



## Strengthening Multiparty Democracy in Nepal: An Assessment of Parliamentary Elections since 1951

Girdhari Dahal, PhD 

Department of Political Science, Prithvi Narayan Campus, Pokhara, Nepal

**Article History:** Submitted 31 Jan. 2023; Reviewed 25 Mar. 2023; Accepted 29 April 2023

**Corresponding Author:** Girdhari Dahal, Email: [girdhari.dahal@prnc.tu.edu.np](mailto:girdhari.dahal@prnc.tu.edu.np)

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.3126/paj.v6i1.54664>

Copyright 2023 © The author(s). The publisher may reuse all published articles with prior permission of the concerned authors. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY 4.0\) License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ScanToAccess eCopy

### ABSTRACT

Based on the secondary data, using qualitative descriptive methods, the study aims to examine the evolution of Nepal's parliamentary system and its actual practice. In the nation's first general election held in 1959, in accordance with the parliamentary system practice, the Nepali Congress won two-thirds of the vote. Similar to this, the left coalition, which includes the Nepal Communist Party (UML) and Nepal Communist Party (Maoist Centre), received nearly two-thirds of the electorate's votes in 2017. Both of those two-thirds governments were unable to function for a full term. Both internal and external factors contributed to the incapacity to work continuously for the entire time period. The findings of the study show that political parties were unable to sustain democratic norms, beliefs, customs and culture because the public opinions expressed by the Nepali people could not be properly translated into political stability and long-lasting peace. In this study, this issue regarding the overall functioning of the political system has been raised because even Nepal's majority rule is not able to remain in the government for a whole term. The study also argues that the parliamentary democratic system is not a "dirty" game, but our political leaders are the dirty players. The study concludes that that Nepal's parliamentary system requires a modification and Nepali political parties should follow democratic norms and values.

**KEYWORDS:** Parliamentary system, elected government, democratic republic, federalism

### INTRODUCTION

The parliament is the supreme legislative body in every democratic nation. Around the world, the parliaments have the authority to enact new laws, amend current laws, repeal outdated ones and make new laws (Babu, 2013). By the twenty-first century, the professional parliament, which has a strong authority in the decision-making, formation and development of the foundations of civil society, of democratic values, has become important in the global community (Kurbanovna, 2020). A healthy and stable

democracy requires a strong, effective and respected parliament, which has been called "the institutional key to democratization" (Tepavac, 2021). The parliaments are some of the most influential political bodies in democracies since they have elected members. They are representative bodies that alter the global political, social and cultural environment, making them democratic forums for debate, problem-solving and decision-making in the political sphere (Ilie, 2015). The argument over the relative qualities of the presidential and parliamentary system has a long history, but Juan Linz's publications about the perceived dangers of the presidential system and the benefits of the parliamentary system in 1990 rekindled the discussion (Elgie, 2005). Although the actual ramifications of these different constitutional arrangements within the democratic polities have received little attention, the institutional contrasts between presidential and parliamentary rule are widely documented (Gerring et al., 2009). An obvious difference between the parliamentary and presidential systems in government survival is that the presidential governments have fixed terms and do not terminate during the first few years, whereas some parliamentary governments fall within a few months (Maeda & Nishikawa, 2006).

Two essential ideas—parliamentary supremacy and the notion of fused, or unified, powers-drive traditional views of parliamentary administration. The former, the notion that the legislature controls the executive branch and the creation of policy, is now routinely disproved (Strom, 2000). The extent to which the UK governments continue to employ the Westminster model to support their actions is then explored. A set of standards, assumptions and meanings that outline this kind of acceptable government is known as the Westminster model (Judge, 2004).

Two issues were believed to have been finally and permanently resolved by the parliamentary party's victory in this important constitutional conflict. There should not be any executive interference with the right to vote going forward (Reinsch, 1909). The paradoxes that democracy itself faces are at the root of many of the issues that democracy has encountered in developing nations. A system of organized power struggles and "government by the people" pitted governability against representativeness (Diamond, 1990).

Ilie (2015) contends that the majority of political systems in Europe are founded on parliamentary democracy i.e. the Westminster model, which is a political system that is becoming more and more popular around the world. In this system, the leader of the parliament is the prime minister and is accountable to the parliament, which is called a parliamentary system. In this political arrangement, the ministers are accountable to the parliament and the prime minister. In the parliamentary system of government, it is arranged to play the role of a strong opposition. In addition, in the parliamentary system, independent judiciary, human rights, pluralism, separation and balance of power, rule of law, and freedom of the press are its main features. The system in which the leader of the parliamentary party with the majority in the parliament or the leader elected by two or more parties or the leader elected by the majority of the elected representatives in the parliament becomes the prime minister and the prime minister is the head of the government. In this system, the executive power rests with the prime minister and the principle of separation of powers is not fully accepted.

