

Understanding Social movement in Nepal: A general perspective

Mohan Das Manandhar
Executive Director, Niti Foundation

“Together you and I will begin to build the new society, a society in which each of us has the chance to grow, to achieve, to contribute, to create dignity for ourselves, and not for ourselves alone but for others also; a society in which each of us has a stake, a share; and we will give back to our children what they deserve – a heritage of hope”

– Tony Blair, April 1997

The above lines encapsulates everyone’s dream- a society that all would envision for. A collective action, effort of all (together) can bring about this change. This collective action and behaviour of people shapes and produces social movements which results to social change. These social movements manifest in various forms and shapes. Some takes the form of a revolutionary upsurge or peaceful agitation, others takes form of political violence, nationalism, or guerrilla warfare.

Nepal has experienced four major social movements in last 70 years resulting in changes in social and political structure of the country in 1951, 1979, 1990, and 2006 (BS. 2007, 2036, 2047 and 2063). Characteristics of these social movements of Nepal indicate resistance of people against the sState. Gellner D N (2003: 3-4) defines forms of resistance as:

- 1) struggles within the elite, when factions within political parties fight for dominance, or political parties themselves represent different sections of elite;
- 2) opposition to the activities of the State on the part of ordinary people, or exploitation of its mechanisms to personal advantage;
- 3) opposition to the whole basis of the State based on explicitly political ideologies, expressed in underground movements and sometimes violent resistance;
- 4) full-scale and open rebellion, which happens only occasionally.

There are other schools of thought on the type and reasons of social movements that have occurred in Nepal. And there is various ways of thinking and understanding them. Respecting diversity and differences in defining social movements of Nepal by various scholars, in this paper I have tried to sketch social movement of Nepal based on collective action frames. Benford and Snow (2000) assessing framing processes and social movements writes, “ the recent proliferation of scholarship on collective action frames and framing processes in relations to social movements indicates that framing process have come to be regarded, alongside resource mobilization and political opportunity processes, as a central dynamic in understanding the character and course of social movements”.

In this paper I have tried to answer the following questions on social movement:

- 1) What does social movement mean?
- 2) How social movement is conceived, takes shape, evolves and brings social change?
- 3) What does social change entail?

Social Movement - definitions

Social movements are a type of group action. They are large informal groupings of individuals and/or organizations focused on specific political or social issues, in other words, on carrying out, resisting or undoing a social change.

The term "social movements" was introduced in 1850 by the German Sociologist Lorenz von Stein in his book *History of the French Social Movement from 1789 to the Present* (1850).

Charles Tilly defines big social movements as a series of contentious performances, displays and campaigns by which ordinary people made collective claims on others [Tilly, 2004]. For Tilly, social movements are a major vehicle for ordinary people's participation in public politics [Tilly, 2004:3]. He argues that there are three major elements to a social movement [Tilly, 2004]:

1. **Campaigns:** a sustained, organized public effort making collective claims of target authorities;
2. **Repertoire:** employment of combinations from among the following forms of political action: creation of special-purpose associations and coalitions, public meetings, solemn processions, vigils, rallies, demonstrations, petition drives, statements to and in public media, and pamphleteering; and
3. **WUNC displays:** participants' concerted public representation of worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitments on the part of themselves and/or their constituencies.

Sidney Tarrow defines [Tarrow, 1994] a social movement as collective challenges [to *elites, authorities, other groups or cultural codes*] by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interactions with elites, opponents and authorities. He specifically distinguishes social movements from political parties and advocacy groups.

Tilly argues that the early growth of social movements was connected to broad economic and political changes including parliament-ization, market capitalization, and proletarian-ization. [Tilly, 2004] Political movements that evolved in late 18th century, like those connected to the French Revolution and the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791 are among the first documented social movements, although Tilly notes that the British abolitionist movement has "some claim" to be the first social movement (becoming one between the sugar boycott of 1791 and the second great petition drive of 1806). The labor movement and socialist movement of the late 19th century are seen as the prototypical social movements, leading to the formation of communist and social democratic parties and organizations. From 1815, Britain after victory in the Napoleonic Wars entered a period of social upheaval. Similar tendencies were seen in other countries as pressure for reform continued, for example in Russia with the Russian Revolution of

1905 and of 1917, resulting in the collapse of the Russian State around the end of the First World War.

