

POWER-SHARING, WAR TERMINATION AND PEACEBUILDING IN NEPAL 12th International Research Conference of KDU

Abstract— *As Nepal is a pluralistic country, it's believed that power-sharing through federalism can bring sustainable peace to Nepal society. Nepal political elites believed that implementing Lijphart consociationalism model, may reduce the ethnic tension and discrimination between majority and so-called minority groups and indigenous groups. Indeed, it could able to transform Nepal monopoly over political power to democratic mainstream.*

The main objective of the research was to find the status of power-sharing, war termination and peacebuilding in Nepal and specific objectives were to find how did power-sharing contribute to war termination in Nepal? And does the theory of consociational power-sharing apply to Nepal? The research conducted in both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The secondary data based on Lijphart consociationalism model and other scholarly articles also have been reviewed. As a primary data, the researcher used personal experiences living in Nepal. The data analyzed using qualitative data analysis tool.

Even though Nepal has met the featured elements which suggested by Lijphart by his theory of consociational power-sharing which is mostly suitable for multi-ethnic societies, there is no any significant changes in social, economic and political sectors due to major political parties' disagreement on the model. They haven't come to an agreement on which kind of federalism going to implement and what are the next steps for durable peace. Nepal is far away from achieving durable peace through sharing power and adopting federalism due to its failure to eliminate all kind of discrimination against humanity through the practice of caste, race and ethnicity-based decimation. It is concluded that this federalization process went ahead promoting peace, development and the absence of threat of peace and jeopardize the stability of the peace in the future.

Keywords— **Consociational; Lijphart; Nepal; Power Sharing; War Termination**

I. INTRODUCTION

Nepalese people witnessed various events and incidents during different phases of decade long violent armed conflict in the country led by the Communist Party of Nepal – Maoist. The launch and the rapid growth of the insurgency challenged the notion that democracy could settle conflicts peacefully and that it was the only acceptable game in town because Maoist launched insurgency when Nepal had restored democracy in 1990. The armed conflict led to the death of more than 13000 people, in addition to many other costs of civil war such as

destruction, displacement and gross human rights abuses. However, eventually, the Maoist successfully negotiated a peace process settlement in their favour and went on to win the post-war election.

The constitution of 1990 could not properly address the issues of social exclusion and inequalities, discrimination among others. As a result, dissatisfied with the state provisions and practices, the Maoist launched a People's Party launched insurgency on 13 February 1996 by attacking rural police posts in three districts- two in the Midwestern and one in the central region. Before, on 4 February 1996, CPN-Maoist's leader Dr. Baburam Bhattarai submitted a list of 40 point demands on nationalism (related to Nepal's relations with India), people's democracy (concerning indigenous nationalities, women and Dalit) and livelihood with an ultimatum to initiate insurgency if they were not met.

The demands included genuine concerns like land rights to tenants, secular state to employment guarantee, poverty eradication etc. One demand called for the abolishment of royal privileges but did not call for a republican state which later became a major issue. Demand for a new constitution to be drawn by peoples' representatives, end of feudalism. To this end, they have waged an insurgency that has claimed an estimated 13000 lives.

The major course of the armed conflict can be found through social inequality and exclusion of large sections of the population from the structures of political and sharing of resources by the traditional ruling elites as the underlying cause of the conflict.

Others state historical-structural conditions, Hindu religion-culture of caste-based discrimination, post-1990 constitutional and political practices as well as the regional and international context.

Poverty and economic inequality: though economic indicators showed there were reasonable economic growth, expansion of development and improved in the human development index in the 1990s, Nepal remained mired in extreme poverty.

Social-cultural inequality: Nepal not only faced inequality, but extreme social-economic inequality also existed among numerous linguistic, ethnics, religious, racial, caste and regional groups.

One group monopolized the political, economic and cultural power, other communities have better access to material resources while Dalit, indigenous nationalities, mid-level Madhesi and Muslims are generally worse off, also one particular group are among executive head in Nepal.

Modernization, social change and fluidity: e.g. penetration of market eroded. Traditional professions, for instance by making available cheaper clothes and shoes resulting in loss of work for the artisan Dalit. For instance, specific state policies contributed to the marginalization of some group.