A parliamentary system is said to be the best system in the world; however, looking at the parliamentary elections in Nepal, it is not seen that any parliament has been able to function for a full term. The first parliamentary election was held in 1959 (2015 B.S.). The Nepali Congress won two-thirds of the popular vote in that general election, but then King Mahendra ended the eighteen-month elected government and established a party-less Panchayat system. The Nepali Congress won the majority in the

second general election in 1991 (2048 B.S.). The then Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala held the mid-term election in three years due to the internal strife within the party. In the mid-term election of 1994, the minority government formed under the leadership of Manmohan Adhikari, who was the leader of the Communist Party of Nepal – United Marxist Leninist (CPN-UML) lasted only for nine months. After that, there were many games of making and breaking the coalition governments. During this period, the game of buying and selling the members of parliament also started and distortions entered the parliamentary system. Even in the fourth general election of 1999, the Nepali Congress won the majority, but it could not work for five years. The then King Gyanendra took the executive power into his hand and dissolved the parliament; as a result, the parliament could not complete its term.

To make the parliamentary system of government more functional, the Constituent Assembly elections were held in 2008 and 2013. The Constituent Assembly made the Constitution of Nepal. Based on the past experience, the Nepali people gave two-thirds of the public vote to the left alliance in 2017. On the basis of the joint election manifesto of the left alliance between CPN-UML and Communist Party of Nepal – Maoist Centre (CPN-Maoist Centre) the Nepali people voted for political stability, long-term peace and progress, and institutional development of the federal democratic republic. The Nepal Communist Party (NCP) was formed after the merger of CPN-UML and CPN-Maoist Centre. The people of Nepal had a lot of hope and trust in this government for political stability in Nepal. They believed that the nation would move forward in the journey of prosperity with the speed of development. It was hoped that through the institutional development of the democratic republic, the achievements of democracy would be realized at the people's level. But the internal conflict of the ruling the NCP reached its climax. There was no ideological or theoretical dispute in the internal affairs of this party. The internal dispute between Prime Minister KP Sharma Oli and the other party chairman Pushpa Kamal Dahal Prachanda and senior leader Madhav Nepal arose. The dispute led to the division of the party. An atmosphere of non-cooperation was created by one party accusing the other.

The people expected improvements in education, health and employment related to the people's livelihood from this government, but their dreams of the people were not fulfilled. Due to the internal conflict of the ruling party, on the one hand, a no-confidence motion was filed in the parliament to remove the prime minister; on the other hand, Prime Minister Oli dissolved the parliament on 20 December 2020 (5th of Paush 2077 BS) and announced the mid-term election. The faction led by the same party leaders Puspa Kamal Dahal and Madhav Nepal protested this step of Prime Minister Oli. A case was filed against this step. The Supreme Court restored the parliament on 11 February 2021. On the one hand, in the case under consideration of the stay, Rishi Katel, the leader of a party called Nepal Communist Party (NCP), who had already registered the party name and later CPN-UML and CPN-Maoist Centre registered the same name. After hearing the claim of being a Communist Party (NCP), the Supreme Court declared that the Nepal Communist Party (NCP) is a party led by Rishi Katel, adding that the CPN-UML and CPN-Maoist Centre would remain unchanged. In the end, the almost two-thirds majority obtained by the left alliance was dismissed. Within the ruling party, its supporters in the government on the one side and the then NCP party leader Pushpa Kamal Dahal returned to the CPN-Maoist Centre, and other party leaders Madhav Nepal and Jhalnath Khanal on the other formed another political party named the Communist Party of Nepal (Socialist). This dispute between the ruling party reached the provinces of Nepal. In Karnali Province, four members of the Madhav Nepal party crossed the floor of the provincial parliament and saved the provincial government of CPN-Maoist Centre.

In this way, the dispute of the centre reached the provinces. The party's whip was violated in the parliamentary elections. The values of the parliamentary system were not institutionalized. The CPN-UML took the action of expelling those four parliamentarians from the party. Similarly, motions of no confidence were registered in the governments of various provinces. Chief Minister Shankar Pokharel resigned from his post and was re-appointed as Chief Minister in order to suppress the question of no confidence in Lumbini Province. The same had also spread to Gandaki Province.

Thus, the parliamentary system, which is the best in the world, could not work for the entire period, the search and discussion of another system as an alternative to the parliamentary system started in Nepal. The parliamentary system is the best system of government in the world, but it failed badly to function properly in Nepal. Though more than two-thirds of the countries in the world have adopted the parliamentary system of government, the presidential system of government is about fifty countries (Linz, 1990). However, the mixed political governance has been implemented in twenty-five countries. In some countries, the communist regimes and consensual governance systems have been in practice. Given the pathetic condition of the parliamentary system in Nepal, it is now time to make a serious assessment of the parliamentary democratic practices of Nepal. Thus, the objective of this study is to make a critical assessment of the parliamentary system in Nepal and its empirical practice.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

With the spread of democracy around the world, the freedom-related exhilaration has given a way to more practical concerns. The issues that the most governments attempted to transition from the state-controlled to market economies are economic (Moe & Caldwell, 1994). The systems with a president are firm; those with a parliament are definite. The parliamentary system also encourages a more formalized approach to politics and policymaking (Gerring et al., 2009). The presidential form of government, in contrast, is distinguished by the distinct division of powers and the functioning system of checks and balances, and is directly elected by the people's legitimacy. As a result, it protects the people's freedom better than the parliamentary structure (Temesgen, 2021).