Zald and McCarthy (1997:1217-18) defines social movement as “a set of opinions and beliefs which represents preferences for changing power elements of the social structure and /or reward distribution of a society.”

Melnci, proposes a definition of social movement as a “specific class of collective phenomena which contains three dimensions.... [it] is a form of collective action which involves solidarity... [it] is engaged in conflict, and this in opposition to an adversary who lays claims on the same goods and values.... [it] breaks the limits of compatibility of the system that it can tolerate without altering its structure” (1989: 29)

These definitions emphasizes at least four aspects of social movement dynamics as suggested by Mario Diani (2002:165):

- a) networks of informal interaction
- b) shared beliefs and solidarity
- c) collective action on conflicting issues
- d) actions which displays largely outside the institutional sphere and the routine procedure of social life

Framing Process of Social Movement and Social Change

The concept of frame as used in the study of social movements is derived primarily from the work of Goffman (1974). For Goffman, frames denoted “schemata of interpretation” that enable individuals “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” occurrences within their life space and the world at large (p. 21). Frames help to render events or occurrences meaning and thereby function to organize experience and guide action.

Collective action frames are constructed in part as movement adherents negotiate a shared understanding of some problematic condition or situation they define as in need of change, make attributions regarding who or what is to blame, articulate an alternative set of arrangements, and urge others to act in concert to affect change.

Snow & Benford (1988) refer to these core framing tasks as “diagnostic framing” (problem identification and attributions), “prognostic framing,” and “motivational framing.” They further states “since social movements seek to remedy or alter some problematic situation or issue, it follows that directed action is contingent on identification of the source(s) of causality, blame, and/or culpable agents. This attribution-al component of diagnostic framing attends to this function by focusing blame or responsibility. Prognostic framing, the second core framing task, involves the articulation of a proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack, and the strategies for carrying out the plan. Motivational framing, the final core framing task, provides a “call to arms” or rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive.”

Political parties and/or social organizations, formal or informal, operating in legal framework of state or outside it, and/or working in available political space or creating one, take lead in defining frames for social movement.

Social Movement and Change during 1920 - 1951

The social movements during early 1920s in Nepal, according to the collective behavior approach, were the symptom and manifestation of a weak society and lacked conditional form of political and social participation. These early social movements were part of political process initiated by elite and educated class of urban areas of Nepal who were deprived of participation in the political process and were influenced by democratic movement of India.

The leaders of social movement of 1920 - 1951 explicitly defined diagnostic framing (problem identification and attributions), by accusing the Rana regime of illegitimately capturing state power and resources through treason, blaming them for being oppressive sponsoring terror in society and projecting people to being slaved. The leaders also articulated prognostic framing (proposed solution to the problem) as making Nepal as modern democratic nation. Dahal D R (2004) suggests that the concept of democracy provided Nepalis a "reference point" to interpret their negative conditions of life and transcend those circumstances through empowerment solutions, involving their self-organization into social groups and political parties. Efforts to overcome political alienation from the status of *raitis* (subjects) and recognition as *nagrik* (citizens), was the source of social and political movements. These efforts were also aimed to bridge the gap between the "objective conditions" of peoples' existence and their own subjectivity, as sovereign citizens. Dahal further points that the social reform movements, which started in the late 1920s, broke the wall of silence, contested the power of the Rana oligarchy founded on primordial ancestry, expressed various forms of domestic disaffection and envisioned the possibility of making Nepal a fairer and democratic nation.

The leaders organized motivational framing ("call to arms" or rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive) in line to overthrow of Rana regime through violent resistance including armed revolution. As a result the social movement took shape of reform and violent resistance to overthrow oppressive regime.

Dahal (2004) describes the movement as political "the political movements of the late 1940s, where many social movements were infused, aimed to create a civil or constitutional state capable of realizing the needs and freedom of people. The rebellious spirits of critical mass released the pent-up feelings of the citizens and violated all social taboos and restrictions aiming to contribute significantly to the creation of a liberal political culture. In that sense, the popular upsurge of 1950 tried to introduce the concept of modernity conforming international conscience for a change from a feudalistic set up to a pluralistic form of governance. That was the beginning of a political culture of weakening kinship ties, caste system, local community, and the questioning of religious authority and tradition.