A decade long violent Maoist insurgency in Nepal has a significant impact in society. Though it caused lots of death, destruction, chaos, panic in the society, at the same time it also contributed to change; change in the social, cultural structure, economic change and most important political change.

Power-sharing as War Termination

According to James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin (2007) most of the civil war are occurred to change the regime and take the power of the central or regional government of the country. Hence, when there is a threat to relative power and cost tolerance parties willing to end the civil war. Every civil war does not end with formal agreements between the parties involved with the war. Especially if rebel could able to take over the power of regime they will not willing to sign for agreements. The power-sharing agreement is a mutually accepted agreement between two combatants. Usually, rebel renounces arms when they see a tendency for them to win is lower than what they will gain from power-sharing.

Monica Duffy Toft (2010) has argued that war termination is neither party are agreeing to end the violence and accept common terms about the post-war state. A negotiated settlement is the agreement between parties to halt the violence. It simply ends the war, but not trying to achieve post-war power-sharing. There is a bulk of arguments about ending the war by negotiated settlement. The most valid critique is that negotiated settlements just reduce the number of deaths compare with the death of victories.

Consider about those authors ideas power-sharing use as a war termination is a short-term goal. After any kind of conflict halt by power-sharing, there should be another mechanism to shift negative peace to positive peace achievement. Lijphart has introduced his consociational power-sharing to reach for long term goals.

Arend Lijphart has built his consociational theory based on political systems in the Netherlands and Belgium. Even though his concept was not new to political science, he has combined his theory with other political scientists' theories. Lijphart (1977) has identified four main features in his consociational theory. They are,

- i) Grand Coalition Government
- ii) Segmental Autonomy
- iii) Proportionality
- iv) Minority veto

Sustainable Peace by Power-sharing

Today's world is more likely to end the wars by negotiating process than war victory. Therefore, scholars and

mediators who involve with peacebuilding pay more attention to power-sharing mechanism. They found that it is the best way to sustain peace; while some scholars criticize it will bring negative impact towards the future. A sustainable peace means the combination of both short term and long term (war termination and consociational power-sharing) steps to build peace in the conflicted society.

When looking at the past two decades of civil wars in the world, the power-sharing arrangement has taken the high demand for peacebuilding. Power-sharing was a comprehensive peace mechanism in Africa. As examples, Sudan's comprehensive peace agreement in 2005, Liberia Accra agreement in 2003, Burundi's Arusha peace agreement in 2000 and DR Congo's Sun city agreement in 2003. Power-sharing guarantee weaker parties that they are not excluded from political, economic and social decision making and give them some incentives remain without breaking the agreement (Katia Papagianni, 2007). Some countries in Africa which came to a peace agreement through power-sharing does not help to sustain peace (Andreas Mehler, 2009). It says that only power-sharing cannot help to bring peace to the conflicted societies and there are other variables have to be considered. Absence of violence does not mean there is sustainable peace. According to Johan Galtung less violent means, negative peace. To be sustained positive peace there should be absent of violence together with the absence of structural violence. Simply it means in conflicting societies there should be the first step to stop the conflict through a peace agreement and then there should be another step to reform social, economic, political and other kinds of cultural dimensions.

Building Lijphart Consociational Power-Sharing mechanisms in Nepal context

In 2006 Nepal was able to end their 10 years' brutal civil war by comprehensive peace accord (CPA). Peace accord has made a space for government and CPN-Maoists to work together to hold the first democratic election after the war. Chandra D. Bhatta (2012) stated that it ends with various types of promises towards economic, political, social, transitional justice (TJ) and sustainable peace. Further on 23rd December 2007 agreed to establish six commissions to work for disappeared persons, truth and reconciliation, state restructuring, scientific land reform, monitoring committee to monitor CPA and agreements and high-level peace commission. According to the CPA (2006) both parties agreed to cooperate in the compliance and implementation of the agreement regarding political sector reform, economic and human rights reforms. Indeed, they agreed to finish all their demands and problems through negotiations before the constituent assembly election start.