While searching for the historical facts of democratic and parliamentary practice in Nepal, it seems relevant to have a general discussion about the governance system of Mithila civilization. It is relevant to mention some examples of how democracy was practiced in the Mithila state located in Janakpur, Nepal during the Ramayana period, about 3000 years ago (Thakur, 1956; Sharan, n.d.). It is mentioned in the *Ashtavakra Gita* regarding the Mithila civilization and how Maharishi Janak, the king of Mithila, used to manage it. It is found that when King Janak took a decision on every matter of public importance, he organized an assembly of learned persons and ruled based on the advice of the assembly (Kafle, 2022). The administration of the *Vidwtsabha* [Assembly] as the parliament has been a tradition since the ancient times of King Janak. Based on that, it can be said that during that period a parliamentary system and people's representatives existed to prepare legislation.

The study of the ideal state of King Rama of *Ayodhya* reveals that he was a skilled popular ruler. His far-sighted spirit and actions seem to prove that his governance system was dedicated to the public interest. His behavior shows how responsive and appreciative Ram was to the people. The fact that he used to act only on the basis of the public opinion, which is also proved by the incident of sending his queen Sita to *Vindravana*. It has been proven by the incidents that Ram abandoned the state and went into exile for the sake of the people. On the other side, because Sita was abducted by Ravan, there was a fierce battle between Rama and Ravan. Rama defeated Ravan and

proved that truth always prevails. Ram was of the opinion that the people should be governed only on the basis of justice and religion. In the *Mahabharata* also, the same has been mentioned in the *Raj Dharma* [King's duty] (Thakur, 1997). Bhishma Pitamaha gave up the throne following the *Raj Dharma*. There are various characters, which are mentioned in the *Mahabharata*. For instance, there were pious characters like Yudhishtira, diplomats like Krishna, archers like Arjuna, wrestlers like Bhima, wise men like Vidura and wicked men like Duryodhana, recluses like Karna, scheming men like Sakuni and hypocrites like Sanjay, who blindly involved in nepotism. Nowadays, such characters can be seen in Nepali politics as well.

When studying and analyzing the governance system of different periods of Nepal, the Lichchavi rule is found as a golden rule (Shrestha, 2005). It is said that even though the king was the centre of all power during this reign, the king was accountable to the people. According to the advice of the assembly which consisted of *Bhai Bhardars* [Advisors] of the Lichchavi period, the king used managerial, judicial, and executive powers. He was also a symbol of foreign relations, religion and unity. The kings of the Lichchavi period were the kings in the name only. Their rule was very popular when doing a comparative study of the governance system of Nepal; it has been confirmed by the study of history that all their governance systems were focused on the welfare, advancement and progress of the people.

Great Britain is said to be the mother of the parliamentary system of the modern age. Parliamentary values have been acquired through a long practice in order to develop the institutions of recognition. When discussing the model of the parliamentary system, the example of *Vela* [Candle] is presented. The Magna Carta of 1215 is regarded as the first practice of the parliamentary system in the Kingdom (Carpenter & Prior, 2015). This was the first agreement that empowered the king's authority over the representatives of England. The parliament had decided that no tax could be levied without passing a law. It was a political event that empowered the people's representatives by controlling them under the arbitrary regime of the king. In the parliamentary history of England, King Charles I was hanged in 1649 by the decision of the parliament. In 1660, the British parliament placed Charles II on the throne on the condition that he be accountable to the People's Representative National Parliament (Straw, 2017). The Glorious Revolution of 1688 institutionalized a constitutional monarchy in Britain. Because of the will of right passed by the parliament, the kingdom claims itself as the mother of the parliamentary system. The parliamentary supremacy existed in Britain. In this way, the constitutional supremacy has been developed in other countries as well. In Nepal, there is the constitutional supremacy in theory, but there are differences in practice. In the United Kingdom (UK) now, the decisions made by the parliament become the constitution and laws. Even though there is a constitutional monarchy in the UK now, if the parliament decides that the monarchy will no longer exist, but the monarchy will end.

Ilie (2017) argues that further empirical research is required because legislative debates are taking on a more significant role in altering political conflict practices and in addressing the most pressing social, economic, and political issues on national and international agendas. More cross-cultural research needs to be conducted in order to identify and better understand the common as well as unique elements of parliamentary practices in national parliaments. Parliamentary debates' main objectives are to negotiate political solutions, come to agreements, and make choices that have an impact on people's daily lives.

The parliament is among the most active political institutions in democracies and have historically served as a forum for a direct debate among the elected citizens. The parliament is democratically constituted forums for political discussion, problem-solving

and decision-making because they are representative bodies (Ilie, 2015). In the similar way, the parliament is also mentioned in this way:

The current parliamentary democracy, which signifies public engagement in all governmental affairs, has come a long way since the 12th century. In Germany at the start of the 1100s, the idea of gathering representatives of particular social strata for royal discussion was first put into motion (Huda, 2005).

