Democratic Transition of Nepal-2006: A Theoretical Sociological Analysis

Tek Nath Subedi

Saraswati Multiple Campus, Lekhnath Marg, Thamel
Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal
Email: tngsubedi@gmail.com

Abstract

Democracy approximates a politically equal situation to all human subjects. People's voice for democracy and increasing number of countries adopting a democratic regime indicate democracy's endorsement of the notion 'people as sovereign'. Often said, each People's Movement is inclined to one's right to freedom, equality and justice. Thus, democracy is deliberately inserted into any of the contemporary debates ranging from a peaceful deal to any social movement and war, be it the external type of Independence Movement, or the internal type of social, cultural, economic and political riots, protest movements or great revolutions including the French Revolution and others. The late-twentieth and early twenty-first century witnessed communist regimes' gradual greet to democracy, and a situation occurred as if democracy was an undisputed form of regime. In 2006, a collective campaign of people throughout the country came to the street making alliance with the civil society organizations, previously underground Maoist party and other mainstream political parties to protest the royal takeover and bring democracy back into practice. The movement was culminated with bringing a huge transition – Nepal's Democratic Transition-2006 – which this paper attempts to theorize. By giving special reference to the Game Theory of Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, this paper verifies the role of micro and macro components as equally and strategically active for enabling the democratic transition of a nation.

1 Introduction

The most superior of all ruling systems in the contemporary era in fact seems to be a democratic ruling. "Between 1970 and 2010, the number of democracies around the world increased from about 35 to nearly 120, or some 60 percent of the world's countries, in what Samuel Huntington called the Third

Wave of democratization." [1]. Democracy in classical literature was meant merely as the manifestation of people's will for the common good, but an advanced definition of democracy is "that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote." [2]. Democracy was ushered firstly in Nepal in 1951 AD, but was short-lived due to the inception of Panchayati party-less ruling system by the-then King Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah in 1960. After 30 years of relentless effort of the political parties followed by a multiparty movement of 1990 – also known as the First People's Movement of Nepal – launched combinedly by the Nepali Congress (NC) and the United Left Front (ULF) kneeled down the absolute royal rule of the Panchayat Era, and restored democracy. The restoration of democracy too could not flourish well due firstly to the Maoist-led war and secondly to the-then King Gyanendra Bir Bikram Shah's takeover citing Maoist uprising on the one hand and political parties' failure to wipe out the Maoist-led war on the other hand. King Shah came to power at a time when neither the Maoist-led war was successful in vanquishing the state army nor the state proved successful in demolishing the rebel. Quite interestingly, the constitutional King did not stay calm after the takeover, but also continued banning political parties and curtail people's constitutional rights such as right to speech, right to communication, right to assemble, etc. Royal takeover became in fact a point of departure for the political parties from their earlier stand of constitutional monarchy to no-monarchy, which was the key agenda of the rebel Maoist party. Consequently, an alliance between major seven political parties (SPA) and rebel Maoist party was made to plan and work together for the restoration of democracy. "The alliance of seven parliamentary parities (SPA), and the insurgent Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) (CPNM), the two principal protagonists of the April political movement came to a seven-point agreement under which the political forces agreed to collaborate and chart a future path." [3].

The consensus made between the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) and Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) in 2005 was similar to the joint effort made by the political parties for the restoration of democracy circa 1980s. The peace agreement between SPA and the Maoist was gainful to all political parties because the dissatisfied civilians, who were victimized by the rebel and the state-army, could also be rescued from the terror and be relieved in case visible initiatives were taken from all sides. In such a backdrop, the SPA and the Maoist party launched the anti-Monarch movement and were able to abolish the monarchy, which had a 240-years of rule in Nepal's history. The movement was believed to be highly successful in yielding major transformations in Nepal's socio-political history as "the kingdom transformed into a republic, the milieu of civil conflict transformed into one of peaceful politics and the non-inclusive state ruled by the high-castes transformed into an inclusively democratic Nepal." [4]. Looking out from the supposedly political vantage, the People's Movement-2006 was a political event, but while looking it from a macro socio-political vantage, it was the democratic transition leading to a great social transformation – the end of Monarchic history and the beginning of a new type of people's democratic era.

