



Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin

LDN Bulletin Special Issue 2005



Proceedings of the Liberal Democracy Nepal
(LDN)
Workshop on

*Opportunities and Challenges
For
Nepali Political Parties
October 20-24, 2005
Washington, DC (USA)*

**Nepal Study Center
The University of New Mexico**



**Proceedings of the Liberal Democracy Nepal (LDN)
Workshop on**

*Opportunities and Challenges
For
Nepali Political Parties
October 20-24, 2005
Washington, DC (USA)*

Nepal Study Center
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Table of Contents

About LDN	3
Workshop Planning Committee	6
Acknowledgements	7
Workshop Declaration	9
Summary of the Workshop	11
APPENDIXES	21
Appendix –1: Opening Remarks by Prof. Alok K. Bohara	21
Appendix –2: A Challenge for Political Parties to Create a Conducive Environment for Peace and Democracy in Nepal (<i>Kul Chandra Gautam</i>)	25
Appendix –3: Conflict Resolution: Way Forward (<i>Murari R. Sharma</i>)	36
Appendix –4: Nepali Diaspora’s Support for Democracy in Nepal (<i>Shyam D. Karki</i>)	41
Appendix –5: Short introduction of the Nepali Delegates	47
Appendix –6: Brief Bios of Speakers/Moderators/Coordinators	48
Appendix –7: Program Outline	52
Appendix –8: Description of the Thematic Sessions	61
Appendix –9: Guidelines for Moderators	63
Appendix –10: Pictures Highlighting the Workshop	65

Liberal Democracy Nepal Forum

The LDN project (<http://www.liberaldemocracynepal.org>) is a result of a productive collaboration between the Nepal Study Center (NSC, <http://nepalstudycenter.unm.edu>) of the University of New Mexico (UNM) and the members of the North American Nepali Diaspora.

The academic focus of the Center and its intellectual asset and research base at UNM has helped LDN become a dynamic forum for thoughtful exchanges on the issues of development and democracy. The LDN forum derives its scholarly strength from its affiliation with these academic entities and participation by various scholars and policy makers, and its grass roots members.

This forum is dedicated to conducting broad-ranging dialogue and discussion among Nepal scholars and practitioners on issues relating to the transformation of the state, politics, and social institutions in Nepal in a way that addresses key long-term causes of authoritarianism, conflict, and societal instability. The areas of our concern are prioritized according to the following initial scheme: *Crisis in Nepal, Fundamental Reforms, and External Role*. The 26- member LDN Policy Council takes pride in LDN's academic connections and scholarly networks, but highly values work with policy relevance.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is the objective of this site?

The Liberal Democracy Nepal project is an attempt by the Nepali Diaspora in North America to engage with Nepali political leaders (with or without party affiliations), policy makers, civil society members, grass-roots activists, and academicians within a common forum to promote liberal democracy in Nepal. The key idea is to open, moderate and maintain a continuous dialogue on the topic among a wide cross-section of people from Nepal and abroad.

2. How does this site define liberal democracy?

We seek to answer the age-old question posed by democracy: What are the rights and powers of the minority in a system based on majority rule? Liberal democracy ensures competitive elections and guarantees social justice and liberty to the citizens. The preamble in our

web site reads, “A liberal democracy... is protected by checks and balances among and separation of power between legislature, government and judiciary. It consists of good governance supported by strong institutions and guarantees personal and economic freedom, individual liberty, social justice, and protection of ethnic and political minorities. The rule of law is an intrinsic and fundamental value and practice in a liberal democratic system. Most importantly, the government under liberal democracy derives its legitimacy only through the will of the people.”

3. Who are the people supporting this site?

This site has been created by members of Nepali Diaspora in North America assisted by many well-wishers of Nepal. The Nepal Study Center of the University of New Mexico provides academic strength and opportunities for educational outreach and research capability on Nepal. Nepali leaders from various parties representing a wide spectrum of political ideologies, experienced policy makers, academicians, thinkers, and grass-roots workers are listed as those who will support the growth of this site and work towards the dissemination of ideas generated here. Most importantly, it is the hope of the creators of this site that practicable ideas emerging from these discussions will be implemented in Nepal. It is an evolving concept, and we will make every effort to be inclusive in incorporating a wide cross-section of Nepali society and well-wishers of Nepal. It is just a beginning.

4. Is this in any way affiliated with a political party or faction in Nepal?

No. The Liberal Democracy Nepal forum initially garnered support from individuals affiliated with seven political parties in Nepal, representing a wide spectrum of ideologies. Their names and political affiliations are currently displayed in the Advisory Members section. This list is neither selective nor exclusionary. We will continue to reach out and invite input and participation from all others.

5. How do I become a registered member of the Liberal Democracy Nepal forum?

The membership to the LDN forum is open to all. You can become a member by completing a new member registration form. Registration is required to participate on the discussions, to post comments, and to ask questions. You must provide your real name and a valid email address to become a member. Your real name will be displayed on the discussion forum along with your comments/posts, but the email address will be

hidden to protect your privacy. Your email will not be given to any third party and will only be used to notify you about news/announcement/comments related to the Liberal Democracy Nepal forum.

6. How does the information collected on the LDN site's forums get disseminated?

Materials coming out of the LDN forums, including constructive comments and other submissions from contributors, will be selected for publication in the Nepal Study Center's electronic publication *Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin* (LDNB). This electronic publication system uses the University of New Mexico's Digital Space repository system known as Dspace.

This open access Dspace repository goes out to hundreds of universities around the world and is easily accessible from Nepal as well. The Dspace network is growing very rapidly across the university libraries around the world. LDNB is a venue for scholarly publication on the issues of development, democracy, and social change. One unique feature of the LDNB publication is that it publishes the main feature articles and a few select constructive comments from the readers. Thus, the LDN Bulletin tries to create a bridge between the academicians, policymakers, and the grass roots people. The electronic LDNB publication intends to release at least two issues per year with several articles in each issue. The quality of the LDN Bulletin will be maintained through a screening process.

(Excerpts from LDN FAQ. Contact: Alok K. Bohara, PhD, Professor, Department of Economics, Nepal Study Center, University of New Mexico:
<http://nepalstudycenter.unm.edu> and Liberal Democracy Nepal Forum:
<http://www.liberaldemocracynepal.org>)

Workshop Planning Committee

Coordinators:

Dr. Alok K. Bohara

Dr. Ambika P. Adhikari

Dr. Anup Pahari

Dr. Shiva Gautam

Dr. Gaury Adhikary

Mallika Shakya

Girija Gautam

Naresh Koirala

Puru Subedi

Sharda J. Thapa

Suman Timsina

Bishal K.C.

Prakash Adhikari

DC Coordinating Committee:

Puru Subedi

Dr. Sugandha Tuladhar

Bishal K.C.

Dr. Anup Pahari

Madhu Panthi

Editorial Board:

Dr. Pramod Mishra

Dr. Ambika Adhikari

Dr. Alok K. Bohara

Dr. Mukti Upadhyay

Dr. Vijaya R. Sharma

Sharda J. Thapa

Suman Timsina

Roger Adhikari

Prakash Adhikari

Moderators:

Dr. Anup Pahari

Dr. Mahendra Lawoti

Dr. Shiva Gautam

Dr. Gaury Adhikary

Dr. Ambika Adhikari

Dr. Alok K. Bohara

Dr. Mukti Upadhyay

Suman Timsina

Floor Moderators:

Dr. Mukti Upadhyay

Dr. Vijaya R. Sharma

Dr. Tara Niraula

Event Sponsors:

National Democratic Institute, Nepal Study Center, Aditya Jha, LDN

Acknowledgements

Members and friends of the Liberal Democracy Nepal (LDN) forum joined hands with the National Democratic Institute (NDI) to conduct a workshop on *Opportunities and Challenges for Nepali Political Parties* in Washington, D. C. on October 22-23, 2005. The representatives of six political parties; Nepali Congress (Dr. Ram S. Mahat, Chakra P. Bastola), Communist Party of Nepal UML (Jhalanath Khanal, Ashok Rai), Nepali Congress–Democratic (Dr. Minendra Rijal, Bimalendra Nidhi), Rastriya Prajatantra Party (Dhruba Pradhan), Jana Morcha Nepal (Pari Thapa), Nepal Sadbhavana Party (A) (Anil Jha), who were on a visit to USA, were invited for a face to face interaction on the present political crisis in Nepal. A prominent Nepali human rights activist Mr. Padma Ratna Tuladhar was also in attendance. The LDN organization expresses its appreciation to these individuals for their time and cooperation.