The modern democratic countries do not often think of liberty in the traditional meaning, which highly valued the responsibility of free citizens to interact directly with others in the public domain (Tan, 2013). The story of the citizen's right to take part in the governmental actions is still incomplete without mentioning the Magna Carta. The Magna Carta, also known as the Articles of Barons, is recognized as the cornerstone of parliamentary democracy in the UK (Huda, 2005). The parliamentary democracy in India of the contemporary British Raj style continued until India won its independence in 1947 (Huda, 2005). According to the constitution, which confirms that Nepal continues to adopt a parliamentary system at both the federal and provincial levels, the form of government will be a plurality-based, multi-party, competitive and federal democratic republican parliamentary system (Acharya, 2018). The mass movement of April 2006 was organized jointly by the seven political parties and revolutionary Maoists with the same spirit and understanding for the restoration of parliament and election of a constituent assembly (Dahal, 2020).

## **METHODS**

This study is based on the secondary sources. The secondary sources contain an analysis based on the constitutions of Nepal, election commission reports, parliamentary system-related journal publications, etc. This study is qualitative descriptive. Rather than saying that any governance system is good or bad in itself, how was that system practiced? What is the role of political party leaders and workers in the operation of that system? How have those political parties practiced democratic values and principles within their party? To answer these research questions, the success and failure of the system can be analyzed based on what kind of democratic system they want to develop and what kind of culture they have built when those parties go into government. The Nepali political parties were crucial to the success of the federal democratic republic and the democratic struggle. Sadly, they have not adhered to democratic values and practices in order to institutionalize a federal democratic republic. Only they adhere to the feudal system, which is characterized by nepotism, favoritism and familyism in practice. They lack a merit system, a capable politician and a well-functioned government structure. Based on these assumptions, the study has been analyzed and a conclusion has been reached.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Results**

While Nepal has been practicing a parliamentary democracy since 1959, the nation's first elected government, which had a two-thirds majority, did not operate full-time. BP Koirala, then head of the Nepali Congress, attempted to establish a legislative government for 202 days. Since the restoration of democracy in 1990, there are currently 29 governments within the country. Currently, a federal democratic republic has been founded in Nepal, and while theoretically, the people are sovereign, a particular number of political parties took advantage of every opportunity. The rights of the people in politics and the economy are being violated. The federal democratic republic has just a theoretical foundation; in reality, there is significant prejudice against them. Social

justice is not practiced in society under the merit system. Monopoly is the single thing that the governance system is in practice everywhere. The leaders of the major political parties have no obligation to the people of the country. They provide a definition of democracy, but the parliamentary system has not worked properly.

***The First Parliamentary General Election in Nepal***

Democracy emerged in Nepal with the revolution of 1951. It was announced that the constitution would be made by the legislative assembly or the constituent assembly. In 1959, the Constitution of Nepal Dominion 2015 was announced. This constitution provided for the operation of the parliamentary system of governance in Nepal (Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 1959). Accordingly, the first general election in Nepal was completed in 1959. The Nepali Congress won a two-thirds (74/109) majority in the parliament. The leader of the parliamentary party BP Koirala was elected. The first elected government was formed under his leadership. He became the first elected prime minister in the parliament in the political history of Nepal. He planned to govern based on the values and the principles of parliamentary democracy.

**Table 1**  
*General Election Results, 1959*

---

S.N.	Name of the Parties	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	Nepali Congress	74	67.88
2	Nepal Nationalist Gorkha Parishad	19	17.43
3	United Democratic Party	5	4.58
4	Nepal Communist Party	4	3.67
5	Nepal People's Council (Acharya)	2	1.83
6	Nepal People's Council (Mix)	1	0.92
7	Independent	4	3.67
	Total	109	100

---

*Source:* Election Commission Nepal 1959

The first elected prime minister of Nepal and the members of his cabinet were arrested. In 1960, the then King Mahendra ended the parliamentary system and started the non-party-less Panchayat system. All political parties were banned. The Panchayat system ended in 1990.

The United People's Movement of 1990 restored the multi-party system in Nepal. The Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal 1990 was created in 1990. The representatives of the people made this constitution of political parties, free people and representatives of the king. Supreme Court Justice Vishwanath Upadhyaya was the chairman of the Constitution Drafting Committee. He also became the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court after the promulgation of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal. This constitution also provided provisions related to a parliamentary system, constitutional monarchy, multi-party system and independent judiciary in Nepal.

