represents the emergence of a new form of social resistance shaped by macro social forces like digital connectivity, global awareness, and moral-political frustration. This young generation seek to protest the system marked by corruption, elite capture, and pervasive unemployment. Unlike the Maoists, Gen-Z activists do not seek to overthrow the state but to redefine accountability and ethics in governance. Their activism is pervasive in digital spaces and urban streets. Campaigns such as Enough Is Enough, "No, Not Again", and Maitighar Mandala protests reflect how young Gen-Z mobilized and objected demanding transparency, employment opportunities, and political renewal.

In long-run perspective, Gen-Z's discontent is not detached from Nepal's historical trajectory; it is the continuation of the unresolved contradictions of the post-revolutionary state. Their struggles highlight how the corruption and exclusion persist even in a republican framework.

Theoretically, the Gen-Z movement exemplifies Pierson's (2004) argument about the interplay between slow-moving institutions and fast-moving events. Structural discontent stemming from youth unemployment, corruption, and inequality had accumulated over years, but required immediate incidents to erupt into mass protest. These "sparks," such as the social media ban and ministerial hit-and-run, activated the deeper kindling of long-standing grievances. This aligns with Mishra's (2009) conception of large-scale structures, which emphasizes how historical continuities in power, exclusion, and inequality persist beneath institutional change. From this perspective, the Gen-Z movement is not an isolated youth uprising but a continuation of Nepal's long-run structural transformation, reframed by digital connectivity, global awareness, and moral frustration.

Ultimately, the Gen-Z protests signify a generational rearticulation of Nepal's democratic aspirations. If the Maoist revolution sought to dismantle monarchy, the Gen-Z movement seeks to democratize the republic itself, to moralize governance, demand accountability, and restore



public faith in the political order. Together, these movements capture Nepal's evolving struggle to reconcile revolution with reform, and structural transformation with ethical renewal

Comparative Analysis: Maoist Movement and Gen-Z Protests

The Maoist Movement (1996–2006) and the Gen-Z protests of 2025, though separated by nearly two decades, are connected through the long-run structural contradictions of the Nepali state. Both emerged from crises of legitimacy, but under fundamentally different socio-political contexts. The Maoist insurgency unfolded within a monarchical and semi-feudal system, where political power was concentrated in the hands of a few elites, and structural inequalities in land ownership, caste hierarchy, and ethnic exclusion prevailed. By contrast, the Gen-Z protests occurred within a republican and federal democratic order, an era that was supposed to have transcended those very inequalities. Yet, the persistence of elite capture, systemic corruption, and economic frustration among educated youth has reignited the call for transformation, revealing the incomplete nature of Nepal's structural change.

The social bases of these movements also sharply diverge. The Maoist movement was rooted in the rural poor, peasants, and historically marginalized groups who saw armed struggle as the only path to inclusion. In contrast, the Gen-Z protests were largely urban, technologically connected, and youth-led, expressing discontent through digital mobilization and spontaneous street actions. Where the Maoists relied on guerrilla warfare and a hierarchical command under the Communist Party, Gen-Z movements are largely decentralized, fluid, and leaderless, reflecting the cultural logic of digital-era activism. Similarly, their grievances mirror different phases of Nepal's political economy: the Maoists sought to abolish feudalism and monarchy, whereas Gen-Z challenges the unfulfilled promises of the republic, especially the rise of nepotism, elite privilege, and youth unemployment.

In theoretical terms, both can be read through Pierson's (2004) framework of long-run processes and Mishra's (2009) idea of large-scale structures. The Maoist movement represented the culmination of historical contradictions embedded in Nepal's agrarian and caste-based order; the Gen-Z movement, however, reveals the continuation of those contradictions in new forms within the republican system. The earlier revolution aimed to dismantle monarchy and feudal power, while the latter protests seek to democratize democracy itself, demanding accountability, transparency, and equitable participation in the state that the Maoist revolution helped to create. Thus, from a long-run perspective, both waves of resistance signify different phases of Nepal's unfinished project of structural transformation.

To better understand the similarities and differences between Nepal's Maoist movement (1996–2006) and the Gen-Z protests (2024–2025), a comparative framework is useful. The following table number 1, outlines key features of each movement, including their socio-political contexts, social bases, methods of mobilization, grievances, stated goals, and theoretical significance. By juxtaposing these movements, it becomes possible to examine how historical structural conditions, long-term inequalities, and generational shifts have shaped distinct forms of political activism.