Notwithstanding the political instability and the frequent changes of government without a single successful completion of a full five-year term after the instigation of democracy in 1950, people's expectation and the political parties' inclination to democratic ruling is still unquestioned. Also, democracy's gaining ascendancy over other types of nondemocratic regime verifies its worldwide character. We can see not only the liberals but also Marxists and other autocratic and totalitarian regimes trending to democracy. "From this, it is clear that democracies generally approximate a situation of political equality relative to nondemocracies that, in turn, represent the preferences of a much smaller subset of society and thus correspond more to a situation of political inequality." [5]. Therefore, democracy or democratic transition, a pathway to freedom, social justice and equality, needs to be theorized as much sociologically as it has been analyzed politically. However, theoretical wrapping of Nepal's transition to democracy in 2006 is the only subject of this paper.

2 Methodology

Democratic transition is a large-scale cum long-run historical process, thus, a macro-sociological concern. It demands a comparative historical analysis of literature about what causes a democratic transition and how. Any sound theoretical sociological analysis of democratic transition requires a review of comparative historical research on key topics such as democracy, movement, regime-change, revolution, world political and economic order, and several broader structural conditions and processes. Therefore, the key methodology that is used while giving this article this current shape is textual analysis. Textual analysis is a broad term for research methods that are used to describe, interpret and analyze texts of a particular genre. Besides, it aims to connect the text to a larger social, economic, political and cultural context. In this paper, textual analysis refers to the thematic analysis of ideas available on books that are published around the

topics: capitalism, socialism, democracy, social order, change, revolution, transition, history, etc.

Major contributors of macro-sociological research, and the thematic description of a world social politico-economic order by using a more sophisticated historicist approach, are Joseph A. Schumpeter, Barrington Moore, James Mahoney, Daron Acemoglu, James A. Robinson, Theda Skocpol, Samuel P. Huntington, Francis Fukuyama, etc. who have made a comparative study of large-scale global phenomena, a review of approaches on those global events and processes, and have produced a theory of structural conditions and processes of revolutions and transition based on their respective disciplinary lens. Their work is widely influential not only in terms of raising intellectual debate and discourse on democracy or nondemocracy, but also to the shaping of world historical social, political and economic order. And, they are brought into the discussion of major social science disciplines via academic curriculum in many universities of the world including the post-graduate course studies of social science faculty of Tribhuvan University.

This paper starts with shedding light on the contemporary world order, the great revolutions of the past, rise of capitalism and liberal democracy, socialism and communism in brief, shift of society from agrarian to industrial stage, and tries specifically to theorize what causes a transition happen. While doing this, it selects some of the widely acclaimed books on great socio-political transitions. Barrington Moore [6] is chosen to be discussed because he has explained the developmental trajectories that have transformed many agrarian societies into the modern industrial ones by which new agendas of research in macroscopic social science are inspired. James Mahoney has assessed "the extent of knowledge accumulation that has taken place in the field of comparative historical analysis, a research area that is sometimes criticized as having failed to achieve cumulative knowledge" [7] on the origins of the democratic and authoritarian regimes by making a critical review of three major research programs of social sciences namely the Barrington Moore, Guillermo O'Donnell, and Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan.

Theoretical ideas of Daren Acemoglu and James Robinson are taken seriously into consideration because they have investigated "why some societies are democratic, why some societies switch from nondemocracy to democracy, and why some democracies revert back to dictatorships" [5]. They have made a detailed analysis of both the democratic or nondemocratic regimes of European, American, Asian and African nations such as Argentina, Britain, Singapore, China, Chile, Columbia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Burma, Brazil, Peru, Venezuela, Uruguay, South

Africa, etc. Theoretical framework of Acemoglu and Robinson is well-approved in this paper firstly, because it has attempted to analyze numerous questions about why democracy or nondemocracy or dictatorship and provide tentative answers to it; and secondly, because the framework of democratic transition made by these two writers seems not necessarily indifferent to the democratic transition of Nepal-2006 (transition hereafter). Besides, a synthesis of theoretical, conceptual and empirical facts on transition as documented by roughly a dozen and a half of scholars is made because a sound sociological analysis of democratic transition requires its theoretical aspects to be weaved into the factors of transition.

