

# **JOURNAL OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

PEER REVIEWED, INDEXED & REFEREED QUARTERLY INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

ISSN 0972-8309

<https://www.jndmeerut.org>

[Vol. 37, No. 1 (Summer), 2024]

<https://doi.org/10.62047/JND.2024.06.30.66>

## **The Dynamics of Nepal's Democratic Transition : A Sociological Analysis**

***Keshab Raj Silwal***

Assistant Professor, Central Department of Sociology, Tribhuvan University,  
Kathmandu (Nepal) E-mail:<keshavsilwal@gmail.com>

### **Abstract**

*This article investigates the dynamics of democratic transition in Nepal from sociological lens. It analyzes sociologically the causes, process and social impacts of political transition in Nepal. Nepal has not long history of democracy, rather it becomes only just more than half century. Nepal has witnessed three democratic movement in 1951, 1990 and 2006. The income, education, civil society, crisis and turbulence, inequality, political institutions, industrialization, urbanization, structure of the economy, capitalism, the nature and extent of globalization are the leading factors of democracy. The awakening and demise of pre-capitalist including feudal, political, economic and cultural forms at multiple levels of social organization, and the expansion and intensification of capitalism lead Nepal to the path of democracy. Another important factor for establishment of democracy in Nepal is increased population of middle class. However, democratic system continues to fail to benefit the overwhelming majority of the population in Nepal due to the absence of a real socioeconomic democracy. Many governments were formed, but they have faced three sequential challenges: foundational challenge, challenge of expansion, and deepening democracy.*

### **Keywords**

Democracy, Democratization, Oligarchic regime, Monarchy, Globalization.

**Centre For Studies of National Development, Meerut**

Editorial Office : D-59, Shastri Nagar, Meerut - 250 004 (INDIA)

Ph. : 0121-2763765, +91-9997771669, +91-9412200765

# 6

## **The Dynamics of Nepal's Democratic Transition : A Sociological Analysis**

### **1. Introduction**

Democratic transition has remained at the core of intellectual and political inquiries in Nepal during one and half decades. However, it is not analyzed sociologically. As sociologist, I am interested in studying these democratic changes in Nepal relating it to sociological theories. Thus, this article has analyzed sociologically the causes, process and social impacts of democratic transition in Nepal. This paper deals with history and factors of democracy from ancient era to the globalized world. It includes the factors of democracy assessed by Mahony (2003), Acemoglu and Robinson (2006). When the military force and the landed elites are weakened, these give the rise to the democracy. The bourgeoisie or the middle class is the main agent behind the democratization. Intergroup inequality, political institutions, structure of economy, and nature and extension of globalization are the factors of democracy. Huntington (2010) has summarized the history of democracy in three waves. These factors of democracy are relevant to the establishment of democracy in Nepal. This paper includes the assessment of Chaitanya Mishra who links spread of capitalism with democracy in Nepal.

The democratic system in developing countries faces various challenges: foundational challenge, challenge of expansion and deepening democracy. These challenges are relevant to the democracy of Nepal. Nepal has short history of democracy as it has long oligarchic regime of kingship and Ranas. There was struggle between for and against the democracy in Nepal during Panchayat system and armed struggle of Maoist. During Panchayat system and civil war, the situation of human rights is worse. This paper uses qualitative explanatory methods and secondary data sources to assess the democratic transition in Nepal.

### **2. Theoretical and Historical Review of Democracy**

Democracy is a global phenomenon on every one's lips. It is more than just political freedom and includes the concepts of social justice