Proportionality

The interim constitution of Nepal provides a proportional representation of societal segments. "(d) to carry out an inclusive, democratic and progressive restructuring of the State by eliminating its existing form of centralized and unitary structure in order to address the problems related to women, Dalits, indigenous tribes, Madhesis, oppressed and minority community and other disadvantaged groups, by eliminating class, caste, language, gender, culture, religion and regional discriminations" (Interim Constitution of Nepal, 2007:18). But as Nepal still does not have constitution other than an interim constitution these agreements are still not sure will last for longer.

Consider about electoral representation proportionality mechanism, it clearly defined how elections should be held fulfilling proportionality requirements.

"(3) By the law, there will be the following members of the CA, elected and nominated according to the mixed electoral system, taking account of the quality of the population, geographical convenience and special characteristics, and in the case of Madhes based on a percentage of the population–

(a) One member elected, under the first-past-the-post system, from each geographical constituency, the number of such constituencies being determined by the Constituency Delimitation Commission under Article 154(a), based on the national census preceding the Constituent Assembly elections, and as far as possible maintaining the same relationship between number of members and population for all the administrative districts, while retaining the same administrative districts as hitherto.

(b) Several members, equal to the number elected under sub-clause (a) elected according to the proportional representation system, with voting being for political parties, and treating the whole country as a single constituency.

(c) Seventeen members nominated by the Council of Ministers based on consensus from among distinguished personalities who have made significant contributions to national life" (Interim Constitution of Nepal, 2007:32)

Further, while political parties do their candidate list they should consider about the proportional representation of women, Dalits, oppressed communities/indigenous groups, backward regions, Madhesis and other groups and also women candidate nomination should be minimum of one-third of the total number (Interim Constitution of Nepal, 2007).

By those amendments, Madhesis could increase their representation in upcoming elections. April 2008 was a remarkable day in Nepal political history since it was the first time for them to elect a representative directly through democratic way (Ashild Falch & Jason Miklian, 2008).

In peace agreement it states that "[t]o carry out an inclusive, democratic and progressive restructuring of the

state by ending the current centralized and unitary form of the state in order to address the problems related to women, Dalit, indigenous people, Janajatis, Madheshi, oppressed, neglected and minority communities and backward regions by ending discrimination based on class, caste, language, gender, culture, religion, and region" (Comprehensive Peace Accord, 2006:04). This was the first time Nepal constitution addressed those ethnicities and indigenous groups in their constitution. Compare this issue with the 1990 constitution, there is no sentence talked about a proportional quota for those groups.

Moreover, by the peace accord ending the feudal land ownership and given the economic protection for people who are economically weak, giving opportunities for investments (Comprehensive Peace Accord, 2006). CPA makes it clear that proportionality is not only narrowed concept for the political sector but also in the social and economic sector too.

The Constituent Assembly Members Election Act, 2007 explain how the post-electoral system should be organized. Under chapter two it described that "The political parties must take into account the principle of inclusiveness while nominating candidates for the First Past the Post Electoral System" (The Interim Constitution, Election of Members of the Constituent Assembly Act 2007:06). Under this proportional electoral system, party should cover at least 10% of the total number of members through the proportional representation system. While listing candidates, the proportional representation of women, Dalits, Madhesi and indigenous tribes should be base of the percentage of the population. Indeed, political parties should pay special attention to oppressed groups, poor farmers. Labours and disabled. Under this proportional electoral system "[t]here must be at least one-third women candidates of the total number comprising the number of women candidates to be fielded under that Proportional Electoral System" (The Interim Constitution, Election of Members of the Constituent Assembly Act 2007:08)

Grand Coalition

After 10 years of civil war, Nepal Westminster political system has shifted to the Consociational system. The first election held with the changes of one-party cabinet system to the coalition government. Nepal CA has designed with several political parties reducing one-party dominant in the CA. The term of the grand coalition came to Nepal political dictionary because of tense got by 10 years' civil war. By implementing this system to Nepal political system expected to sustain political legitimacy and collective identity within the state.

For free and fair election to choose candidates for CA, major political parties in Nepal pay attention to formulating 'grand coalition' to the new constitution of Nepal. Apart from the constitution, other elements should be met is up rising economic and social development.