***The Second Parliamentary General Election***

Nepal held its second general parliamentary election in 1992. Nepali Congress won the majority in this election, although the administration formed by this parliament worked for barely 3 years. Nepal held its midterm general elections in 1995. No political party has a majority in the Nepali parliament. The number of seats obtained by political parties in the house of representatives in the second parliamentary general election is as follows:

**Table 2**  
*General Election Results, 1992*

S.N.	Name of the Parties	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	Nepali Congress	110	53.65
2	CPN UML	69	33.65
3	United People's Front	9	4.39
4	Nepal Sadbhavana Party	6	2.92
5	National Democratic Party	4	1.95
6	CPN (United)	2	0.97
7	Nepal Labor Peasant Party	2	0.97
8	Independent	3	1.46
	Total	205	100

Source: Election Commission Nepal 1992

***The Third Parliamentary Midterm General Election***

In the third general election of 1995, no political party had a majority in the parliament; hence, the largest party CPN-UML formed a minority government. During this period, there were minority governments, coalition governments, distorted forms of parliamentary practice and the parliamentarians who were bought and sold. The number of seats obtained by political parties in the House of Representatives in the third general election of 1995 is as follows:

**Table 3**  
*General Election Results, 1995*

S.N.	Name of the Parties	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	CPN UML	88	42.92
2	Nepali Congress	83	40.48
3	National Democratic Party	20	9.75
4	Nepal Labor Peasant Party	4	1.95



## Strengthening Multiparty Democracy in Nepal

5	Nepal Sadbhavana Party	3	1.46
6	Independent	7	3.41
	Total	205	100

Source: Election Commission Nepal 1995

### *The Fourth Parliamentary General Election*

In Nepal, the fourth general election of 2000 was completed. From this election, the Nepali Congress won the majority vote in the parliament for the third time, but due to the internal strife within the party, it could not govern for a long time. The then king Gyanendra, who became the king after the 2002 palace massacre, took the executive power into his hands and dissolved the parliament. The number of seats obtained by political parties in the House of Representatives in this election is as follows:

**Table 4**

*General Election Results, 2000*

S.N.	Name of the Parties	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	Nepali Congress	111	54.14
2	CPN UML	71	34.63
3	National Democratic Party	11	5.36
4	National People's Front	5	1.95
5	Nepal Sadbhavana Party	5	1.95
	Nepal Labor Party	1	0.48
6	United People's Front Nepal	1	0.48
	Total	205	100

Source: Election Commission Nepal 2000

### *The First and Second Constituent Assembly Elections*

The constituent assembly elections were held in Nepal as a result of the democratic people's movement of 2006. The first constituent assembly election was held in 2008 and the second constituent assembly in 2013. The second constituent assembly elections were held after the first constituent assembly failed to reach a consensus on some important issues. The second constituent assembly made and announced the Constitution of Nepal, 2015.

**Table 5**

*Results of First Constitutional Assembly Election*

S.N.	Name of the Parties	Direct	Proportional	Nominated Set	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	UCPN Maoist	120	100		220	36.60

**Strengthening Multiparty Democracy in Nepal**

2	Nepali Congress	37	73	110	18.30
3	CPN UML	33	70	130	21.63
4	Others Parties and Independent	50	92	142	23.46
5	Nominated set			26	4.32
	Total	240	335	26	601
					100

Source: Election Commission Nepal 2008.

**Table 6**

*Results of Second Constitutional Assembly*

S. N.	Name of the Parties	Nominated Set	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	Nepali Congress		207	34.42
2	CPN UML		181	30.11
3	UCPN Maoist		82	13.64
4	Others Parties and Independent		105	17.47
5	Nominated Set		26	4.32
	Total	26	601	100

Source: Election Commission Nepal 2013

In the post-earthquake period of 2015, the second constitutional assembly was successful in drafting a new constitution in the same year.

***The Fifth Parliamentary General Election***

The constitution of Nepal has provided for parliamentary governance in the form of governance (Constitution of Nepal, 2015). Accordingly, the first general election of the federal democratic republic and the fifth general election of the parliamentary system were held in 2017. In this general election, the left alliance won nearly two-thirds of the votes. The number of seats obtained by political parties in the house of representatives is as follows:

**Table 7**

*Results of General Election, 2017*

S.N.	Name of the Parties	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	CPN UML	121	44
2	Nepali Congress	63	22.90
3	CPN Maoist Centre	53	19.27

**Strengthening Multiparty Democracy in Nepal**

4	Rashtriya Janata Party Nepal	17	6.18
5	Federal Socialist Forum, Nepal	16	5.81
6	Others	5	1.81
	Total	275	100

*Source:* Election Commission Nepal 2017

KP Sharma Oli, the left alliance's and the CPN-UML's chairman, was elected to lead the parliamentary party. The CPN-UML and CPN-Maoist Centre combined together to form the NCP. Due to internal strife in his party, the then Prime Minister Oli disbanded the legislature in three years, declaring that his own party opposed the government and that he would resign as a result of a resolution of no confidence. In this party, a dispute occurred without any theoretical or ideological disagreement. The Supreme Court's ruling ultimately returned the case back to a deadlock, returning both parties to their initial positions.