This workshop would not have been possible without strong support from LDN members and friends, some who flew in from various parts of the country. LDN expresses its gratitude towards numerous friends and members for their hard work organizing the event and running the sessions as moderators. Importantly, LDN thanks the participants for bringing out the declaration of the eight-point recommendations.

This NDI/LDN joint program in Washington D.C. was made possible by contributions from NDI, LDN and the Nepal Study Center (NSC). LDN is grateful for the generosity of Mr. Aditya Jha in supplementing the resources for this program.

The Washington Nepali community generously supported a part of the program, while many LDN members have provided personal financial support. The DC Coordination Committee (DCCC) and local volunteers played a significant role in the planning and implementation of the program. The Baltimore America Nepali Association (BANA) organized a town hall meeting in Baltimore to allow the local community to have an open forum with the delegates.

LDN expresses its gratitude to UN Assistant Secretary-General and Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF, Kul Chandra Gautam, Senior

Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin, Special Issue, 2005

UN official Samuel Tamrat, and former Nepalese ambassador to the UN, Murari Sharma for the panel on the UN role.

Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin (LDNB), the journal of the Nepal Study Center at the University of New Mexico, is pleased to produce a special issue 2005 of the workshop proceedings. It acknowledges the efforts of the LDNB editorial members in the publication and dissemination of the proceedings.

Finally, publication of the proceedings as a special issue of Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin (LDNB) has been made possible by several individuals: Dr. Pramod Mishra, Roger Adhikari, Dr. Ambika Adhikari, Dr. Alok K. Bohara, Dr. Mukti Upadhyay, Dr. Vijaya Sharma, Sharda J. Thapa, Suman Timsina, and Prakash Adhikari. Special thanks go to Dr. Pramod Mishra for summarizing the thematic discussions of the workshop.

Sincerely,

LDN Management Board

Dr. Alok K. Bohara, Dr. Ambika Adhikari, Dr. Anup Pahari, Bishal K.C., Dr. Gaury Adhikary, Girija Gautam, Mallika Shakya, Naresh Koirala, Prakash Adhikari, Puru Subedi, Sharda J. Thapa, Dr. Shiva Gautam, and Suman Timsina.

Workshop Declaration

A workshop on *Opportunities and Challenges for Nepali Political Parties* was conducted in Washington, D.C. by Liberal Democracy Nepal (LDN) on October 22-23, 2005.

The workshop was attended by the representatives of six political parties: Nepali Congress, Communist Party of Nepal UML, Nepali Congress–Democratic, Rastriya Prajatantra Party, Jana Morcha Nepal, Nepal Sadbhavana Party (A). In addition to the delegates of the six political parties, prominent Nepali human rights activist was also in attendance.

The Workshop consisted of four moderated thematic sessions as described in the summary. The Nepali delegates, LDN moderators and participants, deliberated in depth several aspects of these themes that included restructuring of the state, social justice, and inclusive party polity and a negotiated settlement.

On October 23, 2005, workshop participants agreed to recommend the following items as the Workshop Declaration:

- 1) Concerted efforts to protect human rights and civil liberties in Nepal;
- 2) Immediate restoration of multi-party democracy in Nepal, and full support for ongoing movement for democracy;
- 3) National sovereignty to rest fully with the people of Nepal;
- 4) People to decide the role of the monarchy;
- 5) The CPN (Maoists) to commit to lay down arms and pledge unconditional commitment to multi-party democracy, and pluralism, and respect for human rights;
- 6) The political parties to commit to full internal democracy, inclusive people-centered politics and healthy democratic practices.
- 7) A negotiated settlement of the current conflict; and
- 8) Explore all possible support for bringing the three protagonists for a peaceful resolution to the current conflict.

The participating members of Nepal Diaspora included several members of LDN, friends of LDN, community leaders and many invited participants from the Washington metropolitan area and elsewhere in the USA.

On October 29th, the Baltimore America Nepali Association (BANA) organized a town hall meeting to allow the local community to have an open forum with the delegates. The political leaders gave their perspective on the current political situation in Nepal. Their presentations were followed by a lively question and answer session between the delegates and town hall meeting attendees.

This publication brings together proceedings of the workshop.

Summary of the Workshop

Overview

Liberal Democracy Nepal (LDN), affiliated with the Nepal Studies Center, University of New Mexico, collaborated with the Washington-based National Democratic Institute for International Affairs to organize a two-day workshop on “Opportunities and Challenges for Nepali Political Parties” in Washington, D.C. This workshop was held from October 22 to 23, in which delegates from Nepal engaged in dialogue with LDN members and guests from many parts of the United States and Canada.

The Nepali delegates included Chakra Bastola and Ram Sharan Mahat from Nepali Congress; Minendra Rijal and Bimalendra Nidhi from Nepali Congress (Democratic); Dhruva Pradhan of Rastriya Prajatantra Party; Anil Kumar Jha of Sadhbhavana Party (A); Pari Thapa of Jana Morcha Nepal; Jhalanath Khanal and Ashok Rai of the United Marxist Leninist (UML) Party and the noted independent human rights activist, Padma Ratna Tuladhar. Through an interactive format of the workshop, the LDN members and colleagues held open discussions with the leaders of the Nepali political parties. Emphasis was to hear from the Nepali delegates their perspectives on the current Nepali political crisis and possible solutions.

The workshop began with a dinner reception hosted by the National Democratic Institute at its premises on October 21 and ended with a dinner by Kul Chandra Gautam, assistant secretary general of the United Nations.

The two-day workshop consisted of four sessions,

1. Parties Dealing with the Monarchy and Royal Nepal Army,
2. Parties Dealing with the Maoists,
3. Parties Managing the Movement for Democracy, and,
4. Parties Managing Themselves.

These sessions provided a forum for an interactive dialogue between the Nepali delegates and the LDN members and guests. Each session began with selected Nepali delegates speaking briefly on the main topic of the session, representing their personal as well as organizational

views, followed by a set of questions posed to the Nepali delegates by moderators from the LDN members. At the end of each session the floor was opened for the participants to ask questions to the delegates.

Two special sessions followed these interactive sittings. The first dealt with resources available for democracy and development in Nepal. Alok Bohara presented the highlights about the Nepal Study Center at the University of New Mexico. Former Nepali ambassador to the UN, Murari Raj Sharma spoke about different alternatives of conflict resolution in Nepal. Nepali IT entrepreneur, Aditya Jha provided his remarks on economic development in Nepal. Samuel Tamrat, a senior UN officer spoke about the UN experience in dealing with internal negotiations in a country. Shyam Karki, a community leader presented his views on the various community groups and organizations that may be interested in supporting peace and democracy in Nepal.

At the end of this session, a workshop declaration highlighting the common points of agreements was adopted.

After the formal workshop Assistant Secretary General of the UN, Kul Chandra Gautam gave a keynote address entitled “A Challenge for Political Parties to Create a Conducive Environment for Peace and Democracy in Nepal”.

Opening Session (Saturday, October 22, 2005)

In the opening of the workshop, Alok Bohara, founder of the Nepal Studies Center and a professor at the University of New Mexico, and Anup Pahari, LDN Management Board and D.C. workshop organizing committee member, welcomed the participants and highlighted the objectives of the workshop. On behalf of the Nepali delegates, Padma Ratna Tuladhar commended the members of LDN and their colleagues in the US and Canada for organizing this important workshop. He hoped that this interaction would help to find solution to Nepal’s ongoing crisis, which has escalated to the extent that it might even invite the unthinkable foreign intervention.