Forming a grand coalition country should take into account economic and social transformation (Jagannath Adhikari, 2013).

During the post-CA election period, grand coalition was “There shall be a unicameral Legislature-Parliament in Nepal which shall consist of the following 330* members as set out in schedule 2

(a) 209 members of the seven political parties and other parties who were sitting as elected members of the House of Representative and National Assembly immediately before the commencement of this Constitution,

Explanation: The phrase “Seven Political Parties” means Nepali Congress, Communist Party of Nepal (UML), Nepali Congress (Democratic), Janamorcha Nepal, Nepal Sadbhawana (Anandidevi), Nepal Majdur Kisan Party and Samyukta Bam Morcha (United Left Front), which reached a political understanding on Kartik 22,2063 (November 8,2006),

(b) 73 members on behalf of Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist),

(c) 48 members nominated by consensus from the Samyukta Bam Morcha, people-based and professional organizations, oppressed communities, backward regions, indigenous ethnic groups, and from among women and various political personalities.” (Interim Constitution of Nepal, 2007:26)

When political parties have their political vision and mission it’s not easy to bring them all to one coalition. But, when it’s necessary to require two-third majorities to pass the constitution everyone have to work together (Jagannath Adhikari, 2013).’

Table 1 Election Results – 2013

Name of Political Party	CA seats	FPTP	PR Quota
Nepali Congress	196	105	91
United Marxist Leninist	175	91	84
Unified Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist)	80	26	54
Rastriya Prajatantra Party Nepal	24	0	24
Madhesi Jana Adhikar Forum Nepal (Democratic)	14	4	10
Rastriya Prajatantra Party	13	3	10
Tarai Madhesh Loktantrik Party	11	4	7
Madhesi Jana Adhikar Forum, Nepal	10	2	8
Sadbhawana	6	1	5
Sanghiya Samajwadi Party	5	0	5
Communist Party of Nepal (Marxist-Leninist)	5	0	5
NMK (Nepal Workers Peasants Party)	4	1	3

Tarai Madhes Sadbhawana party	3	1	2
Independent Candidates	2	2	0
CPN-M	-	-	-

Source: Based on Bambuddhism in Nepal, 2013

Under the PR system, parties which are allocated up to 30% of the total 335 PR seats should distribute 50% for male and 50% for women.

Table 2 Quota distribution according to gender

Quota provisions	Total	Women and Men
Madhesi	31.2%	15.6% each
Dalits	13%	6.5% each
Indigenous	37.8%	18.9% each
Backward regions	4%	2% each
Khas and Aryan	30.2%	15.1% each

Source: Based on Bambuddhism in Nepal, 2013

The total number of valid votes of 9,463,862, 92 political parties were not able to win any PR seats. Consider about Dalit and women’s FPTP representation it has declined over 60-70% in 2013 election compares to the election held in 2008. Though the Madhesi party lost the FPTP still their representation is playing a major role in CA proceedings (Keith D. Leslie, 2013).

Though it’s supposed to elect at least 33% of women to the CA there is no always such a commitment from parties to honour these. During the 2013 election out of 240 FPTP seats only 10 seats (4.2%) women selected from all parties. But during the election of 2008, there were 30 women elected in the FPTP. During the 2013 election UCPN-M, UML and NC parties could attain respectively 26,26 and 25 women seat out of 240 FPTP in the CA election (Keith D. Leslie, 2013).

First time in 2008 seven Dalit candidates was able to win seats in a FPTP election under the UCPN-M. But this rank has reduced in the 2013 election under 1% only two Dalits is winning their FPTP election out of 240 seats. Those two seats, one from UCPN-M and another from UML. Consider about Dalits population in Nepal, it is 13% of the total Nepal population. Due to this failure of the 2013 election, there is less chance for those people to voice their rights while drafting a new constitution (Keith D. Leslie, 2013). Consider those all elections results, it’s obvious that again marginalized groups and minority groups are losing their representation in the CA. It could significantly affect for constitution drafting as there is no enough number to raise their voice for their rights and dignity.

Segmental Autonomy (Federalism)

Nepal interim constitution in 2007 has separated new page to introduce a democratic federal system in Nepal. Until 2007 there was no word about federalism in their constitution.