***The Sixth Parliamentary General Election***

In 2022, the sixth parliamentary elections were held. These are the total seats won by political parties in the house of representatives under the direct and proportional representation system:

**Table 8**

*Results of General Election, 2022*

S.N.	Name of the Parties	Direct	Proportional	Seats Obtained	Percentage
1	Nepali Congress	56	32	88	32.00
2	CPN UML	44	34	78	28.36
3	CPN (Maoist Centre)	18	14	32	11.63
4	National Independent Party	8	14	21	7.63
5	Rashtriya Janata Party Nepal	7	7	14	5.09
6	Janata Samajwadi Party	7	5	12	4.33
7	CPN Samajwadi	10		10	3.63
	Others Parties and Independent	15	4	19	6.90
	Total	165	110	275	100

*Source:* Election Commission Nepal 2022

In the general election 2022, though 12 political parties and independent candidates got elected to the house of representatives. According to the results of the election, no political party could get a majority in the house of representatives. According to the results of the election, the Nepali Congress has won 88 seats as the

largest political party. The second largest political party CPN-UML has secured 78 seats, while the third largest political party, CPN-Maoist Centre has secured 32 seats. Similarly, the National Independent Party has secured 21 seats in the fourth place. Thus, only these four political parties have become the national political parties. In order to be a national political party, there is a constitutional provision that a national political party can be recognized only after obtaining at least 1 seat directly in the house of representatives and more than 10 percent of the votes cast as the proportional representation.

Currently, since there is no majority of any political party in the house of representatives, the leader of the third largest party Pushpa Kamal Dahal Prachanda has been appointed as the Prime Minister with the support of seven political parties, including the CPN-UML. He was elected with an overwhelming majority of 268 votes during the vote of confidence in 2022.

## **Discussion**

### ***Assessment of Nepal's Democratic Parliamentary System and Practice***

After practicing the parliamentary system at different times, till the end of the autocratic monarchy, seven political parties of the parliament and the CPN-Maoist Centre, which launched an armed rebellion, signed a 12-point memorandum of understanding in 2006. According to the agreement, the Joint People's Democratic Movement of 2006 was organized. The mandate of the movement for the constitutional and institutional development of the federal democratic republic was completed. The second constituent assembly announced the constitution of Nepal in 2015. Nepal was established as a united democratic republic. The general election was completed in 2017. In the election, the left alliance won nearly two-thirds of the public vote. The unprecedented rise of the leftists in Nepal made the capitalists nervous. As a result, the public opinion was disintegrated, fragmented and divided within three years. Now, the questions have started to arise that the parliamentary practice was not successful in Nepal. Has the parliamentary system failed in Nepal? During this period, the parliament was dissolved twice. The Supreme Court directed the President of Nepal to appoint Sher Bahadur Deuba, the leader of the alliance and the parliamentary leader of the Nepali Congress, as the Prime Minister. It is argued that the parliamentary system failed in Nepal and it is necessary to look for a system where the executive directly elected the prime minister.

The leaders of political parties have succeeded in leading the people's movement and bringing the movement to a success. However, they failed to institutionalize the achievements of the democratic people's movement. In this way, the intellectuals of various fields are of the opinion that the democratic republic has not been institutionalized in Nepal.

### ***The Positive Aspects of Parliamentary System***

The prime minister is the de facto executive prime minister. Similarly, the prime minister plays collective responsibility to the people as well as dual membership. The prime ministers should balance the relationship between the executive and legislature. The government is accountable to the people as a democratic practice and respect for the public opinion. Maintaining party discipline and ideological freedom is the positive role of the prime minister in the parliamentary system.

The beauty of democracy is to agree, cooperate and coordinate with controversy, favor, opposition, argument, debate, agreement, disagreement, criticism, self-criticism and criticism. In addition, it is also to promote the adoption of public policy-making on

issues of public importance and the development of positive thinking. The practice of these common things in the parliamentary system as well as the whip of the parliamentary party cannot be denied. If they refuse, the parliamentary party can take various actions. In this practice, a tradition has also been developed that steps can be taken to expel the members from the party. However, if this kind of discipline is not enforced, a state of chaos may be created in the parliament. Therefore, this tradition has been developed in the parliamentary practice for the welfare of the people and the country by periodically accepting the public opinion given by the people. The parliamentary system is not bad in itself. Democracy and parliamentary values, and values of recognition were violated by political parties. In Nepal and many other countries such as Pakistan, no government could run for five years and was not allowed to run. The role of the ruling party and the opposition could not be responsible to the people and nation.

### ***Negative Aspects of Nepal's Parliamentary System***

The findings of the study showed that the parliamentary system is an unstable government and it is a costly arrangement for the nation. In the past, honest party leaders and workers were not given chance to the leading role. The parliamentary government lacked continuity in planning and implementing things. It was an autocracy of the council of ministers and acted contrary to the principle of separation of powers and the parliamentary system favored the capitalist system in general.

The parliamentary system itself is a link to the democratic practice. Now, instead of institutionalizing democratic values and norms in Nepal, there has been an act of destruction. The intervention of national and international capitalist powers was prevalent because the left-wing ideas gained public opinion in Nepal's parliamentary system. In Nepal, the leftist power emerged through the elections. In this way, it was seen that the third communist regime in Asia has taken the reins of the election.

### ***Lack of Visionary Leaders in Nepal***

BP Koirala provided a democratic socialism and Puspala interpreted of Marxist ideology as new people democracy through the united democratic movement. Madan Bhandari, the CPN-UML's secretary at the time, provided a fresh interpretation of Marxism and advanced the multi-party democratic principle. He argued that the people can ultimately decide what is in their best interests based on future competition. He was a multi-talented leader. Leaders strove to institutionalize his views and beliefs, notably Manmohan Adhikari. Similar to this, Krishna Prasad Bhattarai made an effort to uphold the democratic values that were prevalent at the time.