After the introduction of the participants around the table and in the audience, Aditya Jha, a successful Nepali entrepreneur in Canada, spoke about the purpose of the workshop. He said that one of the objectives of the meeting was to develop a common understanding of the

issues facing Nepal at the moment. He expressed that if the Nepali delegates took back to Nepal even one or two actionable items, the workshop would be a success. He ended his remarks by saying that such workshops also built social as well as human capacity required for democracy and development in Nepal.

Thematic Session I: Dealing with the King and the Royal Nepal Army

Gaury Adhikary and Shiva Gautam moderated² this session. Minendra Rijal, Dhruba Pradhan and Jhalanath Khanal spoke.

Chakra Bastola (Nepali Congress) expressed astonishment at the fact that King Gyanendra in his speeches mentioned only his ancestors as the unifiers of Nepal, ignoring the contributions of others in the process. Mahendra Lawoti asked whether what King Prithivi Narayan Shah had done was a unification or conquest. Upon which Minendra Rijal, the US-educated leader of Nepali Congress (D), said that Nepalis should not get stuck in the idea of either sharing the spoils of the past or assigning blames for past actions. He advised that we should take Nepal as it exists and proceed to build a democratic and prosperous Nepal that is inclusive for all Nepalis.

When some political leaders suggested that if the King stands as an impediment to democracy, it's time to do away with the monarchy, an audience member raised a question of Nepali parties' preparedness in handling a kingless state, given the display of internal bickering by political leaders during the 12 years of multiparty system. Mr. Bastola expressed that such generalized statements do not help in pin pointing a problem or solving it. He said any charges should be specific to individuals and events so that they can be investigated.

Dhruba Pradhan of RPP outlined the position of his party on the palace and the RNA. He criticized the King for using RNA to impose his direct rule, even though the situation in 2005 was ripe for the King's take over of power. He made it clear that contrary to popular perceptions, RPP is not a King's party. However RPP believes in constitutional monarchy.

Minendra Rijal said that RNA should not be the shadow of the King. So far in Nepali history, the Army has been controversial only

² The function of moderators was to frame and ask probing questions to the delegates.

during autocratic rules. However, emphasizing the importance of the Army as a national resource, Rijal said that the Army should be modernized for the 21st century Nepal. Ram Sharan Mahat (Nepali Congress) added that the Army should comprise only career officers rather than the King's appointees and that its recently expanded size (from 55 thousand to 90 thousand) should be brought down to the pre-insurgency level.

Padma Ratna Tuladhar, the prominent human rights activist, claimed that during the years of multiparty democracy in Nepal, no political party made any effort to democratize the Army. He said that if we had a constituent assembly, provisions should be made to demobilize the Army away from the king. He asserted that if it is accountable to the Parliament, the King couldn't take cover of the Army. Jhalanath Khanal added that the Army should be inclusive of different ethnic groups in Nepal. To which, Anil Jha, leader of Sadhbhavana Party (A), said that there should also be a Madhesi battalion to protect national interest.

Pari Thapa, leader of Jana Morcha Nepal, and Jhalanath Khanal (UML) made powerful arguments about the role of King in acting against democracy. Khanal said that Nepali monarchy, though 1500 years old, has in the past 60 years fought the democratic forces on every occasion. For example, the monarchy deceived the Nepali people in B.S. 2007, 2014, 2035, 2046 and 2061. Khanal asserted that monarchy never worked for national unity and that the present democracy movement against the monarchy is the final fight. Ashok Rai (UML) saw the Nepali monarchy as an anachronism, as it is not based on merit and is not accountable to anyone.

Pari Thapa, who frequently regaled the audience throughout the workshop with his word play and witticisms, did not see any need of a professional army in Nepal. Instead, he believed in civilian defense as practiced in Switzerland and Costa Rica.

It was clear both from the delegates' remarks and the audience questions that a consensus was developing among the Nepali leaders about the need to abolish Nepali monarchy if it continues to impede democracy. It was the delegates' perception that at least the monarchy should be brought strictly under the constitution and should have extremely limited powers. The Nepali leaders also envision drastically restructuring the Royal Nepal Army so that it is loyal to the people rather than to the palace.

Thematic Session II: Dealing with the Maoists

Anup Pahari and Mahendra Lawoti moderated and Ram Sharan Mahat, Ashok Rai and Padma Ratna Tuladhar spoke at this session.

Moderators' questions and speakers' comments focused on the causes of the insurgency, the attraction for violence as a means to solve problems, and the ways and means of negotiating a peaceful settlement.

Ashok Rai, Jhalanath Khanal, Pari Thapa, and Ram Sharan Mahat used such words as extremist thinking, extreme ambition, deviant, and terrorists to describe the Maoists and their insurgency in Nepal. They did not see the rise of the Maoist movement in Nepal solely as a result of socio-economic disparities. Had it been so, said Ashok Rai, they would have had their movement even during the Panchayat era. The Maoists used differences among political parties and the palace to consolidate and solidify their movement. Because they have become an irreconcilable force, constitutional assembly may be the only way out. Rai, Mahat and Tuladhar agreed that there is no military solution to the conflict (although the Army needs to compel the Maoists to come to the negotiating table), for only a democratic political process can solve the insurgency.

While agreeing that a political solution is the only way out, Tuladhar offered a slightly different perspective on the insurgency. He believed that because of rampant poverty and deep-rooted social ills, the Maoists were able to persuade many people to support their movement. He stated that even though the government wanted a peaceful settlement of the conflict, two attempts to negotiate with the Maoists have failed. Therefore, a peaceful solution still remains elusive.

A question was asked that given the spread of a violent insurgency all over the country, why Nepali people have been attracted to violence to advance their issues. Ashok Rai did not see any innate attraction for violence and offered the example of his own party in the past resorting to violence but renouncing it after realizing that it did not work. Tuladhar suggested that those people who do not believe that peaceful dialogue would resolve their issues resort to violence. Therefore, in order to address the problem, such people must be assured with some evidence that their grievances would be heard and addressed through peaceful means.

Mahat agreed that constitutional method could be the answer to all grievances.

To Anup Pahari's question, "How do you resolve the arms issue of the Maoists during the constituent assembly phase?" Rai and Mahat suggested that UN participation would build the confidence and solve the problem. Tuladhar said that the Maoist leader Prachanda has assured that under UN supervision, his party would give up arms.

A question was put, "Is there an established process of conducting dialogue with the Maoists?" Mahat said there was none. Low-key conversations with the Maoists have recently begun at the party presidential level. Tuladhar said that a dialogue is going on between the Maoists and the seven-party-alliance, which offers the insurgents an opportunity to talk to them and provide for a soft landing. However, there is a need for facilitation for the dialogue between the parties and the Maoists. Minendra Rijal added that despite the fact that the Maoists have adopted terrorist means, they have nonetheless raised many important socio-political issues. For the sake of the well being of the country, they and their issues can't be ignored.

Thematic Session III: Managing the Movement for Democracy

Ambika Adhikari and Suman Timsina moderated this session. Anil Jha and Jhalanath Khanal provided the initial remarks in response to the moderators' questions.

The session focused, among other issues, on coordination and common grounds among the seven-party alliance, the generally apathetic participation of the general public in the movement, the implication of increasing civil society leadership and possible involvement of the Nepali Diaspora in the movement.

Sadhbhavana Party representative Anil Jha emphasized the success at finding common cause with the civil society, the political parties, Diaspora and even the Maoists. Khanal added that since the February 1 takeover by the king, the movement has assumed a new shape by finding common ground with various democratic forces, including the many ethnic groups in Nepal, to end the autocratic monarchy and to establish democracy.

A question was put, “Why have the general public not joined the movement en masse?” Anil Jha said that people’s memory of the misdeeds of the parties in the immediate past might be one of the reasons. On the other hand, Ram Sharan Mahat suggested that because the Maoists control most of the districts and villages, preventing non-Maoist party activities, people have not been able to organize outside of Kathmandu. He also stated that politicians have to be accountable for their remarks and deliver when they assume power, whereas civil society is pretty much free to make any demands at any time.

But what was lacking in people’s large-scale participation has been made up to some extent by Nepali civil society’s active involvement for the restoration of democracy in Nepal. Chakra Bastola and Jhalanath Khanal agreed that political parties no longer have the monopoly over the movement because civil society and even the Diaspora have now taken over the leadership from the political parties, and the parties need to recognize the fact and change accordingly.