“(1) To bring an end to discrimination based on class, caste, language, gender, culture, religion and region by eliminating the centralized and unitary form of the State,

the State shall be made inclusive and restructured into progressive Democratic Federal System” (Interim Constitution of Nepal, 2007:67)

It was clear that Nepal has included federalism to their system to eliminate all kinds of discrimination and also decentralized the power which was centred to the king. By doing so Nepal expected to have a peaceful society where all ethnicities live with ethnic cohesion.

The Maoists were favourable on ethnic federalism because they believed that major indigenous groups like Mager, Gurung, Tamang, Kirat and Limbu communities suffered a lot due to the state formation process. But there was another argument about who and who was not indigenous. In such kind of ethnic tension, parties were facing the problem of protecting national objective and democracy (Bipin Adhikari, 2014).

Introducing federalism to Nepal political life among political parties there were two opinions about federalism. New political parties wanted to introduce identity-based federalism to provide demographic dominance in the units for marginalized groups when NC and UML wanted to create administrative viability based federalism system. Under this system hill Hindu upper caste people will get the privilege to enjoy power for long. Madhesis wanted to divide the province of the north-south vertical axis. The NC and the UML focused on Hill regions and Madhesi were focused on Tarai (plain) region (Prasanna Kumar, 2015).

According to Mom Bishwakarma (2013) like what happened in Ethiopia between two ethnic groups of Guji and Burji, competing over power and resources will bring the society towards inter-community violence. These types of violence will drag society, to social, economic, and psychological damages. Therefore, it cannot simplify the debate of ethnic-based federalism. Further through the federalism could be able to address ethnic, minority communities and ensure social justice. But this can be done by compromising. Compromising can build coexistence, cohesion and community tolerance. To achieve them there is a need of consociational democracy. It guarantees the grand coalition at the central level, a minority veto, proportionality and decentralization especially in multiethnic societies.

Moreover, Mom Bishwakarma (2013) has suggested that Nepal needs a federal system which can ensure the elimination of all forms of discrimination against marginalized groups and protect their rights and recognize identity, culture, and language.

Minority veto

In multicultural societies to protect the right of minorities used the tool of minority veto. By doing so it gives power for minority groups to reject when majorities make some decision which will affect for the well-being of minorities. The basic idea of this concept is every socio-cultural group has the right to veto when there is some decision makes relevant to them or not. It's mean, if the majority is

amending any provision relating to the minority it should be approved by a minority. In consociational countries, the term of veto has used by widely. Most of the scholars wanted to implement this concept for multicultural countries (Mahendra Lawoti, 2005).

Consider about minority veto in the Nepal context, there is no legal statement which directly talks about it. But, the constitution has given equal rights for every community in national level accepting everyone as Nepalese. Therefore, if the majority is making any decision against to minority, they can go through the legal process to stop it as Nepal judiciary also accept the whole population as Nepalese without any kind of discrimination. And there is some minority representation in the CA. And due to proportionality condition, every party has to make their party representing other minority and marginalized groups. Therefore, when there is any proposal discuss in the CA will affect badly for them, they can voice to terminate it. But like Belgium and other successful countries which introduced consociational power-sharing to their political system; Nepal has no direct minority veto towards political, economic and social fields.

II. METHODOLOGY AND EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Following an overview of research methodology and pertinent literature, this article analyses the mechanics of power-sharing in war elimination and peacebuilding. Integrative reviews allow for the inclusion of empirical, practical, and theoretical data related to a research phenomenon which appear to be the case with power-sharing and peacebuilding. The literature reviews mainly undergirded by Lijphart consociationalism model on power-sharing. Peer-reviewed articles and other retained literature were ordered, coded, categorized for data analysing.

III. RESULTS

Power-sharing as war termination in Nepal

Power-sharing agreements have short term and long term objectives. Power-sharing as war termination deals with negative peace what Johan Galtung talked about the absence of violence. In the context of Nepal power-sharing shifted the Nepal civil war to the representative democracy system. Usually, parties are willing to power-sharing because of two reasons. It could be mutually hurting stalemate or power-sharing offers BATNA than the outcome they will reach by victory. Agreed on power-sharing both government and Maoists bound to follow competitive multiparty democratic governance system. Basically, elect members for CA through a free and fair election.