The social movement of 1920s did bring many reforms. Dahal (2004) elaborates on such reform “They invoked the lessons of classical Hindu-Buddhist treatises—*Vedas, Ramayan, Mahabharat, Bhagawat Geeta, Arthshastra*, etc. to awaken the Nepalis from slumber, helped to invent their own karma and renew their élan vital, the living energy. Nepali society embraced the influence of Gangetic belt and Tibet and was interacting with other systems, generating consciousness for fellowship and breaking the chain of ignorance, powerlessness and inequality. Hindu-Buddhist conception of *sanatan dharma* (cosmological order) holds that people are committed to a highest order interest in living with others in order to attain nirvana. Behind each specific reform, such as abolition of child marriage, granting formal rights to people, stopping immolation of widows, introduction of political education through *gurukul* and *sastrartha* (discourse), etc. lay a desire to replace self-serving familism of ruling culture with an ethic of service and responsibility to reshape the nation. After the application of modernity and democracy in Nepal in the late 1940s, *dharma* lost some of its public utility and became a matter of concern only to those involved in spiritual quests.”

There was a visible social change after 1951. The expansion of non-military state activity began to extend to the recent past, military organization moved from a dominant, autonomous segment of state structure to a more subordinated position as the largest of several differentiated departments under control of a monarchy institution supported by civilian administration. During the Panchayat regime, which lasted for 30 years, the Nepali state spent time trying to anticipate popular demands of the State, rebellious movements, risky collective action, and the spread of new organizations. With the installation of direct rule of the king came the creation of systems of surveillance and reporting that made local and regional administrators responsible for prediction and prevention of movements that would threaten State power or the welfare of its chief clients. The state installed and regulated national systems of education, organized aid to the poor and disabled, created number of class based organizations, built and maintained communication lines, imposed tariffs for the benefit of home industries, and other economic activities. It also expanded elite based bureaucracy to include various ethnic people and initiated social mobilization of rural hill people to integrate the process of creating national identity through promotion of national language, culture, and religion. The State’s sphere expanded far beyond its military core, and citizens began to make claims on it for a very wide range of services including security, production and distribution of goods and services. Creating state owned industrial enterprises using foreign aid and investing in public utilities, the state controlled and monopolized economic and development activities, and were able to generate employment for many educated youth and control market and money circulation. The State banned all political parties in an effort to de-politicized the citizenry, but there was no independent agency to check the power of the State. However, the increased activities of underground political parties, unions of students and teachers, literary societies and cultural associations fuelled political and social movement.

Analysis of change in Newar Community gives specific pattern of social structural change. After 1951, the State abolished mandatory rule for specific caste (as defined by Muluki Ain) in Newar community to specific profession eg. Manandhars (except those who are working advisor to the Ranas) were only allowed to do specific business such as oil expeller, selling food, clothes and drinks (alcohol) etc. Once this barrier was removed after 1951 by the State as a result of social movement, specific castes within Newars explored their potentials in various sectors: business,

trade, bureaucracy and other knowledge professions. As a result social mobility (social hierarchy, economic and political power) among castes group started to emerge. In addition, the specific caste groups formed associations that meant to provide social services to their groupings such as Central Manandhar Association bringing various forms of traditional institutions such as *guthis*, cultural groups, and religious committees together through representation. The association was formed on the democratic norm rather than religious or traditional one.

Social Movement and Change during 1960 - 1990

The social movement after 1970s was mainly focused against direct rule of the King. King Mahendra took power in 1960 by throwing BP Koirala an elected prime minister after 18 months of tenure as prime minister of the elected parliament which came to power through the 1959 national election. King Mahendra established party-less Panchayat polity which attempted to institutionalize equality by abolishing discriminatory code of country Mulik Ain. The regime tried to create systems of surveillance and reporting by regional administrators who were responsible for prediction and prevention of movements that would threaten State power. The State also created a number of class-based organizations and directed and implemented development programs, including the creation of public enterprises. The regime was able to generate employment for youth and tried to-albeit artificially-re-organise the composition of the largely elite-controlled bureaucracy to include people from different ethnic and caste backgrounds. The regime also initiated social mobilization of rural people all aimed to “integrate” the process of creating national identity through promotion of national language, culture, and religion. Political parties were banned, an attempt to de-politicise the citizenry to prevent any challenge to the power and legitimacy of the regime. There was, however, no independent mechanism to check the excesses of the State. Meanwhile, activities of underground political parties, student unions, teachers, literary societies and cultural associations flourished despite the ban on forming organizations and social movements. The movements of 1970s came into being to fill the vacuum created by the absence of independent entities to check and balance government.