Table 1

Comparative Overview of the Maoist Movement and Gen-Z Protests in Nepal

Feature	Maoist Movement (1996–2006)	Gen-Z Protests (2024-2025)
Primary Context	Monarchical system; civil war	Post-republican federal system; democratic framework
Social Base	Rural poor, peasantry, marginalized ethnic groups	Urban youth, students, digital natives
Primary Methods	Armed insurgency, “People’s War,” rural mobilization	Digital organization (Discord, social media), peaceful marches escalating to violence, leaderless protests
Key Grievances	Feudal land relations, caste/ethnic exclusion, political centralization	Systemic corruption, elite capture (“nepo babies”), unemployment, failed service delivery
Stated Goals	Overthrow monarchy, establish a republic, structural revolution	Government accountability, anti-corruption reforms, economic justice within the republican system
Theoretical Fit	Culmination of centuries-old structural contradictions	Protest against the unfinished structural transformation and new inequalities of the post-republican era

The comparison reveals that while the Maoist Movement and the Gen-Z Protests emerge from distinct historical contexts, both represent critical moments in Nepal’s continuing struggle for structural transformation. The Maoist insurgency sought to dismantle feudal and monarchical hierarchies through revolutionary means, whereas the Gen-Z uprising challenges the unfulfilled promises of that very republic through digital, urban, and largely nonviolent mobilization. Together, they illustrate Nepal’s long-run trajectory of social resistance, where each generation redefines the meaning of justice, equality, and accountability within evolving political frameworks.

From a large-scale and long-run sociological perspective, both the Maoist Movement (1996–2006) and the Gen-Z Revolution (2024-2025) can be viewed not as isolated political events but as outcomes of deep structural continuities and transformations in Nepal’s social order. This approach, grounded in historical macrosociology (Pierson, 2004; Arrighi, 2000), links slow-moving institutional processes with rapid episodes of social upheaval.

Following Pierson’s (2003, 2004) conception, long-run processes, such as economic inequality, exclusionary state formation, and class stratification gradually build tensions that manifest in periodic ruptures. Chaitanya Mishra (2009, 2010, 2011) similarly argues that Nepal’s political transformations must be seen in terms of long-term structural contradictions between agrarian hierarchies, centralized governance, and emerging aspirations for equality.

The Maoist Movement represented a revolution from below, rooted in agrarian grievances and exclusion within the feudal economy (Marx, 1867; Mishra, 2007). It mobilized marginalized population. In contrast, the Gen-Z Revolution of 2025 represents a digital and post-material



revolt. It arose from educated urban youth frustrated with corruption, unemployment, and unfulfilled democratic promises (The Kathmandu Post, 2025; Rimal, 2025).

Thus, through a large-scale and long-run lens, Nepal's revolutions appear as cyclical reproductions of social contradictions (Mishra, 2011; Skocpol, 1979) shaped by the evolution of class, technology, and global consciousness. What connects the Maoist insurgents and Gen-Z activists is a shared historical discontent, though expressed through distinct structural conditions and symbolic mediums.

Conclusion

The paper seeks to analyse the Maoist movement and Gen-Z protests from the perspective of large scale and long run. Nepal's political transition in 2006 was not simply the outcome of short-term grievances or the actions of particular leaders. Rather, it reflected long-accumulated contradictions across multiple levels: the state, community, class, caste, ethnicity, gender, and even households and individuals. As Mishra reminds us, the immediate protagonists of change such as citizens, civil society, the SPA alliance, or the CPN (Maoist) were themselves products of specific historical and structural configurations. They exercised agency, but not outside of history or structure.

From this perspective, the Maoist Movement appears as part of a broader trajectory of structural transformation, dismantling monarchy and inaugurating a republic. Yet, the transition remains incomplete. The recent mobilization of Gen-Z youth against corruption illustrates how unresolved contradictions persist in new forms. Both are historically situated responses to enduring structural inequalities and failures of governance.

Thus, Nepal's journey from monarchy to republic and beyond must be understood not as a sequence of disconnected uprisings but as an unfolding process of long-run structural change. The large-scale and long-run perspective reveals that Nepal's transformation is ongoing, shaped by past legacies while continuously redefined by new generations.