Both parties agreed to adopt economic, political and social transformation to manage the society damaged by conflict. Specially Maoists could taste the political, economic and social benefits which they cannot reach by continuing the conflict. “[E]nding the current centralized and unitary form

of the state in order to address the problems related to women, Dalit, indigenous people, Janajatis, Madheshi, oppressed, neglected and minority communities and backward regions by ending discrimination based on class, caste, language, gender, culture, religion and region" (Comprehensive Peace Accord, 2006:04). Furthermore, there was policy implementation to end all forms of feudalism through social transformation and policies to protect and promote national resources, right to education, health, housing, employment, food security, and economic protection for socially and economically backward labourers and farmers (Comprehensive Peace Accord, 2006).

Nevertheless, the Maoists agreed for power-sharing because of their hidden agenda to get reputation from the world. "By declaring the ceasefire, the Maoists are trying to take a political initiative to compensate for their military losses, the seven-party alliance agitating against the regime, and gain popular national and international sympathy" (Dev Raj Dahal, 2005:05). According to Chandra D. Bhatta (2012) the Maoists were so clear about what they want from it. That's why when they agreed for power-sharing they have given priority for constitution, not for the peace process. They initiated the peace process just after they get power in the central government. "The Maoists have been floating one proposal after another as a tactical move, to which the other mainstream political parties have reacted passively" (Chandra D. Bhatta, 2012:05). To make trust in them Maoists have handed over their weapons and properties which they have captured during the insurgency time (Chandra D. Bhatta, 2012).

The term grand coalition has been used by many conflicted societies to bring those rebels into the political mainstream and find solutions for their demand through compromising and negotiation. While taking into account the above concepts it's obvious that people will to coalition depends on their interest and hidden agendas. Therefore, though the concept of the grand coalition is helpful to sustain peace, due to parties' desire to fulfil their interests it will be unable to achieve its goal.

Power-sharing as peace-building in Nepal

The conflict between the Maoists and Nepal government ended on November 2006 with both parties agreed to sign a peace agreement. The thought has given a long time for parties to integrate; still, Nepal is facing challenges to move with the peace process. After a long discussion with the local and international actors have identified five components should be addressed in the peacebuilding program. They are, ensure the rule of law, create the conditions for inclusive economic growth, enhance access to basic and services, transform political culture, and ensure socio-economic inclusion (Nisha Pandey, 2011).

Since the end of the Cold War, many countries like Burundi, South Sudan and also Nepal identity-based or

consociational power-sharing have partial peace after a long time of war. (Timothy D. Sick, 2013). All the parties who involved with Nepal peace processes like major political parties, civil societies and the international community had faith that this will be a great chance for them shift to peaceful politics renouncing armed (Dev Raj Dahal, 2005).

According to Chandra D. Bhatta (2012) both donors and civil societies have no common plan and idea about peace-building in Nepal. While donors blaming for ethnic tensions and inciting violence, civil groups separated along partisan lines and was not a success as a mediator between state and society. Even there was no effective cooperation between the private sector and civil society. These all sorts of reasons have made democracy weakened the state.

Further, Chandra D. Bhatta (2012) government of Nepal has to cope with a political and constitutional crisis. Governance could not able to achieve their main political objectives. Thought the monopoly has changed to the political parties' still armed non-state actors, party-wings and their relative organizations are spoiling office with their terms and rule of the game. These weakening institutions has given space for security vacuum, violate the rule of law, undermined human right, cultural impunity, backward development, less foreign investment and economic development and corruption.

Hence, there is no party willing to sustain peace, extending war termination to consociational power-sharing; it is hard to think about a better future for Nepal. As they still couldn't agree on what kind of federalism they going to introduce in Nepal they have unable to transform social, economic, cultural, and political sectors.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

How did power-sharing contribute to war termination in Nepal?

Nepal has ended the 10 years old civil war by peace agreement, not by the military victory. The reason behind the rebel Maoists group to sign a peace agreement with the major government party was the benefit they get signed the agreement was higher than what they will receive by the military victory. They have found that the best way to bring their ideology to the nations and also international is giving up arms and enter the political mainstreams.