The social movement led by political forces (which were banned and were working underground) redefine diagnostic framing of 1951 movement accusing of Rana regime to King, accusing King of usurping power through overthrow of elected government in 1960. However, the social movement was diverted by the State through manipulation of Janamat Sangrah, with majority of vote to monarchy system legitimatizing Panchayat polity and King’s rule. However, the movement brought social change and continued to fuel social movement.

The social movements of late 1980’s , as the ‘new social movements’ interpret it, had both the symptoms of, and solutions to, the contradictions inherent in the modern bureaucratic society. It also articulated the tension between the expanding spheres of human autonomy and growing regulations inherent in the party-less Panchayat system. During this period, the society in urban areas started to change from traditional to modern society due to growing participation of urban educated class in economic ventures and the influence of western culture. Traditional society values social relationships which tend to have an affective component -personal, emotional, and

face-to-face, which is a constraint in the process of developing efficient relations of production via a market. However, in modern societies the social relationships are neutral and impersonal, detached and indirect, which makes possible efficient market relationships. After 1990, due to expansion of schools, people did receive education, mostly up to secondary level, however, these "educated" rural mass did not get employment - as they were aspiring to be employed in organizations rather than being "farmers". This social change has created discrepancies in civil society and social order which produced new social interests which are not incorporated by social order. Thus, the nature of social movements and their main cause - the discrepancy between civil society and social order - produced new, unsatisfied social interests. Therefore, the "urban" social movements which were not only a reaction to the discrepancies, but were also an attempt to change the social order in correspondence with the civil society which also strengthened and intensified the political movement that restored democracy of the country in 1990.

Likewise, Newar community after 1951 started language movement against States' nation building process of *Nepalisation* (one nation, one dress) and *Sanskritization* (one king, one language policy). Newar leaders define diagnostic framing by accusing the State of depriving people of speaking their mother tongue and enhancing their local culture. Newar leaders articulated prognostic framing by stating that all languages will have same status and offering Newars "Nepal Sambat" as national sambat (calendar). The movement was organized under a social network – Manka Khala, which included political parties' wings, their leaders and also social organizations working for Newar communities. This has helped organized Newar communities for mobilization against the State.

As the movement took pace, political leaders started shaping the movement. They redefined the diagnostic framing accusing the State of monopolization of polity, authoritarian monarch and leading country to economic disaster. Similarly, at the same time advocated for the restoration of democracy by offering a multiparty democracy as a solution (prognostic framing) to the problems and ills party-less Panchayat system brought to Nepali society.

In this light, the Nepali society is divided into two social groups: those who own State property (the bureaucracy) and those who do not own State property and are exploited by the owners of State property. The second group comprises all those outside the State bureaucracy. The popular movement of Nepal to restore democracy in 1990 has been influenced by first social groups. On the other hand the social movement that has come about during last 12 years of democratic government has been fuelled by drastic social changes in the rural communities of Nepal which has been influenced by second group of people, who are outside the state bureaucracy.

Social Movement and Change during 1990 - 2006

The pace of social change increased drastically after the restoration of democracy in Nepal in 1990. Some of the visible changes are:

- Rise of intellectual class and politicians having access to government resources, beneficial positions in the public offices, and rewarding political "voice". Suddenly a group of intellectuals and politicians, who were anti-nationalist in Panchayat regime, become powerful. However, their exclusive policy left rural communities and ethnic groups in

despair. Most of these newly emerged political class engaged in their “political” debate in seminars, forums and speeches in the cities and were rich within a decade.

- Disorganization of the rural family due to either huge emigration of individual family members abroad and/or massive emigration of whole families from the rural villages to urban cities. As a result, the youth-less rural societies could not harness resources or neglected opportunities, which hampered agricultural productivity and economic development of societies.
- Change of gender roles in rural communities due to extensive and numerous social mobilization carried out by political parties and various development agencies, The huge emigration of men from the rural villages which has called for new and different social structure and social relationships.
- Less employment opportunities for rural youth due to less jobs in civil services, sickening State owned enterprises and domination of politics in all subsystems depriving them of autonomy and growth. The frustrated youth had nowhere to go except to immigrate to other countries or gang up with insurgents.
- Legitimacy for ethnic groups and religious organizations with an upsurge of organizations representing rights of ethnic groups and promoting various different religions and were recognised and given legal rights to operate freely. These organizations went into full force with various activities to bring their "voice" to be heard by society because for years the differences of different castes, ethnic and marginalised groups were suppressed in the name of National harmony. Nepal's social composition is made of various small groups of different caste and ethnic background and the conflict was hidden in the cover of harmony.