A question was placed, “Do the parties have any data base of the Diaspora and do they have a plan to mobilize the Diaspora to help the democracy movement?” Even though the political delegates acknowledged the significance of growing number of Nepalis living abroad, they could offer no specific plans or structure about how to go about tapping into the enormous energy, resources and interest of the Diaspora in the democracy movement. However, Ashok Rai suggested that statements from the Diaspora in support of the movement, opinion pieces, letter campaigns, etc., play a crucial role in influencing public opinion abroad for the movement of democracy in Nepal. The movement needed this support because nobody knows how long and how much suffering it will take to restore democratic rights to the people in Nepal.

Mahendra Lawoti asked the leaders to be proactive rather than reactive, and Gaury Adhikary said that the seven parties should appoint representatives to coordinate with the Diaspora. Pari Thapa suggested a long-term plan for the movement, saying that revolution is not like fighting because there is no immediate victory. In order to make the movement more effective, political parties need systematic networking with the Diaspora.

Session IV: Parties Managing Themselves

Mukti Upadhyay and Alok Bohara moderated and Chakra Bastola, Pari Thapa and Bimalendra Nidhi of Congress (D), spoke at this session.

At the outset, Denise Baer, a National Democratic Institute representative and expert on political party management, presented her theoretical paper on how political parties function. She provided an overview of internal management within the parties, resource mobilization for the parties and described an effective organizational structure of the parties. She emphasized how important it is to practice modern management techniques to make the parties more effective, accountable and transparent.

For the leaders of Nepali political parties, especially those that had been in power at one point or another during the 12-year multiparty system, the session raised some tough questions. LDN members and guests, while fully supporting the political parties' efforts to restore democracy, perceived high stakes in how the parties would perform in the future. Their questions ensured that the parties understood their concerns and carried new ideas and fresh visions back to Nepal. While Bastola and Nidhi, despite acknowledging the mistakes of the past years due to short experience with governance, said that the parties did not need to apologize to the people, Minendra Rijal favored an apology in order to move forward with the efforts to restore peace and democracy in Nepal. Pari Thapa interjected some humor on what kind of apology was required of the parties.

Pari Thapa summarized the salient features of Nepali political parties. He said that they were neither organized nor professional; narrow vision and paranoia guide their policies as well as practice. The first generation still dominates the leadership with outdated ideas. He observed that political parties were still run by a feudal and autocratic mindset. He felt that the leadership emphasizes brainwashing of the cadres rather than brainstorming for new ideas and fresh vision. Bastola agreed and said that political parties are presently going through a transition, from the complacency and charismatic leadership of the past to a mass-based leadership and the challenges of the future.

Bimalendra Nidhi, on the other hand, felt that new generation of leaders runs his party, although full internal democracy does not prevail

there even now. One of the results of the new generation of leaders at the helm is that the party favors the federal system in Nepal, he added. The speakers also raised issues of proportional representation and inclusion of women, various nationalities, and Dalit communities in the higher echelon of leadership in the parties.

Mukti Upadhyay raised the issue of party break up and indiscipline. This is where both Bastola and Nidhi, whose parties had been in power for much of the 12 years, insisted that there was no need for apology. However, for Bastola, some correction was needed and, for Nidhi, concrete policies and programs will replace apology.

When Alok Bohara asked about reforming the internal management of the parties, Bastola said that restructuring of the state would require reorganizing the internal workings of the parties. In the past, rulers saw the people as subjects, and party leadership often emulated it. He expressed that the parties need to get out of this mentality. To which, Bohara proposed a Political Party Development Index (PPDI) to measure party's performance that could encompass such features as Gender Bias, Ethnicity, Competitive Election Versus Reliance on the Nomination Process, Frequency of Convention, Term Limits, Participatory Decision Making, and Financial Transparency. The speakers generally agreed, although Bastola said that the election process itself would take care of the problem.

In response to a question about the representation of various groups in Nepali parties, Jhalanath Khanal remarked that even among the LDN members and guests at the workshop, there wasn't a single woman present.

In their concluding remarks, the speakers acknowledged the need for the parties to change because old ways of doing things will not work any more. The parties are confronted with new and ever more complex challenges.

On a number of occasions, both at the workshop and at the town hall meeting in Baltimore³, the audience members raised the issue of

³ A town hall style open meeting was held in Baltimore in the evening on October 22nd. It was organized by Baltimore America Nepali Association (BANA). This was conducted by Mr. Dilli Paudyal, and was attended by several dozen participants from Baltimore and the Washington DC area.

parties' concrete manifesto or blueprint or white paper for the future. They wanted some solid evidence that would convince the Nepali people that business as usual will not happen. Furthermore, the issue was raised that if the parties were given the reins of power again, would they conduct themselves differently from how they did in the past 12 years. But the political leaders did not present any specific blueprint or white paper for the future.

The thematic sessions ended here on Sunday, and the two special sessions that followed - Resources for Conflict Resolution and Democracy in Nepal and Analysis of the Nepali Crisis and Possible UN Role - involved speakers who were experts in their respective fields.

Dr. Alok Bohara, Professor of Economics at the University of New Mexico, briefly acquainted the audience with the workings of the Nepal Studies Center at the University of New Mexico. He highlighted the publications of two journals, *Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin* and *Himalayan Journal for Democracy and Development*. Mr. Aditya Jha, a Nepali IT entrepreneur from Toronto, spoke on the need to revolutionize the IT sector in Nepal in order to modernize and make Nepal prosperous as well as opportunities for economic development. Speaking about resources for democracy and conflict resolution, Murari Raj Sharma, former Nepali Ambassador to the UN, addressed the need for UN involvement in conflict resolution in Nepal. A UN conflict expert, Samuel Tamrat, also made a presentation and joined the panel discussion. Finally, Dr. Shyam Karki, former Vice President of the NRN ICC and a community leader in the Nepali Diaspora organizations, presented an overview of the Nepali Diaspora resources in North America and its contribution to Nepal.

One of the highlights of the workshop was the keynote address by Assistant Secretary-General of the UN and Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF, Kul Chandra Gautam. He offered some possible ways to resolve the Nepali crisis and provided recommendations for each protagonist of the Nepali political quagmire.

Appendix-1

Opening Remarks by Prof. Alok Bohara

Honorable guests, LDN members and its friends;

It is my honor to stand here in front of you and share my thoughts, and I am grateful for this opportunity. On behalf of the 26 LDN Policy Council Members, the vast network of friends of LDN, and the Nepal Study Center at the University of New Mexico, I would like to thank co-host NDI and welcome you all. I would also like to thank NDI, LDN Council Members, and the Nepal Study Center for their financial contributions to this workshop.

The LDN project is a result of a productive collaboration between the Nepal Study Center (NSC) of the University of New Mexico (UNM) and the members of the North American Nepali Diaspora, many of whom are here today. The academic focus of the Center and its intellectual asset and research base at UNM has helped LDN become a dynamic forum for thoughtful exchanges on the issues of development and democracy. The LDN forum derives its scholarly strength from its affiliation with these academic entities and from participation by various scholars, policy makers, and concerned citizens both from here and in Nepal.

NSC is also grateful towards some of the panel members (Mr. Pari Thapa and Dr. Ram S. Mahat) for their scholarly contributions they made to the first issue of the Liberal Democracy Bulletin journal. My casual observation convinces me that the Nepali Diaspora in North America collectively has formed a network of social institutions, and there is a vast amount of signaling and informational exchange among the participants. The resulting dynamic spillover effects of a Diaspora have been found to occur through various channels.

Scholars have identified three different categories. In addition to “monetary remittance”, they find the “social remittance” playing an important role in shaping social norms, understanding, and expectations with far-reaching economic and political consequences for the homeland. The third one is being the conventional “knowledge transfer”.

This workshop is an example of “social remittance”. To that end, many members of the Nepali Diaspora are grateful to those who worked very hard for the successful passing of the NRN ordinance, which gives us the visiting rights.

But, we are hopeful that the governments of Nepal will begin to look at us broadly and change the restriction in the ordinance accordingly by valuing our complementarities that go beyond the financial investment.