and equity. Democracy provides an environment for the protection and effective realization of human rights. Yet Democracy has long and dynamic history. The base of direct democracy of Athens has extended to new dimensions in the globalized world and technocratic capitalism. The representative democracy has brought various contradictions and debates in people's participation in the state mechanism. In 431 BCE, Athens' citizens held a general assembly to debate their response to Sparta's challenge (Tilly, 2007). Charles Tilly has further mentioned that between 300 BCE and the 19<sup>th</sup> century CE, a number of European regimes adopted variants on the Greek model : privileged minorities of relatively equal citizens dominated their states at the expense of excluded. The development of democracy in Athens has formed a central source of inspiration for modern political thought (Held, 1996). The political ideals such as equity among citizens, liberty, respect for the law and justice have influenced political thinking of the west. The great Greek thinkers- Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle examined democratic ideas, culture and practices of Athens making way for modern definition of democracy. In the Medieval Europe, Locke, Montesquieu and Madison further developed the new concept on democracy and developed the representative election and three major political structures of democracy - Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. Hobbes had created the concept of cruel state highly undemocratic for maintaining peace and order. Bentham, James Mill and John Stuart Mill had extended the new rights for the liberal democracy in the modern period of advanced, urbanized, industrialized, technological, capitalist, progressively more secular society.

Social structure contains various factors leading to democratic system. Regarding the factors those responsible for the rise of democracy, James Mahoney has assessed the claims made by three major schools of thought: the Barrington Moore School, Guillermo O'Donnell School, and the Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan (Linz-Stepan) School. Since the School of Donnell rests heavily on identifying factors contributing the rise of bureaucratic- authoritarian regime in South American countries, he limits his focus on assessing the School of Moore, and Linz-Stepan. Moore's School has identified internal class relationship within a state a major factor for establishing democracy. Considering bourgeoisie class the more decisive among others it claims with whom the bourgeoisie makes alliance decides the nature of the regime. If it allies with labour-repressive lord, the regime turns

to be autocratic, and if it allies with the working class then the regime turns to be democratic. James Mahoney has stated :

“The bourgeoisie or the middle class is main agents behind democratization. Democratization is fundamentally an urban process in which rural classes have little role to play. The working class has played a major role in pushing forward democracy, especially in the historical transitions of Northern Europe and the contemporary transitions of Southern Europe, Latin America, and Africa. Working-class strength is positively associated with democracy” (Mahoney, 2003).

Mahoney rejects the notion of Moore's school that 'a strong bourgeoisie that avoids an anti-peasant alliance with a labour-repressive landed elite facilitates democracy' and 'an anti-peasant alliance that unites a labour-repressive landed elite with a politically subordinate bourgeoisie facilitates authoritarianism' citing examples of many countries of the Europe and America including France, England, Sweden, Japan, Germany, Argentina, etc. Mahoney does not agree that the mere alliance of bourgeoisie and proletariat contributed to the emergence of democracy in France; rather it was the weakening state of the landed elites that contributed bourgeoisie to “fulfill the historic role of establishing parliamentary democracy”. Similarly, the displacement of labour-repressive landlords in Germany and Japan was not because of a bourgeois revolution but due to the peasant groups' inability to lead successfully the revolution. So far as Japan's case is concerned, “landlords played the relatively passive role of allowing powerful bureaucratic and military elites to seize state power and initiate industrial expansion that ultimately benefitted the modern bourgeoisie”.

Mahoney has construed Linz-Stepan School of thought as voluntarist metatheory for considering agency the most decisive factor for the regime transition. The leadership, the political institution, voluntarism, contingent political scenario, etc are declared the most decisive factors. For them, “those actors have certain choices that can increase or decrease the probability of the persistence and stability of a regime...leadership...can be decisive and cannot be predicted by any model”. But Mahoney does not consider agent always sufficient for democratizing (Mahoney, 2003). The better, for him, would be to build a bridge between the voluntarist and agent-based emphases with the structural components arguing “the historical and structural factors such as

economic development, changes in the global economy, and the spread of international norms, and the ‘causers’ of democracy, which correspond to the regime actors and opposition factions who make key choices during transition periods that produce democratic regimes”. This way, for Mahoney, the accumulation of components, which are the very products of a national and international structure, decides the type of regime.

Mahoney finally argues on the multiple factors like the “spread of knowledge about democratic institutions, norms supportive of democracy, and actors and institutions in society” responsible for the rise or demise of a democratic state. He does not mention that the path to democracy in terms of class relation follows homogenously to all societies. Nor he considers class relationship as less significant factor for the transition to democracy.