By doing so, both parties agreed to implement a free and fair democratic electoral governing system in Nepal and through that Maoist could able to enter the democratic political system and find political solutions for their problems. Ending the civil war through power-sharing has decentralized Nepal political power addressing problem-related to women, Dalit, indigenous people, Janajatis, Madhesis, oppressed, neglected and minority

communities and backward regions through compromise. Indeed, eliminate all kinds of discrimination against humanity, such as discrimination based on class, caste, language, gender etc.

Does the Theory of Consociational Power-sharing Apply to Nepal?

Nepal has met some of the four features suggested by Lijphart by his consociational power-sharing. Many scholars like Lijphart, has found multi-ethnic societies need federalism. As Nepal also multi-ethnic country Lijphart's consociational theory can continue for long-lasting peace. Before the implementation of consociational theory, there was no such system in Nepal society. Consider about 1990 constitutions there is no power decentralization and Nepal has introduced as the Kingdom of Nepal. That's mean all the economic, social, political power centralized under the king hegemony. Though 1990 constitute included elect members for 'house of representatives' through the election; it was differing from the 2007 interim constitution. Under the 1990 constitution if none of the party able to achieve majority support his majesty can appoint prime minister considering only which party got more support. But in the 2007 constitution, there is a chance for a grand coalition if none of the party able to get 2/3 of the votes in the ballot. Especially there was no quota representation in the 1990 constitution like the 2007 interim constitution.

Consider about factors caused for Nepal conflict it's not only due to the tension of discrimination. There is another type of horizontal inequalities. Therefore, just changing the political system of democracy or introducing federalism Nepal cannot achieve sustainable peace through the power-sharing process. All the strategies made for peace and development should be taken into account economic, social, and cultural factors. Otherwise, though the in terms of political setting Lijphart theory fit into Nepal context, it won't be successful in terms of durable peace and development.

When introducing consociational power-sharing theory to Nepal society, people believed that demobilizing from the monarchy regime it can bring democratic federalism. But breaking their all hopes political actors started to act to attain their political will other than a national will. Some of the decision was made by CA without a referendum. Therefore, people lost their trust in the current political system.

Yubaraj Sangroula (2009) has listed major mistakes and weakness has done by political parties during the peace process.

i.) The psyche of Sovereign Entities: The political parties obliged to accept they are representatives of the people than sovereign entities. The best example for this kind of behaviour is the interim constitution of 2006. It was a contract between seven-party alliance government and CPN-Maoists instead of Nepali people.

ii.) CPA as an Agreement between Government and CPN-Maoist: parties signing the agreement were failed to realize that they are the negotiation for people in Nepal. It has become a political contract between government and rebel party.

iii.) CA Election not a Platform of Consensus: CA election used for political benefits rather building a consensus for a 'new Nepal'.

iv.) Glorification of Violence: Political parties didn't prepare for democratic parties for electoral competition. Violence was used to win the election and political leaders used youth arming them for political purpose.

Due to these all the reasons thought the consociational theory match to the Nepal society still Nepal was unable to practically implement those four components in their society. In Nepal, political, economic, and social power was enjoyed by main caste groups especially Brahman. Culturally, there is some group call untouchable group. Those people together with other ethnic and caste groups, suppressed for long years until Nepal becomes free from the king's regime. Therefore, consociational power-sharing give acceptance in society without discriminations.

Nepal has experienced a democratic deficit, as the new leader failed to establish democracy by encouraging a combination of representation and accountability. The concept of federalism presented in Nepal today reflects the failures of the past and the decisions that will bring real political and economic power to local governments. The left and the right oppose the federal government and claim to create a deep agency. Some people think that over time the land will disappear completely. Although widespread, the challenge is to use the federation as an opportunity to promote participatory participation and responsible accountability for Nepal's economic progress and social well-being. These problems stem from several structural barriers. Such as, the insular political parties have not expanded their outreach and become more inclusive and decentralized; the state does not recognize historical marginalization enough based on the destruction of political and economic identity, and; lack of facilities or presence and/or autonomy has reduced in government services. At the same time, political parties have no experience in operating effectively governing public agencies and bureaucrats to improve the services available. According to this study, Nepalese believe in multiple democracy, but less political parties. This contradiction must be reduced to increase the legitimacy of the agreement the political system itself; Enable social movements to affect political party reform; Devolve state functions to the local level, and; Further research on legitimacy particularly on how important are the economic benefits to the legitimacy of the administration? And there is Macroeconomic impact is a political concern for the national dimension of Nepal.