After the restoration of democracy in 1990, 29 governments have been formed in Nepal. There were 14 prime ministers in Nepal, who have used their executive power to the overall development of the nation. Krishna Prasad Bhattarai, Girija Prasad Koirala, Sher Bahadur Deuba and Sushil Koirala are the leaders of the Nepali Congress. Baburam Bhattarai governed twice for one year, Girija Prasad Koirala ruled five times for eight years and 10 days, Sher Bahadur Deuba ruled for five years and 193 days, and Sushil Koirala governed for one year and 243 days. Altogether, they ruled for a total of 17 years and 134 days. Manmohan Adhikari, Madhav Nepal, Jhala Nath Khanal and KP Oli Sharma are the four leaders of the CPN-UML. The leader of the CPN-UML Adhikari ruled for 286 days, Nepal for 257 days, Khanal for 204 days and Oli for four years and 34 days. These leaders were in power for a total of seven years and 126 days. But now Madhav Nepal and Jhala Nath Khanal are separated from the CPN UML and made a new party CPN (Socialist). The CPN-Maoist Centre was led by Puspa Kamal Dahal and

Baburam Bhattarai. Dahal ruled Nepal for three years and 114 days, which is three times as long as Bhattarai's one year and 197 days' reign. There were 29 changes to the administration despite the late King Gyanendra reigning twice, Surya Badhadur Thapa reigning twice, Lokendra Bahadur Chand reigning twice and Khilaraj Regmi reigning once. In Nepal, these authorities have not been in charge for the past five years. As a result, the failure of these Nepali governments has contributed to the breakdown of the country's parliamentary system. Political stability is necessary for the development of the economy, society and culture. The findings of the study show that the parliamentary system does not fit in the Nepali context.

The political party leaders lacked vision, mission and goals in general. After the 1990 movement for democracy, the council of ministers was established for 29 times. The institutional growth was lacking in the federal democratic republic's values and acceptance. It has not been possible to create a democratic system that the general public can experience. Democracy has evolved into a tool for the vested interests of the political elite. The leaders of the political parties in Nepal frequently lack vision and commitment. This discussion explains why Nepal lacks competent politicians.

## **CONCLUSION**

Since the democratic revolution of 1951, Nepal has adopted a parliamentary system. There have been two elections for the constituent assembly and six general elections under the parliamentary system. Out of these, the coalition governments and minority governments were formed to produce two majority governments and two governments with majorities of more than two-thirds. Since 1990, there have been 29 different prime ministers. Nepal's parliamentary system has come under fire because these governments have been unable to function efficiently on the basis of parliamentary norms, values and recognition. It seems as though the general public is about to form a negative opinion of politics. Even the state's constitutional organs were unable to be institutionalized. The parliamentary system has long been one of the most often-used systems in existence in the world. In Nepal, this system is a failure. In fact, the parliamentary democracy has failed to surmount the obstacles of nepotism, favoritism and sycophancy in Nepal; as a result, the parliamentary democracy is failing in Nepal. No system of government has ever given members of all political parties an equal opportunity, which has resulted in a widespread dissatisfaction among both honest political figures and ordinary people. Greed of the political elite and poor public administration has placed the entire Nepali political system in a precarious position with regard to the federal democratic parliamentary system. It appears that the basis of all evils is not the political leadership or the political system itself, but rather the lack of democratic parliamentary rules. In reality, our political leaders are the "dirty players" because they are not under the parliamentary democratic system.

The political leaders in Nepal must refrain from nepotism, favoritism, groupies and other forms of corruption as a remedy if the country is to have a successful parliamentary system. For the sake of the common interests and the welfare of the country and the people, the system will not fail if individual interests and the arbitrary nature of the leadership can be discouraged. Due to the partisan agendas of the political parties and the haughtiness of the leadership, Nepal's parliamentary system is in jeopardy. The intelligentsia and the general population have poor opinions of the parliamentary system. This system does not appear appropriate given Nepal's current situation, it seems. As a result, we are currently in a position where we need to identify alternative options in order to move forward.