Acemoglu and Robinson have extended their assessment of democracy identifying various factors leading a democratic transition, which are the income, education, civil society, crisis and turbulence, inequality, political institutions, industrialization, urbanization, structure of the economy, capitalism, the nature and extent of globalization, etc. (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2006). For them, inter-group inequality is the major contributing factor. They admit that “inter-group inequality should have an effect on the equilibrium of political institutions and thus on the likelihood that a society ends up as a democracy”. When inequality is minimal, revolution could never be a threat and even if it is, the ruling elite can prevent revolution by several promises of redistribution packages. It is only in case of higher level of inequality does democratization become a necessity. Concomitantly, a decrease in inequality makes a highly unequal society more likely to democratize. However, this does not mean that falling inequality necessarily induces democratization.

*“In another highly unequal nondemocratic society, we might see inequality fall but democratization does not occur because something else changes as well (e.g., the extent of globalization changes) that decreases the appeal of democratization”.*

**—Acemoglu and Robinson, 2006**

Transition to democracy, for Acemoglu and Robinson, is more likely to occur amid economic and political crisis. During this time the political movements are more likely to be launched by the opposition parties. The growing disappointment of the public to the regime

resulted by the crisis inspires the opposition for extending their movement. Acemoglu and Robinson have argued of democratic transition in many Latin American countries in the context of severe economic difficulties. They have identified many transitions to democracy during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries throughout the world where social unrest and turbulence were rampant. Even during the crisis, the incumbent regime could hardly allocate its resources to suppress the uprising. Hence, regime transitions are more likely to occur during times of crisis or turbulence. The middle class since it deserves “more comfortable economic situation and the greater education of its members - can be a critical catalyst in the process toward democracy” as well.

The development of capitalism is another factor of democracy. Many scholars have credited capitalism for increasing the power of the poor thereby challenging the non-democratic regime. This has partial truth but the capitalist development does not always lead a country towards democracy. It is not the capitalist development that constitutes of every positive as Acemoglu and Robinson states, but it is, “both the strength of the citizens and the trade-off of the elite between repression and concession that determines the fate of democracy”. They further argue that the agrarian economy hardly enables citizens to organize as their living is highly scattered. It is an increased urbanization and industrial employment, the tangible outcomes of capitalist expansion, which enables them to organize thereby collectively voicing for democracy.

Today a strong economic tie with other nations throughout the globe has tied every nation. European Union, International Monetary Fund, etc are some global economic organizations, which affect significantly for the change in political regime across the world. From these organizations, the elite can invest their capital out of their own country. As the elite invest their capital, the global economic organizations have to protect the capital by institutionalizing democratic regimes. Likewise, the global trade system denies the disruption of economic activity as it is costly for developed nations and more costly for many less developed nations that have just entered into the world economy. Similarly, Acemoglu and Robinson (2006) believe that the “increased political integration and the end of the Cold War (if not hijacked by the war against terrorism) might imply that countries that repress their citizens can perhaps expect stronger sanctions and reactions from the democratic world”. All these signify

that globalization contribute to the transition to democracy. Acemoglu and Robinson have found positive correlation of income, education, social unrest, economic depression, street fighting, capitalism, etc with democracy.

Samual P. Huntington (2010) has analyzed history and factors of democracy mentioning three waves of democracy. The first wave was before the First World War in which he emphasized modernization, urbanization, creation of middle class, and decreasing inequality. The end of Second World War started the second wave of democracy with the collapse of empires. For the third wave of democracy, Huntington has assessed five factors : 1) a crisis of authoritarian legitimacy created by economic recession induced by the oil shocks of the 1970s and the international debt crisis of the 1980s; 2) the income growth and increase in education experienced in the 1960s; 3) the change in the attitude of the Catholic church; 4) the changes in the attitudes of international institutions, the United States, and the Soviet Union; and 5) the 'snowballing' or demonstration effects that led to contagion and the international dissemination of democracy.