The Maoist Movement and the Gen-Z protests, though distinct in their origins and expressions, illuminate Nepal's long-run trajectory of social transformation. The former dismantled the monarchical order and exposed the structural inequities of feudal society, while the latter confronts the persistence of elite dominance and institutional stagnation within the republican framework. Both reflect deep-rooted struggles for justice, representation, and accountability revealing how structural contradictions evolve rather than disappear over time. Through the lens of long-run processes and large-scale structures, the continuity between these two movements underscores a generational redefinition of revolution: from armed insurgency to digital resistance, from the demand for regime change to the demand for moral and institutional reform. Together, they embody the unfinished project of Nepal's democratization and the enduring aspiration for social transformation.

Funding Statement: No fund available from any institution

Transparency Statement: I confirm that this study has been conducted with honesty and in full adherence to ethical guidelines.

Data Availability Statement: Author can provide data.

Conflict of Interest: The author declares there is no conflicts of interest.

Authors' Contributions: The author solely conducted all research activities i.e., concept, data collecting, drafting and final review of manuscript.



References

- Alexander, J. C., & Giesen, B. (1987). From reduction to linkage: The long view of the micro–macro link. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch, & N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The micro–macro link* (pp. 1–42). University of California Press.
- Alexander, J. C., Giesen, B., Münch, R., & Smelser, N. J. (Eds.). (1987). *The micro–macro link*. University of California Press.
- Arrighi, G. (2000). Globalization and historical macrosociology. In J. Abu-Lughod (Ed.), *Sociology for the twenty-first century: Continuities and cutting edges* (pp. 117–133). University of Chicago Press.
- Collins, R. (1994). *Four sociological traditions*. Oxford University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1982). *The rules of sociological method* (S. Lukes, Ed.; W. D. Halls, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1895)
- Ford, J. B. (1972). Macro-sociology and micro-sociology: A way to bridge the gap. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 2(2), 255–266. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41420453>
- Gurvitch, G. (1957). *Sociology of law*. Philosophical Library.
- Hoult, T. F. (1969). *Dictionary of modern sociology*. Littlefield, Adams & Co.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital: Volume 1*. Verlag von Otto Meissner.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford University Press.
- Mishra, C. (2007). Political transition in Nepal: Toward an analytical framework. In *Essays on the sociology of Nepal* (pp. 1–34). FinePrint.
- Mishra, C. (2009). Making research sociological. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 3, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v3i0.2780>
- Mishra, C. (2010). *Historical consciousness and the making of modern Nepal*. Martin Chautari.
- Mishra, C. (2011, January). *Nepal: Long-term, large-scale: History and theory* [Paper presentation]. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu.
- Mishra, C. (2011). *Essays on the sociology of Nepal*. FinePrint.
- Mishra, C. (2011). Revolutions and reproductions: The cyclical pattern of social change in Nepal. *Studies in Nepali Society and History*, 16(2), 45–67.
- Pierson, P. (2003). Big, slow-moving, and invisible: Macrosocial processes in the study of comparative politics. In J. Mahoney & D. Rueschemeyer (Eds.), *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences* (pp. 177–207). Cambridge University Press.
- Pierson, P. (2004). *Politics in time: History, institutions, and social analysis*. Princeton University Press.
- Rimal, P. (2025, October 17). How Gen Z turned a hashtag into a revolution in Nepal. *Online Khabar*. <https://english.onlinekhabar.com/how-gen-z-turned-a-hashtag-into-a-revolution-in-nepal.html>
- Shrestha, B. K. (2017). Political corruption in Nepal: Causes, consequences, and the way forward. *Himalaya: The Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies*, 37(2), 102–115.
- Skocpol, T. (1979). *States and social revolutions: A comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge University Press.



- Suvedi, M. (2024). Contemporary research: An interdisciplinary academic journal, 7(1).
<https://doi.org/10.3126/craiaj.v7i1.67252>
- The Kathmandu Post. (2025, April 18). *Billions embezzled in Pokhara airport works, probe finds*.
<https://kathmandupost.com/national/2025/04/18/billions-embezzled-in-pokhara-airport-works-probe-finds>
- The Kathmandu Post. (2025, September 6). *'Nepo kid' trend sparks anti-corruption campaign in Nepal*.
<https://kathmandupost.com/national/2025/09/06/nepo-kid-trend-sparks-anti-corruption-campaign-in-nepal>
- The Kathmandu Post. (2025, September 8). *Nepal's Gen Z uprising explained*.
<https://kathmandupost.com/national/2025/09/08/nepal-s-gen-z-uprising-explained>
- Weber, M. (1922). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. University of California Press.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), *NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.