It is understandable that not all institutions within these networks are alike. There are numerous social associations and organizations with different shapes and forms, such as: ANA, NRN, ANMA, NAFA, NAC, PAC and the list goes on. Often, entries of new members into this network are triggered by major events, like the February 1st.

Examples include: interaction programs, petitions writing campaigns, blogs, lobbying, radio programs, email discussion groups, new political organizations, rallies, and e-magazines. Some will have a short-term goal, and others, like the Liberal Democracy Nepal forum, have been formed with a long-term vision in mind to have a continuous debate on development and democracy.

Nevertheless, these activities with useful spillover effect can provide “social remittance” to Nepal, and also signal to civil society and the leaders in Nepal: “You are not alone in this struggle.”

I also would like to take this opportunity to appeal to our own Diaspora that these institutions within the social network in North America shall not be treated like adversaries regardless of who organizes them. They should be treated as complementarities.

As far as the current state of affair is concerned, the bottom line is that the road to democracy is wide with many lanes, and all hands small and big are needed to move the big boulder. This workshop is just one of those lanes. The goal is the same: restoration of democracy in Nepal and move the country away from violence and towards peace and prosperity.

The Nepal Study Center has launched several academic initiatives and the Liberal Democracy Nepal forum is a piece in the puzzle. The LDN approach may be more deliberative, reflective, and academic, but the

goal is the same: *help create a democratic, stable, peaceful, inclusive, and prosperous Nepal.*

Our primary concern here is to restore democracy and bring about the peaceful resolution to the bloody conflict in Nepal.

The eight years old insurgency has taken its human toll in excess of 12,000 deaths, has ravaged infrastructures, has displaced thousands of Nepalis, decimated social capital, and dismantled the political structures at the grass roots levels. And the ever-widening gap between the King and the political forces and the moves like February 1 followed by a series of disappointing decisions and ego clashes have pushed the country further onto a slippery slope.

It will be a mistake on the part of the King to try pushing back the country to the pre-1990 state, whereas the parties cannot afford not to learn a lesson from their mistakes. The Maoists' singular dream to convert Nepal into a communist state is full of landmines. The call for the day is to restore people's sovereignty and democracy in Nepal, and to solve the insurgency problem.

Perhaps, the two-day seminar will force us to look into this by standing outside the box and explore different angles and possibilities. The task is not trivial. The evolution of liberal democracy in this country took several decades to flourish. This great democracy in the world (USA) disenfranchised more than half of its population for more than a Century, whereas a model country like Switzerland started allowing its women to vote only in 1973.

The point is that it takes time to build political institutions. The Nepali democracy was snuffed out in only after 12 years. But the lesson is this too that democracy is not a self-correcting mechanism if we do not work on it. For example, free market cannot function properly without rules, transparencies, protections, and freedom, all at the same time. Similarly, in a liberal democracy elections are necessary but not a sufficient condition.

Separation of powers, political and economic devolution, the rule of law, protection of ethnic and political minorities, social justice, and internal democracy are all essential ingredients to make a democracy

work. Struggle for power or power sharing in isolation will not solve the Nepali problem.

We are not here to lecture you but to listen and share some thoughts. It pains us to see a country with so much potential slowly slipping into oblivion. With some give and take, and without any compromise on liberty, people's sovereignty and a competitive multiparty political system, I believe we can get out of this quagmire.

Within a short period of time, Nepal has shown to the world that it can be a place of opportunities. The growth in academic sectors with more than 8000 independently run schools, 50 engineering colleges, 14 medical schools, and the countless management and IT schools is an example of our Nepali entrepreneurial creativity.

Numerous micro hydro projects dotting the Himalayan landscape are examples of our problem solving capability. More than 13,000 forest user groups managing more than 1 million hectares of profitable community forest demonstrate to us that we can work collectively for a common public good.

When I see the two rising economic powers – India and China—interested in trans Himalayan road network through Nepal, it also gives me some hope. Who knows, with the advancement in IT education and financial deregulations in the banking sector, and other deregulations Nepal could emerge as a financial capital of South Asia, a real Shangri-La, between the two giants.

The 12 years of democratic experience between 1990 and 2002, no matter how messy it was, did provide a lot of ground work for these achievements.

When I see all of our political parties united and coming together for the first time to ponder over solutions, it gives me real hope.

Finally, I know this struggle is difficult. But don't forget that, quoting someone, "That which comes easily departs easily. That which comes of struggle remains."

Hang in there!

Thank you.

Appendix-2

A Challenge for Political Parties to Create a Conducive Environment for Peace and Democracy in Nepal

Remarks by Kul Chandra Gautam*

My colleague Tamrat Samuel has outlined very well the role of the United Nations in peace making, peace building and conflict resolution in general, and the current efforts and further possible role of the United Nations in resolving the conflict in Nepal.

Tamrat and I are both from the United Nations. But he comes from the Department of Political Affairs, which has a specific mandate in resolving political crises, such as the one in Nepal. I come from UNICEF which has a different mandate focused on the well-being of children, which is also a huge issue in Nepal exacerbated by the conflict.

Tamrat, and now the Secretary-General's Special Advisor Lakhdar Brahimi, and Ian Martin in Kathmandu speak officially and authoritatively on the political and human rights situation in Nepal and how the UN is trying to be helpful.

Although as UN colleagues with mutual interest in Nepal, we meet and brief each other often, when I speak on matters concerning Nepal's political situation, I do so in my personal capacity as a Nepali citizen.

In my personal capacity as a Nepali I feel freer to speak more frankly and have done so often, and will do it today as well.

I would like to take the occasion to thank Tamrat for his deep interest in and commitment to bringing peace in Nepal. As a Nepali I am impressed by how thoroughly and deeply he has immersed himself in understanding Nepal's complex political situation, and the actions and reactions of Nepal's various political actors.

* Mr. Gautam is Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author in his personal capacity, and not necessarily those of the United Nations or UNICEF.

Although initially the UN's involvement in resolving the political crisis in Nepal was perhaps a bit too cautious, a bit too slow and not at a sufficiently high level, thanks partly to Tamrat's tenacious efforts, we now have the best possible UN representatives that Nepal could hope to have. Lakhdar Brahimi and Ian Martin are both very senior, seasoned and respected envoys.

And the Secretary-General personally takes a deep interest in Nepal. I have often felt very touched when Mr. Annan spots me in some reception or other occasions and pulls me out and always asks or remarks on something that has just happened in Nepal. We are lucky to have the Secretary-General's personal interest and the support of his trusted envoys in dealing with Nepal.

We all know the Secretary-General has many other crises to deal with. While Nepal is obviously uppermost in our minds, it is not yet a high profile crisis of strategic importance to the world. Hence we need to be all the more grateful for the Secretary-General's strong interest and support.

On the UN's role in conflict resolution in Nepal, some of you will recall that last year in August I gave a speech at the Nepal World Affairs Council in Kathmandu on "*Possible Role of the United Nations in the Peace Process in Nepal*". In that speech I addressed the various manners in which the UN can be helpful.

While there is always some sensitivity about the UN role in the political process, there are other areas in which we can expect the UN role to be universally accepted, respected and supported. This includes, for example, post conflict reconstruction and development; coordinating a massive humanitarian assistance effort; assistance to people displaced by the conflict; demobilization of child soldiers and their reintegration with their families and society, etc.

We must not underestimate the value of UN's support in these and other areas. In fact, we must start planning on this right now even before the conflict ends and peace is restored. Let us remember that while most of us as political party leaders or politically savvy citizens are focused on issues of governance, elections, coalitions and negotiations, the ordinary people of Nepal will be looking for rapid peace dividends, not so much on the political domain but on their livelihoods.

So let us think about what the UN could do to help ordinary people in providing relief, rehabilitation and development assistance as a matter of high priority and urgency.

Believe me, it is not too early to plan for that. And the ordinary people of Nepal will judge you – political party leaders – even more on what you do to alleviate the hardships of their livelihoods than on your stance on other vital constitutional, political and electoral issues.