### **3. Democratic Transition in Nepal**

Nepal had a long history of monarchical domination and Nepal's democracy is in its embryonic stage, which faces several challenges from various fronts. The Gorkha rulers referred to their territorial domain in terms of a Persian loanword meaning possessions 'Muluk' as the entire possessions of the King of Gorkha (Burghart, 1984). By coding M. C. Chandra, Burghart has discussed that in the administration of his possessions the king saw himself as a landlord who classified exhaustively and exclusively his tracts of land according to tenurial categories and then assigned, bestowed, licensed, or auctioned the rights and duties over these tracts of land to his subjects. The customary law of Nepal was depending on the Brahmanical codes that followed the customs of religion. Having listened to the counsel of his gurus and priests, the king of Gorkha or his agents made various judicial decisions concerning the social order within the realm.

Ranas held state power from King following tyrannical, dictatorship and autocratic. All powers of rule in Nepal were vested in the Chief Ministership, the office of which passed by collateral succession within the Rana family up to the first half of the twentieth

century They could kill people who they did not like. They later promulgated Muluki Ain of 1854 had divided people into five categories : (1) wearer of the Sacred Thread, (2) Non-enslaveable Alcohol Drinkers, (3) Enslaveable Alcohol drinkers, (4) Touchable species from whom Wearers of the Sacred Thread could not accept water, and (5) Untouchable species from whom Wearers of the Sacred Thread could not accept water. That created discrimination among people and was highly undemocratic.

In the winter of 1950-1951, an alienated faction of the Rana family, the members of the outlawed Nepali Congress Party, and King Tribhuwan combined forces to overthrow the 105-years-old Rana regimes as well as the proprietary form of government (Burghart, 1984). The first democratic election was held on 1960 B.S., but could not sustain for long time. The Panchayat System replaced the parliamentary system and the sovereignty vested in King Mahendra in 1962. The king became supreme commander of army. In the name of nation-building, King Mahendra started new way of homogenization by making compulsory national language in government office, new Muluki Ain, new national emblems.

Until 1990, Nepal was an absolute monarchy running under the executive control of the king. Faced with a people's movement against the absolute monarchy, King Birendra, in 1990, agreed to large-scale political reforms by creating a parliamentary monarchy with the king as the head of state and a prime minister as the head of the government. Nepal's legislature was bicameral consisting of a House of Representatives and a National Council. The House of Representatives consisted of 205 members directly elected by the people. The executive comprised the King and the Council of Ministers (the Cabinet). The leader of the coalition or party securing the maximum seats in an election was appointed as the Prime Minister. The Cabinet was appointed by the king on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

Governments in Nepal have tended to be highly unstable; no government has survived for more than two years since 1991, either through internal collapse or through parliamentary dissolution by the monarch. In the first free and fair elections in Nepal in 1991, the Nepali Congress was victorious. The 1994 election defeat of the Nepali Congress Party by the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist-Leninist) (CPN(UML)) made Nepal the first communist-led monarchy in Asia, with Man Mohan Adhikary Prime Minister. In



mid-1994, parliament was dissolved due to dissension within the Nepali Congress Party. The subsequent general election, held 15 November 1994, gave no party a majority and led to several years of unstable coalition governments. As of the May 1999 general elections, the Nepali Congress Party once again headed a majority government. There have been three Nepali Congress Party Prime Ministers since the 1999 elections: K.P. Bhattarai (31 May 1999-17 March 2000); Girija Prasad Koirala (20 March 2000-19 July 2001); and Sher Bahadur Deuba (23 July 2001 - 2003).

In February 1996, the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) began a violent insurgency in more than 50 of the country's 75 districts. About 13,000 police, civilians, and insurgents have been killed in the conflict since 1996. The government and Maoists held talks in August and September 2001. On June 1, 2001, King, Queen, Crown Prince and Royal family were killed in royal massacre, and the late King's surviving brother Gyanendra was proclaimed king.