3 Review of Literature

3.1 James Mahoney's Review of Democratic Transition Theories

James Mahoney's contribution substantially develops the body of research on political sociology basically on democracy and authoritarianism. He has discussed three major schools of thought in which the Barrington Moore school explores class relation as the key internal factor of democratic transition, the O'Donnell program focuses on the rise of a bureaucratic-authoritarian regime, and the Linz-Stepan school highlights the voluntarist leadership theory of democratic transition. Since O'Donnell research is less relevant to the objective of this paper, only the Barrington Moore and the Linz-Stepan schools are reviewed here.

Barrington Moore highlights internal class relationship as the most relevant factor for the rise of democracy. It highlights the role of a strong city bourgeoisie, who involves mainly in commerce and industry, is important to the creation of democracy. It means that with whom the bourgeoisie class makes alliance determines the nature of the new regime. If a bourgeoisie class allies with the labor-repressive landlord class the regime turns to be autocratic, but if it allies with the working-class the regime transforms into a democratic. It however is doubtful that a strong bourgeoisie, who avoids an anti-peasant alliance with a labor-repressive landed elite facilitates democracy, and an anti-peasant alliance, which unites a labor-repressive landed elite with a politically subordinate bourgeoisie facilitates authoritarianism. Mahoney ceases to admit the fact that the mere alliance of bourgeoisie and proletariat contributed to the emergence of democracy in France; rather it was the "weakening of the landed elites the bourgeoisie was able to fulfill its historic role and establish parliamentary democracy" [7]. Mahoney construes Linz-Stepan theory as voluntarist metatheory for it considers agency as the ma-

jor causal factor of regime-change. The leadership, the political institution, voluntarism, contingent political scenario, etc. are declared as the most decisive factors. "The Linz-Stepan program was motivated by a concern with political agency and voluntarism, including an effort to move away from the more "deterministic" structural approaches found within the emerging Moore and O'Donnell research programs. The goal of the series was to incorporate leadership and contingent political choices alongside more structuralist factors such as class conflict." [7]. Mahoney does not only give credit to a single agent for democratizing process, but gives an equal emphasis to "the spread of knowledge about democratic institutions, norms supportive of democracy, and actors and institutions in society capable of sustaining democratic behavior" [7] for the rise or demise of a democratic regime. He disregards the fact that the path to democracy follows homogenously to all societies, but regards class relationship as one factor of democratic transition.

3.2 Barrington Moore's Theory of Revolution

Barrington Moore [6] has analyzed the historical conditions in which social class and inter-class coalitions plays a vital role in transforming rural agrarian societies to the modern industrial ones. He explored three historical routes through which modern industrial societies were developed. The first route was a capitalist democratic route by which a strong bourgeoisie, in absence of a radical role of peasant and of serious challenge by the aristocracy, engendered a parliamentary democracy in England, France and the United States, and successfully transformed them as industrial capitalist countries. The second was the capitalist reactionary route by which Germany and Japan witnessed revolution from above. It engendered a fascist dictatorship, which was the result of an alliance between bourgeoisie and the aristocracy during the revolution. The third route was the communist route by which China and Russia were industrialized, but were communist dictatorships. The peasantry in both the countries was strong enough to spur the revolution from below against the centralized bureaucracy.

Notwithstanding the importance of social class in transforming a society, Moore has given credit to the bourgeoisie class in ensuring a democratic regime. He cogently writes, "we may simply register strong agreement with the Marxist thesis that a vigorous and independent class of town dwellers has been an indispensable element in the growth of parliamentary democracy. No bourgeois, no democracy." [6]. In France, England and the United States, the peasantry was either subordinate to the bourgeoisie, or was destroyed by the bourgeoisie revolution as aristocracy was destroyed. The bourgeoisie-aristocratic alliance has little chance of fostering a democratic regime, because the landed aristocracy is reluctant to adapt to the structural changes, therefore, a quasi-democratic rule may begin. Communist revolution took place in Russia and China because peasantry was the single dominant class or actor, which lacked diverse caste and cultural hierarchies.

Looking specifically, with reference to Moore, at the predominant existence of communist parties with their reverence to lower-class and peasantry that the bourgeoisie revolution is the possible path to democratic transition, because caste distinction as sacred and profane is very dubious, and it fails to fuel for a proletarian revolution. One of the major reasons that India is out of the mentioned routes is its "religiously tinged caste codes, which cover practically the whole range of human activities, any innovation or attempted innovation in premodern times was likely to become the basis for another caste." [6].