I. References

- Adhikari, B. (2014, April). *Legitimacy and peace process from coercion to consent*. (A. Ramsbotham, & A. Wennmann, Eds.) *Accord*, 134.
- Adhikari, J. (2013, December 15). ekantipur. Retrieved from <http://www.ekantipur.com/the-kathmandu-post/2013/12/15/editorial/come-together/257006.html>
- Ashild Falch., Jason Miklian. (2008, May). A Transitional Success Story: The Nepali Experience with Power-sharing. CSCW.
- Bhatta, C. D. (2012, February). Reflections on Nepal's Peace Process. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 4.
- Bishwakarma, M. (2013, November 04). Conflict and consensus. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from ekantipur: <http://www.ekantipur.com/the-kathmandu-post/2013/09/03/oped/conflict-and-consensus/253181.html>
- CIA. (2015, May 12). Central Intelligence Agency. Retrieved from [cia.gov: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/np.html](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/np.html)
- Comprehensive Peace Accord. (2006, November 22), Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Dahal, D. R. (2005, December). Nepal: Changing Strategies of the 'People's War'. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 6.
- Falch, Ashild; Miklian, Jason, (2008, May). A Transitional Success Story: The Nepali Experience with Power-sharing. CSCW.
- Fearon, James D.; Laitin, David D; (2007). Civil War Termination. American Political Science Association (p. 49). Chicago: Stanford University.
- Interim Constitution of Nepal, 2063(2007), English translation by UNDP: Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Jaiswal, P. (2015, February 13). Nepal: Political Rivalries Stymieing Constitution-Making – Analysis. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from Eurasia: <http://www.eurasiareview.com/13022015-nepal-political-rivalries-stymieing-constitution-making-analysis/>
- Lawoti, M. (2005). Towards a Democratic Nepal: Inclusive Political Institutions for a Multicultural Society. New Delhi: Saga Publication India Pvt Ltd.
- Leslie, K. D. (2013, December 09). Nepal 2013 Constituent Assembly Election Final Results (without PR lists) and Collected Information. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from Bambuddhism in Nepal: http://lesliechand.blogspot.be/2013/11/2013-nepal-constituent-assembly_19.html
- Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in Plural Societies*. London: Yale University Press.
- Mehler, A. (2009, May 27). Peace and Power Sharing in Africa: A Not So Obvious Relationship. *African Affairs*, 21.
- Pandey, N. (2011). Insights: International Institutions, Aid effectiveness and Peacebuilding in Nepal. *International Alert*.
- Papagianni, K. (2007). Power-sharing: A conflict resolution tool? *Oslo Forum Africa*, 11.
- Sangroula, Y. (2009, June 20). Peace Process in Nepal: Successes and Failures from Jurisprudential Perspectives.
- Sick, T. D. (2013). Power-Sharing in Civil War: Puzzles of Peacemaking and Peacebuilding. *Civil Wars*, 7-20.
- The Interim Constitution, Election to members of the Constituent Assembly Act. (2007), English translation by UNDP: Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Toft, M. D. (2010, Spring). Ending Civil Wars: A Case for Rebel Victory. *International Security*, 32, 7-36.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project has been possible with the cooperation, support and kindness of many people. I express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Stef Vandeginste for his continuous guidance and insight throughout the research with a great deal of suggestion on my analysis regularly. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to all my Nepali friends who deserves thanks for providing me valuable information and materials on the various aspects of the peacebuilding in Nepal. I am wholeheartedly thankful to my colleagues who supported and encouraged me throughout this entire endeavour.

Lastly, but in no sense the least, my gratitude goes to my family who inspired, encouraged and provided their priceless assistance from the beginning of this research.