King Gyanendra suspended the Parliament, appointed a government led by himself, and enforced martial law in 2005. The King argued that civil politicians were unfit to handle the Maoist insurgency. Telephone lines were cut and several high-profile political leaders were detained. Other opposition leaders fled to India and regrouped there. A broad coalition called the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) was formed in opposition to the royal takeover, encompassing the seven parliamentary parties who held about 90% of the seats in the old, dissolved parliament.

On 22 November 2005, the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) of parliamentary parties and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) agreed on a historic and unprecedented 12-point memorandum of understanding (MOU) for peace and democracy. Nepalese from various walks of life and the international community regarded the MOU as an appropriate political response to the crisis that was developing in Nepal. Against the backdrop of the historical sufferings of the Nepalese people and the enormous human cost of the last ten years of violent conflict, the MOU, which proposes a peaceful transition through an elected constituent assembly, created an acceptable formula for a united movement for democracy. As per the 12-point MOU, the SPA called for a protest movement, and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) supported it. This led to a countrywide uprising called the Loktantric Andolan that started in April 2006. All political forces including civil society and professional

organizations actively galvanized the people. This resulted in massive and spontaneous demonstrations and rallies held across Nepal against King Gyanendra's autocratic rule. Twenty-one people died and thousands were injured during the 19 days of protests.

Finally, King Gyanendra announced the reinstatement the House of Representatives, thereby conceding one of the major demands of the SPA, on 24 April 2006. The activities of the King became subject to parliamentary scrutiny and the King's properties were subjected to taxation. Moreover, Nepal was declared a secular state abrogating the previous status of a Hindu Kingdom. On 23 December 2007, an agreement was made for the monarchy to be abolished and the country to become a federal republic with the Prime Minister becoming head of state. Nepal became secular, federal and republic. The election of Constitutional assembly was held in the April 2008 and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) became the largest party. But the constitutional assembly was dissolved in 2011 without promulgating new constitution due to the several social issue, one is the issue of federalism. Political parties did not agree on the mode of federal system whether it should be on the basis of ethnicity or on the mixed identity. Second election of new constitution assembly was held in 19 November 2013. The promulgation of new constitution took ten years in 2015 which deteriorated freedom and human rights. Local bodies are vital to all democracies and their continuous as these are institution at its roots. Elected local councils were dissolved in July 2002 by the Sher Bahadur Deuba government and the local election was not conducted for long time and local bodies remained without elected representatives. Two general elections along with local election have been held after promulgation of new constitution in 2017 and 2022. Yet, no single party got majority and there is still political bargaining among the parties and people do not feel the full democracy and good governance. Thus, the democracy in Nepal is not stable and people feel absence of democratic rights. The major flaw in Nepal's democracy emerged in 2020 when the elected government encroached upon the constitution. However, the Supreme Court overturned the government's actions against the dissolution of the elected House of Representatives. In reality, Nepal functions more as a party-cracy than a true democracy.

Nepal has short history of democracy as it has long oligarchic regime of kingship and Ranas. There was struggle between for and against the democracy in Nepal during Panchayat system and armed

struggle of Maoist. Politics has manipulated the democracy and people feel the absence of freedom, human rights and democratic rights for long time. The Nepalese society is divided into various groups demanding rights for women, deprived and excluded groups such as dalits and ethnic, and regional autonomy. Nepal is in the transition of democracy and the state of fragility. The real sense of democracy is absence in Nepal and people are still demanding rights that are more democratic.

#### **4. Assessment of Democracy in Nepal**

Nepalese youths had increased contact with outside world for study during 1950s and inspired by the independence movement of India. They learnt how democratic system protects freedom and human rights. They established Nepali Congress and started armed struggle against the Rana regime to establish democratic system in Nepal. However, the powerful King and the increased percentage of illiterate population resisted for the stability of democracy system. King Mahendra took benefits from the cold war and established Panchayat System, the direct rule of King. He banned political parties for conducting political activities. However, the political parties were active against the Panchayat System under the ground for establishing democracy and after 30 years, Panchayat system was ended with first people's movement of 1990. There were various factors those supported the re-establishment of democracy in Nepal.