The politicisation of State apparatus by the political parties for their partisan interested resulted in fragmentation of government structure and system resulting degeneration of individual performance and declining public services, and deteriorating implementation of development activities. The democratic government’s social policy was defected because the legal system was arbitrarily dominated by politics; rights remained illusory, social policy, like everything else, was ideologically loaded; and all measures were developed without citizens' participation or control or any attempts at consensus building. Poverty or unemployment, that did not correspond with official ideology were ignored and were not addressed.

After 1990, Newar community were rewarded through acknowledging the need to accept ethnic rights by political parties. The then prime minister of interim government K P Bhattarai came as the chief guest to celebrate “Nepal Sambat” procession organised by Manka Khala. After few years in 2000, the government declare Shankha Dhar, who started Nepal Sambat as national figure. The language movement of Newars gave impetus to the initiation of ethnic movement in Nepal, which by 1998 had become a visible force in political and social space of Nepali polity. However, the language movement of Newars did not take higher pace as the leaders of movement joined various parties. The main leader of language movement of Newar community became Minister in UML government. But there were various social groups that were established by Newar community for protection and promotion of various cultures of specific groups of

Newars such as Jyapu Mahasang, Shakya Association, Sesya Samajh etc. which started claiming for their identity and rights.

Even though constitution of 1990 gave multiparty democracy to people, it was under constitutional monarchy. This limited political parties to organise society in defined political ideologies. The political polarisation of society was very weak. The communist and social democrats were not able to exert their influence or demand for defining economic and social programme of the government in political ideological lines. Faith based ideology promoted by monarch remained influential in the States activities. Economic liberalisation did change lives of middle class citizens of urban cities. To promote people's participation and narrow the widening gap between the government and the governed the various Act such as District Development Act, Municipality Act, and Village Development Act of 1991 and Local Self-governance Act of 1998 was introduced. The Acts relies on people's participation in the process of governing as envisaged by the Constitution. Despite these developments political stability and rapid economic growth has eluded the country and the initial euphoria at the restoration of democracy of the people especially people of rural areas quickly dissipated. The expectation of the central bureaucracy that public policies for social reform, for reducing inequalities resulting from gender, caste, etc. through the political process to bring social change, was rather, far fetched. The Judiciary, State Media, and Election Commission remain centralised.

The State did bring policies to empower excluded group – Women, Janajati (Indigenous communities) and Dalit. The government formally recognizes 59 indigenous communities. However, the State did not recognize “Madhesi” as excluded group. Government tried to organise excluded movements in these groups and co-opt them in the state apparatus. Like language movement of Newar community, most of the right focused movements of excluded groups were diluted as a result of cooption by the State through public polices. However, these organized groups (of excluded communities) organized by government could not address issues of excluded people from rural areas or of marginalized people. As a result people began to organize in micro groups and federating in district and national level associations. They have progressed beyond being organizations only responsible for serving their communities through service delivery to pressure groups advocating for rights.

Grassroots organizations of present Nepal perform wide variety of welfare, socio-economic activities and reform activities for their members. The majority of grassroots organizations (user groups) are working for socio-economic activities for various themes including forest, health, water, and micro-credit. The study on group-based organization in Nepal by Biggs et. all indicates that there were about 400,000 groups out of which 200,000 were of micro-credit groups. Number of registered cooperatives has grown to 9362 (Statistics on Nepalese Cooperative Societies & Unions, Government of Nepal, Ministry of Agriculture & Cooperatives, Department of Cooperatives, 2007, July 9) as of the record up to April 13, 2007, compared to 830 in 1990. With the increase in number, cooperatives have diversified their involvement in micro & medium level enterprises.