3.3 Theoretical Contribution of Acemoglu and Robinson on Democratic Transition

Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson have also extended their ideas by identifying some necessary factors of democratic transition that include income, education, civil society, crisis and turbulence, inequality, political institutions, industrialization, urbanization, economic structure, capitalism, the nature and extent of globalization, etc. For them, inter-group inequality was the most important factor. They admit that the "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" [5]. 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. This does not however mean that the falling of 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" [5]. Democratic transition is also fueled by economic and political crisis. The oppositional parties utilize economic and political crisis as an opportunity to protest the government and sometimes it takes the form of a big movement that can topple the government. Acemoglu

and Robinson have argued of democratic transition in many Latin American countries in the context of severe economic hardships. They have identified many democratic transitions across the world during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with high degree of social unrest and turbulence. The incumbent government during the crisis fails to allocate its resources to suppress the uprising. Therefore, regime changes more frequently occur during the time of crisis or turbulence. In this situation also the middle class having a "more comfortable economic situation and the greater education of its members – can be a critical catalyst in the process toward democracy [5] as well. The seed of democracy in many European countries was sown after the great revolutions. Democracy occurred in France soon after the 1789 revolution. England had the similar case. In Germany and Sweden also, the driving force behind political liberalization and democratization was the threat of social disorder and revolution. Disorder was heightened by wars, and other shocks to the social order were outright there. Liberalization was occurred in line with massive social unrest. In many countries of the world, "massive labor protests destabilized authoritarianism and opened the way for the establishment of a democratically elected government" [5]. Social unrest and revolutionary scenario therefore are other important factors which may effectively contribute to a democratic transition.

Liberalism, capitalism and democracy are separate concepts, but many scholars attach democratic transition to the rise of liberal capitalism. Capitalism encourages people's mobility and freedom thereby a challenge to the static regime. Democracy "is the right held universally by all citizens to have a share of political power, that is, the right of all citizens to vote and participate in politics. The right to participate in political power can be thought of as yet another liberal right – indeed, the most important one – and it is for this reason that liberalism has been closely associated historically with democracy." [8]. But it is not necessarily for Acemoglu and Robinson that the capitalism constitutes of all positive, but the true "strength of the citizens and the trade-off of the elite between repression and concession that determines the fate of democracy" [5]. 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 and make a collective voice for democracy. Today nation-states in the world are mutually connected via strong global economic organizations like European Union, International Monetary Fund, etc., which work effectively for a change in national politics. The elite can from these organizations invest their capital out of their country. As a result, these organizations have to protect the capital of investors by institutionalizing democratic regimes in their respective countries. 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. As Acemoglu and Robinson say, 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" [5]. All these signify globalization's contribution to a democratic transition.

Democratic transition occurs not in isolation but in relation with various internal and international conditions. And, a positive correlation exists between income, education, social unrest, economic depression, street fighting, capitalism, and democracy. Acemoglu and Robinson deny the fact that the single internal or international factor is sufficient for a democratic transition. Thus, they have taken Game Theory as an overarching building block of approach to democracy. According to the Game Theory, "individuals have well-defined preferences over outcomes or the consequences of their actions; for example, they prefer more income to less and they may prefer peace, security, fairness, and many other things. Sometimes masses of individuals have interests in common or even act collectively. However what matters is that individuals do have well-defined preferences that they understand. They evaluate various different options, including democracy versus nondemocracy, according to their assessments of their (economic and social) consequences. In such situations, the economic approach suggests that people often behave strategically and that their behavior should be modeled as a game" [5]. The theory "focuses more on normatively and institutionally regulated interactions among parties involved in friendship, collaboration and exchange as well as diverse negotiation processes." [9].

3.4 Synthesis of Theories on Democratic Transition

Theorizing a democratic transition encapsulates multiple factors of a regime-change. Let's start with the class contradiction within a country. Each society consists of a wide-variety of economic classes having multiple interests of each class. The poor class – basically the peasants and workers – desires for a democratic regime while the rich class – mostly the lord and aristocratic groups – dreams for a totalitarian regime. While the middle class – more specifically the bourgeoisie – because "by

virtue of its more comfortable economic situation and the greater education of its members – can be a critical catalyst in the process toward democracy." [5]. In the present era of democratic globalization, the middle-class could hardly make an alliance with elite-class or voice for autocracy, because the middle-class by nature is in between the upper and lower-class, and is in more strategic position in terms of bargaining with others. Since the lower-class people outnumbers the upper-class people, making an alliance with lower-class becomes more beneficial for the middle-class.