Prominent Sociologist of Nepal Dr. Chaitanya Mishra has assessed the political transition of Nepal. Political and journalistic writings on Nepal have invariably attributed the success of the popular movement and political transition to the Seven Party Alliance, the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) and civil society groups across the country (Mishra, 2007). Some have also attributed it to the activism of the poor, women, lower caste groups, particular religion groups, etc. Some others have attributed it to the organized resistance against the state put up by ethnic groups. Some others have attributed it simply to an overwhelming 'desire for peace and stability' among citizens following 12 years incessant and numbing fear and searing violence. Except these prevalent concepts, Mishra has given major four constitutive themes of multi-level historical-structural processes: first the awakening and demise of precapitalist including feudal, political, economic and cultural forms at multiple levels of social organization, second the expansion and

intensification of capitalism, third democratization based on successively enlarged, intensified and relatively successful popular movements, and fourth individualization, capability enhancement and empowerment. These four constitutive themes had crystallized the recent royal coup, popular resistance and the consequent collaboration among seven parties' alliance, Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) and civil society. The CPNM made a fundamental break with its past in 2003 when it declared that its immediate political program would be geared not toward a New Democratic state, but toward the 'completion of bourgeois democratic revolution'. Chaitanya Mishra has discussed :

“There were two CPNMs. The first CPNM lived between 1994 to 2002 when it upheld the program of New Democracy and the strategy of 'People's War'. The second CPNM was born in 2003 when it began to seriously question the program of the historical appropriateness of the program New Democracy and instead, gradually, convinced itself of the validity of a program of bourgeois capitalist transition not only for the present day Nepal, but also for other similarly placed peoples and countries for building a people-based democratic program suited to the 21st century” (Mishra, 2007).

According to Chaitanya Mishra, Nepal's economy acquired a decidedly capitalist tendency as early as the mid-1880s. It was much closure in 1950s, and expanded and intensified since 1980s. The Birta, Guthi and Kamaliya system were abolished which were the symbols of the feudal system. So, Nepal is not semi-feudal and semi-capitalist as the left parties has stated, rather it is capitalist country which enforces Nepal to be more democratic than socialist. Civil societies, which were itself a product of the rise of capitalism and previous democratic struggles, were the key actor of political transition of Nepal. These classes are highly educated and acquainted with globalization and always showed the negative reaction to the activities of Maoist. The large mass of civil societies scattered across the country and beyond gave excessive pressure to transform Nepalese Maoist and to establish democracy. Mishra has given more emphasis to the internal social structures, so the analysis of Mishra has lacked pressure of international structure. As Samuel P. Huntington (1991), the 'snowball rolling' role of globalization is also important factor to establish democracy in Nepal.

Another important factor for establishment of democracy in Nepal is increased population of middle class. During Panchayat system and after 1990, new middle class were increased and resided in sub-urban area with their new culture that is sub-urban culture (Liechty, 2008). They are mixed group from different places and races, and they are together because of their class. Nepalese people are attracted to foreign jobs, foreign study, foreign language and foreign dress. Thousands of people are leaving the country to work and study in foreign. Nepalese people get money from aid, remittances and tourism. The money is flowing in the market of Kathmandu even Nepal is the poorest country of the world. The middle class are educated and acquainted with the outside world. The first people's movement of 1990 and the combined effort of seven parties' alliances and Maoist of 2006, Nepal entered into democratic system with new era of republic and secular country.