¹ Report: An Exploratory Study of Gender, Social Inclusion and Empowerment through Development Groups and Group-Based Organization in Nepal: Building in the Positive by Biggs S, Gurung SM, Messerschmidt D, Novemeber 2004

These group-based organization created national and district associations promoting and advocating of their rights, benefits and identity. The national organizations that were established through movement for right of excluded (women, janjati and dalit) also expanded their membership creating various grass root organizations working for rights of people in rural Nepal. These groups focused on reforming social structure on the basis of human right and democratic principles. Manandhar MD (2008) suggests that these organizations initiated social movement on social democratic principle “These new upcoming ‘reform oriented” organizations were involved in creating awareness among general public about their rights (for example “janjati” groups representing indigenous peoples social movement for civil rights), in empowering poor and marginalized in raising their “voices”, fighting for oppressed and disadvantage (for example , “dalit” organization involving empowered Dalits seeking to remove the yoke of discriminatory and dehumanising traditional practices), promoting equity and participation in governance (for example “poor farmers” groups involved in movement of poor farmers seeking land rights as tenants and smallholders). Success of these “reform oriented” right-based grassroots organizations in the process of democratization has brought two distinct dimensions in the development process: social mobilization and advocacy – result social transformation”. The third stream of grass root organization emerges to promote and protect human rights of the people as a result of Maoist violent insurgency. These right based organizations were working as buffer between the State and insurgents and protecting common people from atrocities of the State’s oppression and Maoist violence. The growth of these grass root organization did help provide services and justice people were aspiring for.

These grass root organizations became vehicle for social movement for change. Dahal DR (2004) view that these grass root micro groups stirred new social movement on social democratic lines “In fact, there are deep stirrings at the grassroots, the upsurge of previously marginalized and excluded section of people, generating real hopes for the regeneration of democratic politics which is also capable of stimulating social transformation. Inspired by the highest level of consciousness, the new social movements reflect a horizontal series of groups struggling against penetration, fragmentation, exclusion and atomisation of society. Based on the ideology of democratic pluralism these groups are socializing, mobilizing and politicizing people's identities, activities and relations and are seeking to cast vertically integrated Hindu-Buddhist caste society into a new form.

The period after 1990 which saw a growth in the civil society organizations, which combined with the rights to organize politically and free expression, has also initiated the discussion of caste and ethnicity-based discrimination. Members of groups excluded from power and decision-making began to organize and demand rightful representation, which some said was lower than that during the Panchayat period (Yadava, 2006). There were also little changes in the Hindu social order, which was protected by the State by declaring Nepal as a Hindu Kingdom in the constitution.

Advocacy against social exclusion and discrimination and demands for rightful representation and inclusion marked 1990s but the political parties and successive governments largely ignored the demands. The accumulated grievances that were unaddressed made way for new political space which was used by a splinter from two communist parties -- –United Peoples’ Front (UPF)

and Communist Party Nepal (CPN), Mashal² -- to reorganize as the Nepal Communist Party (Maoist) and launch its "People's War". The Maoist insurgency encouraged participation of suppressed and marginalized communities both in their fighting forces and also as heads of "People's governments" formed during the conflict (Gellner, 2007 and de Sales, 2008).

Political instability marked the mid-1990s, which was also conducive for the expansion of the social movement fuelled by the Maoists insurgency. Initially, the ruling political parties largely dismissed insurgency as a law and order problem until it eventually grew to become the foremost challenge facing the new democracy. This period also witnessed a transition in the monarchy after the royal massacre on June 1, 2001. The insurgency has spread across Nepal by the turn of the century and in November 2001 the government sent the army to fight and "disarm" the Maoists.

In an attempt to ride the political instability, King Gyanendra (enthroned in 2001) assumed political power through bloodless coup in February 1, 2005. The initial political opposition to the reintroduction of direct royal rule was placid but it eventually gathered strength and the King was eventually forced to concede in April 24, 2006. This came following 19 days of joint protests of the political parties and the Maoists, who had agreed on a common struggle against the monarchy. The same agreement also committed to establish an inclusive State and hold an election of a constituent assembly to write a new constitution.

Maoist party were successful in defining diagnostic framing for movement by organising grievances and difficulties people faced. Accusing the State for social exclusion, inequity and injustice became the core reason for the movement. They also articulated prognostic framing – offering constitutional assembly and Republic state as a solution. Additionally they offered autonomous state for the ethnic groups with right to self determination. The leaders also organized motivational framing ("call to arms" or rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive) to change the face of Nepal (creation of new Nepal) through open rebellion including violent armed revolution.