The role of middle class in destabilizing a system is marked clearly by Samuel P. Huntington as well. He says, "The true revolutionary class in modernizing societies is, of course, the middle class. Here is the principal source of urban opposition to government. It is this group whose political attitudes and values dominate the politics of the cities." [10]. He adds, "As the modernization continued, however, rural radial movements had decreasing leverage on the political process, and the urban middle class increased in size compared to the industrial working class. The potential threats democracy posed to middle-class groups thus declined, and those groups became increasingly confident of their ability to advance their interests through electoral politics." [11].

Modern society is enmeshed with rising complexity and intensified crisis in social, economic and political sphere, which may cause a shift from the primacy of these spheres, and ultimately the regime-change and transition. A crisis-ridden state is prone to uncertainty, and people too display less attention and sympathy towards the inept government. Crises are more visible in job-market, where workers are exempted to receive their full salary; bonus and other allowances are cut-off, and many are in risk of losing their job. Likewise, the price of basic needs soars. Dissatisfied civilians being frustrated by the mere neglect from their government and its failure to rescue people from hardships pose a serious threat to the existing regime and demand for a new people-friendly regime. The opposition parties in such a turmoil may by chance receive a massive support from the public, and has chances of strike any deal to take over the incumbent government. Therefore, any crisis can be a starting point for parties to make strategic plan and take necessary steps to initiate a major counter-offensive against the regime.

The embeddedness of modern-day capitalism with liberal type of democracy indicates their happy marriage. Capitalism and democracy are indeed a duality; neither can exist without the other. The capitalist political-economic system enables the process of endless accumulation of capital via its chain of investment, production, distribution, profit-making, and reinvestment. It allows the capitalist to more easily take their money out of their country. It gives people freedom than food; people are free to move than to survive. The capitalist class favors a democratic regime because of democracy's endorsement to 'the right to private property' while at the same time the working class is obliged to opt for democracy because they are riddled by capitalism's idea of 'right to equality'. Being puzzled by democracy's leaning to freedom, the poor-class people do advocate democracy than a proletarian-dictatorship. Likewise, people are socialized by capitalism in a way that democracy strengthens the rights not only of the owning class but also of the working class. Preference of countries also go for democratic regime because no country expects sanction from the international community. This has been the route the borderless character of capitalism contributes to the emergence of democracy and democratic transition.

Notwithstanding the application of sociological theories in explaining a democratic movement or transition, Game theory comes to successfully replace other previous ones. The Game theory is a theory of social interaction, where two or more competing agencies work together strategically to achieve a goal. "It is developed in and applied to multi-agent interaction situations where there are interdependencies among two or more of the agents." [9]. In this strategically important interaction, decision is made mutually for benefiting all the actors, and the outcome for each actor depends on the action of all actors. It connects material condition with the social context and emphasizes the role of norms, institutional arrangements, a wide array of activities including communication, cooperation, agreements, and a more strategic actions and interactions. In addition to this, the sociological game theory "formulates the concept of judgment on the basis of which actors either construct their actions or make choices among given alternative actions through making comparisons and judging similarity (or dissimilarity) between the option or options considered in the game and their norms and values in the situation." [9].

4 Analyzing Democratic Transition of Nepal-2006

The democratic movement of 2006 has been the benchmark in the socio-political history of Nepal. The country renewed itself by a "radical departure from its past– a departure from the two-and-a-half century long history of monarchical rule, a departure from the decade-long tumultuous period that was marked chiefly by the insurgency carried out by the Communist Part of Nepal-Maoist (CPN-Maoist) and a departure from Nepal in which the

political sphere was dominated by the Hill-Hindu Brahmin and Chhetri males" [4]. This section sheds light on some key internal factors of democracy in Nepal such as class inequality, institutional activism, growing people's power, frequent coups, and some international factors like world capitalism, international trade, support from outside, etc. and attempts to review it by giving special reference to the Game Theory in order to make a more convincing theoretical sociological analysis of transition.