**REFERENCES**

- Acharya, K. K. (2018). Local governance restructuring in Nepal: From government to governmentality. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 12, 37-49.
- Auel, K., & Benz, A. (2005). The politics of adaptation: The Europeanisation of national parliamentary systems. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 11(3-4), 372-393.
- Babu, V. (2013). The role of the parliament as the supreme representative body. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, (2), 284-287.
- Carpenter, D., & Prior, D. (2015). *Magna Carta Parliament*. Houses of Parliament, Parliamentary Archives, London.
- Dahal, G. (2020). Democratic practice and good governance in Nepal. In *Building Sustainable Communities* (pp. 151-169). Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore.
- Diamond, L. J. (1990). Three paradoxes of democracy. *Journal of democracy*, 1(3), 48-60.
- Election Commission Report. (1992). Election Commission Nepal.
- Election Commission Report. (1995). Election Commission Nepal.
- Election Commission Report. (2000). Election Commission Nepal.
- Election Commission Report. (2017). Election Commission Nepal.
- Elgie, R. (2005). From Linz to Tsebelis: Three waves of presidential/parliamentary studies? *Democratization*, 12(1), 106-122.
- Gaige, F., & Scholz, J. (1991). The 1991 parliamentary elections in Nepal: political freedom and stability. *Asian Survey*, 31(11), 1040-1060.
- Gaige, F., & Scholz, J. (1991). The 1991 parliamentary elections in Nepal: political freedom and stability. *Asian Survey*, 31(11), 1040-1060.
- Gerring, J., Thacker, S. C., & Moreno, C. (2009). Are parliamentary systems better? *Comparative political studies*, 42(3), 327-359.
- Hachhethu, K. (2000). Nepali politics: Political parties, political crisis and problems of governance. *Domestic Conflict and Crisis of Governability in Nepal*. Kathmandu: CNAS (Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies), 1-19.
- Hachhethu, K. (2007). Legitimacy crisis of Nepali monarchy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1828-1833.
- Huda, K. (2005). The state of parliamentary democracy: Worldwide reflections. *Journal on Asian Affairs*, 27(1), 5-23.
- Ilie, C. (2015). Parliamentary discourse. *The International Encyclopedia of language and social interaction*, 1-15.
- Ilie, C. (2017). Parliamentary debates. In *The Routledge handbook of language and politics* (pp. 309-325). Routledge.
- Judge, D. (2004). Whatever happened to parliamentary democracy in the United Kingdom? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 57(3), 682-701.
- Kafle, D. R. (2022). The historical development of settlement by Aryan people in Terai of Nepal. *Historical Journal*, 13(1), 1-7.
- Kurbanovna, B. A. (2020). Trends in parliamentary effectiveness in ensuring the development of society. *Восточно-европейский научный журнал*, (5-5 (57)), 33-36.
- Linz, J. J. (1990). Presidents vs. parliaments: The virtues of parliamentarism. *Journal of Democracy*, 1(4), 84-91.
- Maeda, K., & Nishikawa, M. (2006). Duration of party control in parliamentary and presidential governments: A study of 65 democracies, 1950 to 1998. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(3), 352-374.
- Moe, T. M., & Caldwell, M. (1994). The institutional foundations of democratic government: A comparison of presidential and parliamentary systems. *Journal of*

- Institutional and Theoretical Economics (JITE)/Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, 150(1), 171-195.
- Nepal, R. M. (2020). Leaderships in the global south: On BP Koirala's economic thinking. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management*, 7(1), 21-29.
- Oxford Analytica. Judiciary will be key to easing Nepal political crisis. *Emerald Expert Briefings*, (oxan-es).
- Paudel, M. N. (2016). Prospects and limitations of agriculture industrialization in Nepal. *Agronomy Journal of Nepal*, 4, 38-63.
- Reinsch, P. S. (1909). Parliamentary government in Chile. *American Political Science Review*, 3(4), 507-538.
- Russell, C. (1976). Parliamentary history in perspective, 1604–1629. *History*, 61(201), 1-27.
- Sharan, R.K. (n.d.). *Mithila Mahatmya*. Shree Janaki Pustak Bhandar.
- Shrestha, T.N. (2005). Administration of Nepal: Historical context. Ratnapustak Bhandar.
- Straw, H. M. (2017). 'Everybody's king': Charles II and the representation of restoration rule in England, 1660-1679 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kent (United Kingdom)).
- Strom, K. (2000). Delegation and accountability in parliamentary democracies. *European journal of political research*, 37(3), 261-290.
- Tan, K. P. (2013). The Singapore parliament: Representation, effectiveness, and control. In *Parliaments in Asia* (pp. 47-66). Routledge.
- Temesgen, S. A. (2021). Critical analysis on the comparative advantage of presidentialism over parliamentary system on liberty and national unity in Ethiopia. *The African Review*, 48(2), 528-544.
- Tepavac, T. (2021). The parliament of Serbia. *Undermining Democracy. Processes and Institutions in Serbia 2010-2020*, 81-108.
- Thakur, H. (1997). *Yo Janakpur ho*. Mazdoor Pustak Bhavan.
- Thakur, U. (1956). *History of Mithila*. Mithila Institute.
- The Constitution of Nepal. (2015). Government of Nepal, Ministry of Law and Justice, Law and Book System Committee.
- The Constitution of Nepal. (2019). Government of Nepal, Ministry of Law and Justice, Law and Book System Committee.
- The Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal. (1990). Government of Nepal, Ministry of Law and Justice, Law and Book System Committee.
- The Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal. (2015). Government of Nepal, Ministry of Law and Justice, Law Book System Committee.
- Whelpton, J. (2005). *A history of Nepal*. Cambridge University Press.

**To cite this article [APA style, 7<sup>th</sup> edition]:**

Dahal, G. (2023). Strengthening multiparty democracy in Nepal: An assessment of parliamentary elections since 1951. *Prithvi Academic Journal*, 6, 104-119.

<https://doi.org/10.3126/paj.v6i1.54664>