Social exclusion is said to occur when a group is excluded "from rights or entitlement as a citizen, where rights include the social rights to a certain standard of living and to participation in society" (HRD, 1997). The movement sensitized rural and urban people analyze society from "social exclusion" paradigm suggesting that Nepali citizens were excluded from exercising their rights on the basis of their social identity in terms of caste, ethnicity, race and gender. Discrimination and violence against individual citizens of these identified groups nurtured by the State has been the foundation of social exclusion. Dr. Harkha Gurung (2006), prominent social scientist and planner articulated exclusion as "State advocacy of Hindu religion relegates the Janajati, ethnics and other non-Hindus as peripheral subjects. Cast system perpetuates untouchability that inhibits the right to equality of Dalit.... In addition, there is the Madhesi

² Both of these communist parties advocated for republic Nepal during 1990 People's Movement. Though UPF participated in first general election and became third largest party in parliament, there was major confrontation within party and split away group of this party boycotted second general election for republic Nepal. On the other hand, CPN Mashal boycotted all post 1990's election for republic Nepal but there was major confrontation within party on armed revolution. Split away group supporting armed revolution in CPM Mashal joined with split away group of UPF and formed Communist Party Nepal, Maoist started armed revolution in 1995.

community being discriminated on regional basis." The State created structural barriers in access to state resources, justice and services to these identified socially excluded groups: women, janjati, madhesi and religious and linguistic minorities.

As a result of the movement, the parliament was reinstated which curtailed the power of the King (May 18, 2006) and the first meeting of the newly elected Constituent Assembly (CA) declared Nepal a republic on May 28, 2008. King Gyanendra accepted the CA decision to end the institution of monarchy on June 11, 2008. The constitution was supposed to be promulgated in May 2010, however, the deadline has been extended till May 2011.

The issues of social exclusion and representation had now become central to the political transformation and state-building process. This was also a period of establishing identities and institutionalizing group-based demands. This has been central to the post-2006 public discourse (Gellner, 2008 and Mishra, 2007). The period also witnessed several identity-based movements and voices for autonomy and self-determination. Protests in the Terai following the promulgation of the Interim Constitution (January 2007) led to the establishment of a new political dynamic, with the formation of new parties for representing the Madhesi identity. The Maoists emerged as the largest party in the Constituent Assembly election held in April 2008, and two of the Madhesi parties emerged as the third and fourth largest political forces. The Constituent Assembly, today has representation of Nepal's different ethnic and other social groups (including women and Dalits) in numbers that were never known before (Hachhethu, 2008) and social exclusion and inclusion have been central in the constitution writing process.

Hachhethu Krishna (2009) concludes "the Nepali state has long existed as an exclusionary entity. Some of its attributes have begun changing as a result of the ethnic and regional movements. The ethnic and regional movements began with an assertion for identity and have resulted in the transformation of some basic characteristics of the Nepali state. Nepal has changed from a monarchy to a republic, from a unitary to a federal state, from a Hindu kingdom to a secular state, from a country with a one language to one with a multi-language policy, and from an exclusionary to an inclusive state.

Ethnicity and regionalism are no longer subjects discussed by only academics and activists. The political parties and government have taken the rights of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and Madhesis as agenda for their broader mission of restructuring the Nepali state. The ball is now in the court of the CA. Its diverse composition, both ideologically and in caste/ethnic terms, also suggest the competing and conflicting interests that are contesting. The aspirations of different stakeholders need to be addressed at three levels."

The Newar community leaders have shifted their focus of their movement towards demanding for a Newa Autonomous State. Swayata Rajya Manka Sangharsa Samiti – Working committee for demanding autonomous state was established in 2008. This committee was represented by three main political party (Congress, UML and Maoist) and Nepa Rastriya Party, and six social groups which represent Newar communities, trying to create a common platform for political party leaders from different political ideology to further their movement towards demanding autonomous state on the basis of identity.

The constitution is still being finalized and the issue of the State's restructuring has not been resolved yet. The aspiration and grievances of people need to be addressed and economic progress to be attained to immediately.