4.1 Internal class contradiction spilled over the ground

Class inequality is widely recognized as a fertile ground for a movement or a revolution to break out. Structural theorists like Karl Marx, Samuel P. Huntington, Theda Skocpol, etc. regard inequality as a strong foundation of a revolution. Once looking at the centuries-long feudal type of royal rule and people's dissatisfaction to it for it has given a priority-value to the landlord and nobility class, the poor people of Nepal, be it a landless farmer or an industrial proletariat, were organized spontaneously for the democratic movement of 2006, and prepared to overthrow the monarchy. People assessing transition from an immediate glance may find no indications of class contradiction spilled over the ground as people from each and every corner had come to the street. But it would be highly unfair if the role of a class-inequality as one crucial factor of the transition is underestimated. The agitators joined the people's movement in 2006 keeping in mind that the monarchical institution, the one and the only remnant of feudalism, will be swept away by the wave of great movement. "It was mostly the middle class and the bourgeoisie who had participated in the movements." [12]. Summing up, the middle-class people had fully utilized their time as demonstrators of the movement to defeat the Royal King, their historical class-enemy, whose care was more for the elites and less for the middle-class.

4.2 Institutional arrangement during the movement

The people's movement of Nepal in 2006 witnessed the activist role played by many social and political organizations. Acemoglu and Robinson too emphasize the role of political institutions and civil society. During the 2006-movement, all political parties, human rights organizations, ethnic and religious organizations, civil society, etc. stayed at the forefront. The role played by political parties was not less important as Acemoglu and Robinson argued; but the role of civil society was more than the political parties and political leaders. The civil society was at the heart of attraction as people agitated by wrong-doings of political parties were faithful to civil society members. Likewise, the role of human rights activists and some civil society members was more important than that of political leaders in convincing the people for protest. To round off, civil society organizations and its members were more accountable than the political parties and its leaders for the last few years of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century. Nepal's political parties once failed to gain immediate trust by the public during the movement started inviting civil society members to their programs and rallies to give key speech against the monarchy; a proper coordination and arrangement of public institutions for the revival of democracy. If civil society organizations too lacked accountability, people would not have been readily convinced for protest against the royal takeover and democracy would not have been easily restored.

4.3 Nexus between the capitalist world order and state system

Democracy seems to be connected historically with capitalism. The practice of a political freedom accredited by democracy and the idea of free market aspired by capitalism qualify to some extent for both the democracy and capitalism to be understood as synonymous. Significant variation exists between these two concepts, however, no democracy in the contemporary era has arisen in any country except in conjunction with a capitalist market. It means that the capitalism is necessary for a democracy to reach at least at a certain level of independence from the state. Also, capitalism requires a democratic regime for its legitimate growth. Insofar as the assault of democracy in Nepal is concerned, it took place at a time when capitalist development was towering. The international community displayed only the resentment to the royal takeover of Nepal. Moreover, India and China, two closest neighbors of Nepal, formally denounced the royal rule. As the country had already become a part of a world system and an international state system it could hardly function in isolation with the international community. No support to royal government of Nepal from the international community meant that the royal rule was always under the international surveillance. International stakeholders of capitalism were too much strategic to drive the King, a traditional cum national force, out of Nepali politics by providing support to liberal democratic forces of Nepal.

4.4 Accumulated response of people to unnecessary torture by the state

Of many pivotal movements in Nepal's history, the advent of democracy in 1950 and its restoration in

1990 is considered as far-reaching, Democracy in practice gave rise to freedom, rights, power, and growing awareness and higher expectation to people in Nepal. Despite democracy being battered frequently by Royal Kings, people's aspiration to it was never-weakening. Since people started after the restoration of democracy experiencing the freedom, they continued to fight against political or royal dictatorship. During King Gyanendra's direct rule circa 2005, rights of people were forfeited, communication networks ceased, and many political and human rights activists were jailed. Curfew lifted in major cities in order to harass political activities, but people defied curfew and continued to protest. Ultimately, the 19-days of relentless agitation compelled the king to bow down and return democracy back to Nepali people.