The social and economic structure is supportive for the democracy in Nepal. However, the democracy is not stable in Nepal. Nepal's democracy index score is 4.60, according to the Economic Intelligence Unit (2024). This classification indicates that Nepal is not considered fully democratic but rather a hybrid regime. Essential democratic qualities such as independent suffrage, participation in decision-making, equality, human rights, inclusion, and equitable redistribution are under threat. Control over participation and suffrage is predominantly held by the elites or higher classes. Consequently, the regime falls somewhere between authoritarian and democratic. In the first constituent assembly of 2008, women held approximately 12.5% of the seats (30 seats). However, by the general election of 2022, this representation had decreased to 4.25% (7 seats). Although the new constitution includes quotas for women and Dalits at the local level, they still occupy fewer administrative positions, indicating that patriarchy remains deeply entrenched. The human rights situation has become gloomier. Women have less literacy rate and less access to health services. Nepalese women find themselves susceptible to both public and domestic violence, which constitutes rape, sexual abuse in the work place and at home, and human trafficking. During civil war, the human right condition was the worst and the condition is still worse due to various armed groups are active in Terai and other part of the country. Thus, the democracy and human rights in Nepal is in fragile condition.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Democracy needs particular social structures that lead the state to be democratic. The major factors of democracy are intergroup inequality, political institutions, rise of middle class, weakened military force, structure of economy, and nature and extension of globalization are the factors of democracy. In the ancient Athens, citizens had leisure time to involve in the activities of state and took part in the direct democracy. Slaves, old men, children and aliens were excluded in the ancient democracy, but new social movements have added new rights in the democracy such as women rights, child rights, employment rights, aboriginal rights, labour rights etc. Freedom, democracy and human rights have intense relationship. As the capitalism developed in the sixteen century, more rights were added in the democracy such as property rights.

Democracy in developing countries has similar situation in some context having similar social and economic structure. The military intervention is the common problem of these countries. The so-called largest democratic country is also facing many problems in the stability of democracy. Nepal has short history of democracy as it has long oligarchic regime of kingship and Ranas. There was struggle between for and against the democracy in Nepal during Panchayat system and armed struggle of Maoist. Politics has manipulated the democracy and people feel the absence of freedom, human rights and democratic rights for long time. The Nepalese society is divided into various groups demanding rights for women, deprived and excluded groups such as dalits and ethnic, and regional autonomy. Nepal is in the transition of democracy and the state of fragility. People are still demanding rights that are more democratic as the real sense of democracy is absence in Nepal. Political parties are more than people are and actually, Nepal has party-cracy, rather than democracy.

#### **References**

- Acemoglu, Daron and James Robinson, "What do we know about democracy?", *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, Chapter 2, Cambridge : Cambridge University, 2006, 48-87.
- Alphonse SJ, Manu, "Democracy in South Asia-Challenges : Democratic Promise, A Distant Dream", Patxi Álvarez SJ (ed.), *Democracy in the World*, Rome : Promotio Iustitiae, Social Justice and Ecological Secretariat, 2012. Available at <http://www.sjweb.info/documents/sjs/pjnew/PJ109ENG.pdf>

- Bajoria, Jayshree, *Democracy in South Asia*, New York : Council on Foreign Relations, 2008.
- Burghart, R., "The Formation of the Concept of Nation-State in Nepal", *Journal of Asian Studies*, 44(1), 1984, 101-125.
- Economist Intelligence Unit, *Democracy Index 2023 : Age of Conflict*, New York : EIU, 2024.
- Held, David, *Models of Democracy*, Stanford, Calif. : Standford University Press, 1996.
- Huntington, Samuel P., *The Third Wave : Democratization in The Late Twentieth Century*, Bangalore : Adarsh Books, 2010.
- International IDEA Report, *The State of Democracy in South Asia*, New Delhi : The Study of Developing Societies (CSDS), 2006.
- Liechty, M., *Suitably Modern: Making Middle Class Culture in Kathmandu*, Kathmandu : Martin Chautari, 2008, 39-58, 183-208.
- Mahoney, James, "Knowledge accumulation in Comparative Historical Approach : The Case of Democracy and Authoritarianism", James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003, 131-74.
- Mishra, Chaitanya, "Political Transition in Nepal : Toward an Analytical Framework", *Essays on the Sociology of Nepal*, Kathmandu : Fineprint, 2007, 1-34.
- Nepali, Dr. Rohit Kumar, *Democracy in South Asia*, Stockholm, Sweden : International IDEA Publications, 2009.
- Tilly, Charles, *Democracy*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2007. ★