I would like to focus my remarks today on how Nepal's parliamentary political parties can play a more effective – indeed a decisive – role in ending the conflict and bringing about a genuine democracy – not just restoring the old *prajatantra* but instituting a new *lokatantra* in Nepal.

I focus on political parties, not because they are the only players, nor because they are the only ones who need to change and transform themselves. Certainly the King, the RNA and the Maoists too have a huge responsibility to change their behavior. But it is the political parties to whom the future of Nepal's democracy and destiny beckons today. Hence my focus on what they can and must do to create an environment conducive to resolve Nepal's current political crisis.

Political parties are the foundation of a modern multi-party democracy. After some tentative start in the 1950s, Nepal got a real chance to try out multi-party parliamentary democracy only in the 1990s. The results of this period were mixed. Ram Sharan Mahat has captured very well the essence of this period in his book "*In Defense of Democracy: Dynamics and Fault Lines of Nepal's Political Economy*".

The decade of democracy in the 1990s was sometimes chaotic, but it led to flourishing of political freedoms, faster than previous pace of economic growth and social services, a free and thriving media, civil society activism in the fields of human rights and social justice.

Despite the normal teething problems of a new democracy in a feudal society, it was functioning relatively well especially at the local level and was beginning to produce good results. But we must be honest and acknowledge that at the national level, the parliamentary political parties acquired notoriety for corruption, mismanagement, and bickering for power and perks.

There is no doubt that the political parties squandered their opportunity to help build a strong foundation for democracy with good governance. None of the party leaders truly commanded great popular respect. Many of them were seen as power-hungry political opportunists, lacking vision, maturity and a sense of accountability.

However, without justifying their shortcomings, it must also be objectively acknowledged that Nepal's political leaders were, on balance, perhaps not terribly more corrupt and inefficient than leaders in many other new and fragile democracies.

Had the democratic experiment been allowed to continue, over time, there was a good chance that younger and more accountable leaders would have emerged from the grass roots and would have helped transform the parties. A functioning democracy tends to be self-correcting as voters eventually throw out irresponsible and unaccountable leaders.

Moreover, the value of democracy should be measured not only by the performance of political leaders but also by the vibrancy of civil society, the freedoms enjoyed by people to express their views and pursue their dreams. And from that point of view, Nepal was actually on the right track, until the Maoist insurrection derailed it.

As we look ahead to the future, the political parties can and must play a decisive role in creating an environment conducive to resolving the current conflict and ushering in a new chapter of democracy. But to do that they will have to reengineer themselves, bring truly democratic practices in their internal working methods, bring out fresh, untainted young leadership, and commit themselves to a strict "code of conduct" to hold themselves accountable to high standards of integrity.

Many of the current party leaders must acknowledge that they have given democracy a bad name by their mal-administration and corruption, and they must take bold measures to exonerate themselves from popular revulsion – some of it justified but much of it stoked by anti-democratic forces.

To address effectively the real as well as the perceived weaknesses of the political parties, I believe a detailed and specific plan of action and a code of conduct needs to be prepared and subscribed to by all the major

political parties, especially those in the seven-party-alliance, both collectively and individually.

In my view such a code of conduct should address 7 specific issues:

1. Internal democracy within political parties
2. Non-tolerance of corruption
3. Affirmative action to empower underprivileged groups
4. Responsible behavior of “loyal opposition”
5. Commitment not to politicize civil service and security forces
6. Campaign financing arrangements
7. Agreement on the role of the Monarchy and the Maoists

Let me elaborate on each of these 7 points:

1. **Internal democracy within political parties:** All political parties champion democracy for the country, but most of them do not practice it in their internal organization and management. Some elder leaders or a small circle of leaders are believed to have undue and undemocratic influence in policy setting and decision-making within the parties.

There is a patronage system whereby even leaders widely known to be corrupt and unaccountable receive protection from the party leadership. The following steps are some of the steps needed to overcome this situation:

- Institute term limits for key leadership positions in political parties, so nobody is able to retain top party positions for more than 2 or 3 terms,
- Open up and democratize the selection process for candidates for election, possibly through “primary elections” or straw polls in electoral constituencies,
- Provide for recalling elected leaders, under certain circumstances, when their conduct betrays their campaign promises or the party’s election manifesto,
- Fill all party leadership positions through elections rather than consensus or nomination by party leaders. If necessary, leaders

may always co-opt additional, competent advisors to support the party leadership.

2. **Non-tolerance of corruption:** Political parties have a reputation for tolerating and even condoning corruption. There have been many high profile cases of senior party leaders in important government positions who have acquired wealth beyond their legitimate source of income while in office.

Sometimes even when the leaders themselves are clean, they are accused of facilitating corruption, nepotism and other special favors to members of their extended families.

There has hardly been any successful prosecution of known and notorious corrupt officials who continue to hold high positions in political parties and government. People deeply resent the sense of impunity and lack of accountability with which influential politicians get away with corrupt practices. This breeds a sense of cynicism and distrust in political parties that needs to be urgently corrected.

The following would be some specific actions to deal with this issue:

- Requirement for leaders to disclose their own and their immediate family members' income, assets and tax payments on an annual basis, and especially before and after assuming ministerial or senior constitutional positions,
- Disqualification of leaders from holding party or government positions for a certain period when indicted for corruption or certain other serious misconduct,
- Appointment of ombudspersons within each party to investigate allegations of corruption or misrepresentation of income and assets (e.g. resources siphoned off to relatives, friends and business partners).
- Public disclosure of political parties' assets, income and expenditures on an annual basis.

3. **Affirmative action to empower underprivileged groups:** True democracy cannot thrive in a situation where large segments of a nation's population feel that they are disenfranchised, second class citizens.

The Maoists have been able to take advantage of the disaffection of Nepal's *janajatis*; *dalits*, *Madhesis* and other oppressed and marginalized communities, as well as women and other vulnerable groups.

Mainstream political parties must now adopt a policy of affirmative action to provide better representation of such groups in the party hierarchy as well as in provision of social services and economic opportunities in society at large. The following might be some possible actions:

- Ensure fair representation of women and various geographic and ethnic groups in fielding candidates for local, district and national positions. Consideration should be given specifically to reserving a certain percentage of seats (up to 33 percent) in local, district and national level elected bodies to women candidates.
 - Parties should include in their programs how they will provide for special facilities for girls and students from depressed communities to get earmarked scholarships based on certain criteria for a limited period.
 - Parties should judge their responsiveness to issues of social justice and economic and gender equality partly based on their own efforts and performance within the parties, including in their leadership positions.
4. **Responsible behavior of "loyal opposition":** None of the elected parliaments of the 1990s were able to serve out their full term. That was not the fault of the King or the Maoists. It was due to the unprincipled behavior of parliamentary political parties.

As soon as a government was formed, there were attempts to undermine and unravel it both from within the party in power and by the opposition parties.

This unhealthy trend led to frequent changes in government; composition of jumbo cabinets, factionalism within parties and horse-trading for power and perks. The inability of political parties to serve as mature, responsible, loyal opposition gave democracy a bad name.

We must ensure that in future there are specific strictures built into the *code of conduct* of political parties that strongly discourage and penalize such behavior. When they are out of the government, the parties have to learn to serve as responsible and loyal opposition, and wait for their turn until the next election.

- 5. Commitment not to politicize civil service and security forces:** A frequent criticism of the political parties has been that when they come to power they get into the habit of giving jobs to their party cadres and supporters, often subverting due process of civil service recruitment, promotion and transfers. This leads to politicization of civil service and substituting professionalism with favoritism.

While it is understood that in a democracy a party in power is entitled to fill certain policy level positions by political appointees, the integrity and professionalism of the civil service should not be undermined.

It is the fear of such politicization that has led some to worry about the police and security forces coming under the control of elected officials. The political parties must reassure the public that they will not seek to make the police, the army and the civil service subservient to their political whims and preferences.

All parties should also commit not to incite students and teachers to frequent strikes and disruptions of educational institutions in pursuit of non-academic, political demands.

- 6. Transparent campaign financing arrangements:** Making fair and transparent campaign financing arrangements is a huge challenge in all democracies. It is a perpetual problem right here in the USA. And it is especially challenging in a country like Nepal.