Many scholars indeed blame the King for his usurpation of power as the major factor for the people's movement be it in 1990 or in 2006, and the 2006-movement was the reaction of King Gyanendra's two royal coups in 2002 and in 2005. "His wresting of total power not only spurred the political parties to align with the CPN-Maoist but also further alienated the king from the masses." [4]. Not only this, but also the major factors of a democratic transition of 2006 were the Maoist insurgency from 1996 and the royal takeover in 2002 and 2005. Over the time, "the Maoist movement managed to infuse a completely new element into mainstream political discourse – that of inclusion – an issue that other political parties had no choice but to adopt as well" [13]. Equally important was, "The Maoist displacement of local state and elected representative cut off the limbs of Nepal's young democracy. Meanwhile, King Gyanendra complemented the Maoists' work by beheading democracy through his twin coups in October 2002 and February 2005, which forced a return to absolute monarchy" [14]. Looking at the frequent attack democracy had to encounter with during its infancy caused either by the rebels or by rulers, civilians were in high alert waiting for the most appropriate time to transfer insurgency to normalcy, which could be a win-win situation to all the people and political parties of Nepal.

4.5 Nationwide grievances cashed by the political parties

Arguments for explaining revolutions from a broader structural level are on the rise. The structural perspective of revolution gives emphasis to the underlying causes and larger scope of a revolution in which the participants are highly aware of its consequences. Conflict occurs and regime changes in countries normally in the backdrop of a deplorable situation. As Theda Skocpol says, "First, changes in social systems or societies give rise to grievances, social disorientation, or new class or group interests and potentials for collective mobilization. Then there develops a purposive, mass-based movement – coalescing with the aid of ideology and organization – that consciously undertakes to overthrow the existing government and perhaps the entire social order. Finally, the revolutionary movement fights it out with the authorities or dominant class and, if it wins, undertakes to establish its own authority and program." [[15]. The mass movement of people in several parts of all then-then 75 districts followed often by live torch rallies against the royal regime during the night-time; and support to it by professional groups like Teachers, Professor, Lawyers, Journalists, Trade Unions, Doctors, Engineers, etc. were cashed by the political parties implied that the non-democratic ruling was unacceptable, and anti-King sentiment was on the peak.

Some scholars take transition as a transition from authoritarian regime to a democratic regime, from violence to peace, and from exclusion to inclusion. To be specific, the people's movement 2006 was successful in replacing the monarchy by a democratic republic, the Maoists-led armed insurgency by a peaceful negotiation of war, and the traditional people-state relationship by restructuring of the state. The 2006-movement was the right forum for people to express their accumulated dissatisfaction over prolonged war, for Maoists to start ground politics instead of involving in risky underground politics and war, for political parties to defeat their traditional rival and widen their political scope, and for all trade unions and professional groups to expand their bargaining power in multiparty democracy.

4.6 Large-scale structural conditions preferring a democratic regime

A number of factors, both internal and external, can be attributed to a democratic transition in any country. Regarding the democratic transition in 1950, "it was the internal contradiction within the regime, and the changing international context, which led to the collapse of the Rana rule" [16]. While analyzing the People's Movement of 1990, the ban of political parties, sizeable growth of middle-class population, and systemic crisis were pointed as major internal factors while international movement for freedom and democracy, and international trade and transit issues as key external factors of a democratic transition in Nepal [17]. Moreover, amidst the rising tension between Maoist insurgency and constitutional crisis, the political landscape of Nepal drastically changed after the royal takeover by King Gyanendra in 2005. However much interesting to observe was people's dis-

interest in political parties and their reluctancy to join the party-led protests. But they had a strong belief on civil society activists and joined the movement. Besides, civil society and its leaders were also heavily influenced by the international human rights organizations including the United Nations. The 'royal takeover and its disregard to civil rights' and 'the anti-King national and international context' were identified as the key factors of 2006-people's movement of Nepal [18]. Besides, it was a blunder from the King Gyanendra to declare himself as the "King of the 21st Century" and to impose a state of emergency in the country. It seems quite incompatible in this modern era to have a King, who owing to his hereditary power, aims to rule the country. Present global capitalist system too invalidates the hereditary power, which contradicts with the rational cum democratic political leadership. To round off, the strategic role played by the international community as a part of a world-system was pivotal for the outbreak of the People's Movement and the democratic transition of Nepal of 2006.