Hence, the pattern of occurrences and nature of the social movements of Nepal does point to new social movement that will demand for defining Nepali Nation and call for social democratic state with economic prosperity. This movement may evolve and become a force within 5 years if following condition prevails:

- Constitution is not promulgated in stipulated time or constitution that is promulgated is not owned by all political parties and various movement (of excluded group) actors.
- Border between India and Nepal is formally closed and has same political status as border between Nepal and China.
- Many countries send Nepali migrant workers for various geopolitical reasons.
- The intensity of polarization of society in line of political ideologies (between Marxist – Maoist and liberal capitalist, between Marxist and Identity politics, and between national and regional Madhesi parties) by political parties turns violent

Conclusion

Termed by the German Sociologist Lorenz Von Stein, social movement is a type of group action in which individuals and/or organizations focus on a specific political or social issue to carry out, resist or undo a social change. It is a result of ordinary people making collective claims on others especially those in authorities through contentious performances, displays and campaigns.

The study of social movements uses the concept of frame which enables individuals to locate, perceive, identify and label occurrences within their life space and the world. Frames help to understand and give meaning events or occurrences and thereby function to organize experience and guide action. Collective action frames are made to provide guidance and understanding of some problematic conditions to the movement followers. It also helps them negotiate the need for change and assign the person or element to be blamed and express alternative set of arrangements and advocate to others to act together to affect the desired change. Very often than not, political parties and/or social organizations, formal or informal, operating in legal framework of state or outside it, and/or working in available political space or creating one, take lead in defining frames for social movement.

Nepal has experienced four major social movements in last 70 years resulting in changes in social and political structure of the country in the years 1951, 1979, 1990, and 2006 (BS. 2007, 2036, 2047 and 2063). Starting from overthrowing of the Rana Regime by the elite and educated class of urban areas of the country who were deprived of participation in the political process and were influenced by democratic movement of India, social movements in Nepal has been a manifestation of a weak society that lacked conditional form of political and social participation. Likewise, the 1970s movement came into being to fill the vacuum created by the absence of independent entities to check and balance government. The 1980s social movement had characteristics of a modern bureaucratic society which reflected the tensions between the

expanding spheres of human autonomy and growing regulations inherent in the party-less Panchayat system. On the other hand the social movement that has come about during last 12 years of democratic government has been fuelled by drastic social changes in the rural communities of Nepal which has been influenced by second group of people, who are outside the state bureaucracy.

Four years after the last major social movement, Nepal awaits the finalization of the constitution. The growing dissatisfaction among the general public needs to be addressed immediately and economic progress to be attained. In the light of previous social movements, the idea of a new social movement seems to be boiling under which will demand for defining Nepali Nation and call for social democratic state with economic prosperity. This movement may evolve and become a force within a short time period as five years mainly if the constitution is not formalized and owned by all political parties and various movement actors along with other reasons.

References:

- Bhattachan, Krishna B. Discourse on Social Exclusion and Inclusion in Nepal: Old Wine in a New Bottle. in Social Inclusion Research Fund ed. *Identity & Society: Social Exclusion and Inclusion in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point. 2009.
- Dahal, Dev Raj. "New Social Movements in Nepal," The Organization, July-December, 2004.
- Diani, Mario. "The Concept of Social Movement," Kate Nash ed. 2000. Readings in Contemporary Political Sociology, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. Ltd. 2000.
- Gellner, David N. 2008. Introduction: Transformation of the Nepalese State. in David N. Gellner *Resistance and the State: Nepalese Experiences*. New Delhi: Social Science Press.
- Gurung, Harkha. *From Exclusion to Inclusion: Socio-Political Agenda for Nepal*, Social Inclusion Research Fund, Kathmandu, 2006.
- Hachhethu K., Yadav LB and Gurung D. *Nepal: State and Ethnicity*, Research Report, Social Inclusion Research Fund. 2010
- Manandhar MD. "Grassroots Organizations as Dynamic Vehicles for Socio-Economic Transformation in Rural Nepal". Article in The Organization. March 2006,
- Snow DA, Benford RD. Framing Process and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Rev. Sociol.*26:611-39. 2000
- Tarrow Sidney, *Power in Movement: Collective Action, Social Movements and Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 1994
- Tilly Charles, *Social Movements, 1768–2004*, Boulder, CO, Paradigm Publishers, 2004 262 pp
- UNDP. Nepal Human Development Report 2004: UNDP. 2004
- Yadava. Ram P. Caste/ Ethnic Representation in His Majesty's Government at Policy Level in Nepal. in *From Exclusion to Inclusion: Socio- Political Agenda for Nepal*. Kathmandu: Social Inclusion Research Fund. 2006.