In the past, some parties have condoned corruption in the name of raising funds for their political parties. Others have allowed individual candidates to flout agreed campaign financing norms.

To make democracy work is not always cheap. We must invest in it. It is clear that in Nepal, as in other democracies, we must provide for some state financing of electoral campaigns, based on agreed criteria, and limitation on private contributions for political parties and election campaigns.

7. **Agreement on the role of the Monarchy and the Maoists:** The political parties need to come out with their bottom-line position vis-à-vis the Monarchy and the Maoists. They need to dispel people's suspicion that they will be hoodwinked by the palace again, as they have been in the past. They also need to make it clear to the Maoists – and to the public - their pre-conditions for any strategic alliance with them.

Having jettisoned any reference to constitutional monarchy, or openly advocated for a republic, two of Nepal's largest political parties have now put themselves in a seemingly uncompromising position regarding the role of the Monarchy.

Still people wonder what, if any, compromise the seven-party-alliance as a whole is prepared to make to accept a “ceremonial monarchy”. The parties need to explicitly lay down their terms for any compromise.

At present there is a presumption on the part of Nepal's international friends that a political compromise is still possible to retain some form of a ceremonial monarchy. But the ground realities in Nepal seem to be shifting rapidly in favor of a full-fledged republic. Many civil society activists and the younger generation of party leaders are now taking an uncompromising position on *lokatantrik ganatantra*.

And even if the elder leaders of political parties so wished, they might no longer be able to persuade their younger cadres to compromise in favor of any form of Monarchy. We may soon reach a point of no return if the King continues to act in a manner that depletes any remaining support for a constitutional monarchy.

If the Monarchy is jettisoned, there will be questions about how the Royal Nepalese Army will react and behave. It is important for the political parties to lay out their vision for the future of the military in a

possible republican set-up, so that the Monarchy is not replaced by a military regime or lawless chaos.

The issue of whether to go directly for a constituent assembly or to first temporarily reinstate the parliament for it to lend constitutional legitimacy to the call for a new broad-based government to conduct elections for a constituent assembly, also needs to be decided unambiguously by the seven-party-alliance.

Regarding the Maoists, the political parties must come up with a politically clear, unified and consistent stand on how to deal with them. The parties should consider drafting a framework agreement, which might include some non-negotiable propositions, such as respect for universally agreed human rights, and a pluralistic, multi-party democracy. There should then be a series of negotiable options for consideration on other matters of statecraft or policies.

For example, the precise powers of the King, if some form of a truly constitutional monarchy is retained; the command structure of the military; whether we should consider a federal structure of government; mixed proportional representation; affirmative actions in favor of women, *dalits*, *janajatis*, *Madhesis* and other disadvantaged groups; a bi-cameral versus a unicameral parliament; direct election of the Prime Minister; structure of local governments, etc. can all be put forward for negotiation and compromise.

I believe that if the political parties would come up with such an agreed plan of action and code of conduct, they will have a chance to regain the confidence of the people.

Still I worry that the level of cynicism about the currently established leadership of the political parties is so high that the parties may need to contemplate some further radical measures.

For example, it would be very thoughtful and patriotic for the senior-most leaders of the political parties, especially those who have already had their chance to serve as heads of government, to gracefully step-aside, or assume honorific advisory roles, and make room for younger leaders to take charge.

The young, and so far untainted leaders, in turn, must reach across party lines and be the collective champions of “code of conduct” such as the one I have outlined, and agree to abide by it, no matter who is in a future government and who is outside the government.

Dear friends that is why so many eyes and ears are on you here today. Those of us who are not involved in active politics, and who have no personal political aspirations – like yours truly – we look to you to take bolder leadership. Please be prepared to even challenge your senior leaders, challenge the old ways of doing politics that has alienated so many ordinary citizens.

A crisis of the magnitude that our dear Nepal is facing today demands acts of extraordinary courage and wisdom. I hope that all of you - and us - can rise to the occasion.

Thank you.

Appendix-3

Conflict Resolution: Way Forward

By Murari R. Sharma[#]

Nepal is passing through a turbulent period, whose complexity is astoundingly enormous. A triangular conflict among the palace, political parties and Maoist rebels has been fraying the very fabric of Nepalese society.

The king is out consolidating his absolute authority, more so after the royal coup of February 1, 2005, by taking draconian measures. He has expanded the military, created several extra-constitutional institutions, and decreed many laws – including the recent one to crack down on the media – to bolster his control. Municipal elections announced for early next year are seen as a government ploy to buy time and pacify the world community.

Angry with the king, the main parties - together with their student wings and civil society - have taken to the streets. Maoist insurgents have been trying to fish in troubled waters by announcing a unilateral ceasefire and by courting the parties that they helped to pull down from the pedestal of power.

Evidently, the Maoist conflict has been truly devastating in terms of its human, economic and social costs. Growing clashes between the government and agitating groups have accentuated such costs. More than 12,000 people have lost their lives. An economic disaster has hit the country. Destruction of private property and public infrastructure has been huge; lack of security has dried out investment; businesses have been closing; development has stalled; and growth rate has declined. The total economic loss runs into billions of rupees.

Moreover, the conflict has created a social and humanitarian crisis. Villages and towns have witnessed massive displacement of people; young women are leaving school and getting married to avoid Maoist conscription. Children have been turned into guerilla fighters. Cities have

[#] Mr. Sharma is Nepal's former ambassador to the UN, and is currently affiliated with the UN.

been crowded as never before with people having no jobs or means of livelihood, and crimes are on the rise.

Actually, the clock of progress has been turned back by several decades. The national plan objective and UN millennium development goals have become impossible to meet.

Responsibility

All three political protagonists are throwing the ball to each other's court for this precarious situation. Poverty, exclusion and lack of awareness make society susceptible to extremism. Nepal has them all, and there is enough blame to go around.

By all accounts, the Shah dynasty must take most of the responsibility for Nepal's predicament. It failed to foster prosperity, educate people and build an inclusive society under its 120-year direct rule, even if 104 years under the Rana oligarchy and 12 under the democratic governments were excluded. The Maoists exploited this failure and the resultant mass frustration to rally support for their armed insurgency.

Conspiracy theories apart, the palace did not help the elected government to grapple with the Maoist problem, either. For instance, it did not allow the government, in the two rounds of dialogue with the rebels, to make political compromises necessary to find a peaceful settlement. Nor did it permit the government to mobilize the army to nip the conflict in the bud. Currently, atrocities under the royal regime have been driving many people to Maoists.

Since the Maoist movement to grab power began in 1996, the rebels have been responsible for killing, terrorizing and extorting people; destroying private property and public infrastructure; shattering the economy; and criminalizing society. The violence undermined the successive elected governments, destabilized the country and fueled the palace's ambition to regain the power and glory it had lost with the advent of democracy in 1990.

Political parties, too, should bear the responsibility for their failure to provide stability, control corruption and deal with the Maoist problem more prudently when they were at the helm of affairs. This failure, in turn,

gave room for the rebels to mobilize the disenchanted people against democracy and for the palace to manipulate the parties and weaken them paving the way to impose its absolute rule.

Options

Political forces in Nepal have three options to choose from to resolve the tripartite problem in hand. First, they could just slug it out until one or two of them prevail(s) over the other(s). Second, they could come together to find a homegrown, peaceful settlement. Third, they could seek external facilitation or mediation to put a peace process in place.

Naturally, taking the first route would mean more death and destruction, continued political uncertainty and economic devastation, as well as a failed state that will have to be resurrected from the ashes. Mere contemplation of its consequences makes one shudder with fright.

A truly homegrown solution would be ideal and could still be within the realm of possibility if key stakeholders agreed on making political compromises and mutual accommodation. However, all stakeholders have hardened their position further after the royal takeover. Therefore, the space for an internal, negotiated solution seems increasingly shrinking, if not yet wiped out.

The Nepalese people cannot wait forever for an internal solution to emerge. Hence, it is now time for Nepal to begin to look for external facilitation/mediation.