5   Conclusion

This paper has discussed the micro to macro components and the local and global contexts while reviewing the theories of democracy. It comes to conclude firstly the rise of democratic conscience among people, who do not think only of safeguarding their rights, but also the change in a regime if needed. It means that the fruit of democracy once tasted by people, they cannot return back to any regime that lets people down. Secondly, democratic movement awaits not the leaders, instead individuals having strong institutional base, and their coordinative role can work as a catalyst of freedom movement. Civil society members, who lacked a strong political base, and were clearer than political leaders on agendas of human rights and freedom, were trusted by the mass of people and the international community. Thirdly, the realization by people that the socio-economic and political interests reinforce both at the local and the global level. People's dream for equality, their voice for peace and prosperity, which was fully covered by the capitalist media worked decisively for the transition. Fourthly, the strategic political understanding between major political forces, who attempted to bring the-then insurgent Maoist party into the mainstream politics via peace process, and its support by the international community, should be considered as both the internal and external sides of a democratic transition. Fifthly, the effective role of middle-class people as their population has outnumbered the population of upper-class and industrial workers in Nepal in general and in capital city

Kathmandu in particular, needs to be marked, because King Gyanendra's move has jeopardized the livelihood of middle-class people, whose active presence ignited to mass mobilization during the movement. Finally, the proverb 'the more suppression, the deadly is the explosion' came to be translated. Nepali people were quite tolerant of types of oppression and a violent war, but they were frequently tortured by the state administration such as by police, army, armed forces, etc., and become intolerant. Once they confirmed autocracy as their real enemy, they came to struggle quite convincingly against the conventional power thereby permitting the emergence of a new era. Well-estimated analysis of people regarding the long-existed social inequalities, rising economic turmoil and insecurity, snatching of political rights by the old regime, internal class contradictions, rise of capitalist world order, global market and trade deficit in Nepal, and their strategic role-play to initiate peace, prosperity, security, fairness, and freedom, which boosted their participation voluntarily in the people's movement of Nepal in 2006 verifies the Game Theory of Daren Acemoglu and James A. Robinson that acclaims the role of micro and macro components as equally and strategically active for enabling the democratic transition of a nation.

References

[1] F. Fukuyama. *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy.* Profile Books, London, 2014.

[2] J. A. Schumpeter. *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy.* Adarsh Books, New Delhi, 2011.

[3] C. Mishra. *Essays on the Sociology of Nepal.* FinePrint, Kathmandu, 2007.

[4] K. Hachhethu, S. Kumar, and J. Subedi. *Nepal in Transition: A Study on the State of Democracy.* International IDEA, Kathmandu, 2008.

[5] D. Acemoglu and J. A. Robinson. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[6] B. Moore Jr. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World.* Beacon Press, Boston, 1966.

[7] J. Mahoney. Knowledge accumulation in comparative historical research: The case of democracy and authoritarianism. In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, editors, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences (Cambridge Studies in Comparative*

Politics), pages 131–174. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[8] F. Fukuyama. *The End of History and the Last Man.* Free Press, New York, 2006.

[9] T. R. Burns, E. Roszkowska, U. Corte, and N. Machado. Sociological game theory: Agency, social structures and interaction processes. *Optimum. Economic Studies*, 5(89), 2017.

[10] S. P. Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* Adarsh Books, New Delhi, 2009.

[11] S. P. Huntington. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century.* Adarsh Books, New Delhi, 2010.

[12] B. Sijapati. *People's Participation in Conflict Transformation: A Case Study of Jana Andolan II in Nepal.* Social Science Baha, Kathmandu, 2009.

[13] D. Thapa. Introduction. In D. Thapa, editor, *The Politics of Change: Reflections on Contemporary Nepal*, pages ix–xvii. Himal Books and The Asia Foundation, Kathmandu, 2019.

[14] S. Einsiedel, D. M. Malone, and S. Pradhan. Introduction. In Sebastian Einsiedel, David M Malone, and Suman Pradhan, editors, *Nepal in Transition: From People's War to Fragile Peace*, pages 1–17. Cambridge University Press, New Delhi, 2012.

[15] T. Skocpol. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.

[16] T. L. Brown. *The challenge to democracy in Nepal: A political history.* Routledge, London, 1995.

[17] N. R. Khadka. Democracy and development in nepal: Prospects and challenges. *Pacific Affairs*, 66(1):31–48, 1993.

[18] C. D. Basnet. Civil movement and civil society in the people's movement of 2062-2063. In Hiramani Maharjan, editor, *Civil Society in Loktrantra: A Review of the Past Twenty-five Years*, pages 79–100. Martin Chautari, Kathmandu, 2020.