External Assistance

The United Nations, non-governmental organizations, regional powers, global powers, and small countries with expertise and resources for conflict resolution are the main candidates to ask for external support for facilitation/mediation. They bring varying combinations of strengths and weaknesses into the process, as tentatively shown in the following matrix.

External Players' Strength and Weakness Matrix

External Players	Peace-Making Period			Post-Conflict Period	
	Perception of Fairness	Political Influence	Economic Influence/Aid	Compliance with Accords	Reconstruction Assistance
United Nations	Very High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High
NGOs/INGOs	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Regional Powers	Moderate	Very high	Very high	Very high	Moderate
Global Powers	Very low	High	High	High	Very high
Rich, small countries	Very high	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High

Note: Ordinal order stands as Very high, High, Moderate, Low and Very low. As Nepalese political stakeholders perceive external players in different lights, the rankings would be an average of their perceptions.

Obviously, none of those players enjoys a clear advantage over others in all important areas that have bearing on a peace process. It would therefore be wise to ensure that all of them cooperate in the process to generate synergy and steer dialogue to success.

UN Role

The United Nations, with its accumulated experience in conflict resolution, can play a meaningful role in resolving the crisis in Nepal. The Secretary-General has already offered his good offices, and he has been dispatching frequent fact-finding missions to Nepal. A few months back, he also sent his top advisor, Lakhdar Brahimi, to Kathmandu to demonstrate the seriousness of his intent.

Experience suggests that the world body has a better record of accomplishments in post-conflict peace building activities than in facilitation and mediation. It excels, for instance, in such areas as keeping the peace as well as helping to disarm, demobilize and reintegrate combatants; organize elections; monitor human rights; deliver humanitarian assistance; and build institutional capacity. Currently, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, the Congo, the Sudan, Haiti, etc. have been receiving such assistance through UN peacekeeping and political missions.

Although I am not clear about the details, Maoists have already welcomed a UN role. Political parties are open to the idea but fear, not

without reason, that the rebels could use the UN presence to protract negotiations and consolidate authority in their strongholds. The palace, which seems to favor a military solution to the conflict, is reluctant to accept external mediation. In this context, it is unlikely to accept UN mediation, partly because Nepal's neighbors are averse to the notion and partly because it could open the way to limit royal power.

In most situations, the United Nations has been working with regional powers to bring the conflicting parties to the table, keep them there, and encourage them to strike a peace deal.

Way Forward

Only democracy, the most inclusive system of all, offers a tent large enough to symbiotically accommodate political actors of varying stripes and people of different persuasions. Most Nepalis want that: the king should accept a ceremonial status; Maoists should renounce violence, lay down arms and join the democratic mainstream; and political parties should convince the people that they stand for inclusive party-structure, inclusive society, and good governance.

This would only be the fire-fighting part, however. In the medium to long term, additional measures will be necessary to strengthen peace and promote social harmony. New challenges require novel solutions. Restructuring the state and empowering the people should be central in efforts to find such new, lasting solutions.

All protagonists in Nepal should realize that history is a harsh judge. Only those monarchies that empowered people to govern themselves have survived the test of time. The failed totalitarian utopia has no place in this era. And a democracy that does not provide good government, improve conditions of living for people and build inclusive society is bound to fail.

It is a shame that the country of Lord Buddha, who renounced all princely privileges to bring peace to humanity, is witnessing so much greed and violence for power. I hope all sides will learn from history and live up to their solemn obligations to their country and people. This will be consistent with Nepal's enlightened culture.

Appendix-4

Nepali Diaspora's Support for Democracy in Nepal

Shyam D. Karki Pharm. D.⁺

Introduction:

Nepalis started to immigrate to the USA in the 1960's. There were less than 100 Nepalis in the 1960's and pace started to pick up with a couple of thousand Nepalis coming to the USA in the 1970's. At the end of the 1980's the number went to 10,000. The 1990's saw the growth picking up more speed and the number went to 50,000. With the introduction of diversity visa lottery and insecurity in Nepal, there was an exponential growth in the number of Nepalis coming to the USA and the number is estimated to be more than 100,000 and if the current trend continues, it will reach 250,000 by the end of the decade.

Nepalis in the USA cover a wide spectrum from every group of society, from a college students to University Dean, manual laborer to nationally recognized professional, all very good at what they do and very proud of their accomplishments. Everyone has a success story to tell and it mirrors the stories of Europeans coming to the USA in the pioneering days of the conquest of the West.

Organizations

As the number of the Nepalis grew, they started to form community organizations. At first, these organizations were mostly devoted to congregate Nepalis, exchange stories and celebrate religious and cultural festivals. However, with the increase in numbers, organizations have also multiplied. There are currently more than 100 Nepali organizations in more than 30 states and they cover a wide spectrum (cultural, social, political, charitable etc). Nepali communities are very active, vibrant, and very caring about Nepal and they mirror Nepal.

Among the Nepali organizations, **Nepalese Americas Council (NAC)** is unique in that it is a coordinating body formed by 24 different

⁺ *Dr. Karki is President, Nepali American Public Affairs Council*

organizations with a combined membership of 5,000. Every membership organization sends three representatives to its council and the executive body is elected by the council members. It is mainly focused on keeping the communications active and open among the member organizations and coordinating their joint programs. It is noteworthy that it had passed the resolution calling for an international organization of the Nepali Diaspora in its 2000 convention and furthermore all Nepali community organizations had agreed not to organize any annual convention in 2000 as a token of support for this organization. Another noteworthy fact of the 2000 convention was the attendance of political leaders by invitation from Nepal (S. B. Deuba, and Jhalanath Khanal), which was a formal acknowledgement of the active support of the Nepali Diaspora for democracy in Nepal.

NAC is a working successful model of the concept of Unity in Diversity amongst the Nepali Diaspora in the USA. Many organizations are involved in helping Nepal in some ways and few of them are mentioned here.

1. Association of Nepalis in Americas (ANA); NECC, Schools, drinking water.
2. Association of Nepalese in Midwest America (ANMA); Schools,
3. Nepalese Association in South East America (NASeA); Schools,
4. ANS; California 15 scholarships for college students
5. ANS NY; Micro-lending,
6. Empower Nepal; Scholarships and schools
7. America Nepal Medical Foundation; Medical education and health projects
8. Indira Foundation; Nursing scholarship, Briddhashram, Nepali language school
9. Timsina Foundation; Literary awards, Nepali language school
10. Pasa Pucha; Scholarship, temple renovation
11. International Nepali Literary Society (INLS), Nepali language and literature
12. Phoolbari, Kaligandaki Dance Theatre of Nepal; Nepali culture
13. Sagarmatha TV, Nepal Post, Radio Dovaan, Nepali press

There are some Nepali organizations, which are primarily focused on public affairs. They have played a significant role in sensitizing the Nepali Diaspora as well as the US mainstream to the political situation in Nepal and mobilizing their support for the Democracy and overall development in Nepal. Noteworthy among these organizations are:

1. Liberal Democracy Nepal (LDN); an academic think tank involved in providing a forum for different ideas and opinions, scientific analysis of ramifications of different policy decision and fostering a democratic culture in Nepal. LDN is the host of this program and speaks a lot about its scope and nature of work and its stature in the Diaspora and mainstream communities.
2. Nepali American Public Affairs Council (NAPAC) formed in 2002 is a public advocacy organization of the Nepali Diaspora dedicated to bringing them to the mainstream by organizing citizenship; voter registration drives, lobbying the Congress and other public figures for the interests of its community which included human rights and democracy in Nepal. Its delegation led by Suman Timsina, Puru Subedi, Shiva Gautam and myself (all of them attending the current program - which explains how Nepali Diaspora members work closely helping each other) have been very active in mobilizing support of the US congress for the democracy movement in Nepal.
3. Nepalese Democratic Youth Council, (NDYC) USA has been in the forefront in organizing many interactive programs, rallies for the support of Democracy in Nepal. It is very highly regarded and has a large following not only in New York but in many other states as well.
4. Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights, NY is also very active in sensitizing the Nepali Diaspora and other communities to the political situation in Nepal. And has teamed up with NDYC in organizing many rallies and meetings in support of Democracy in Nepal.

Nepali Diaspora members have been very active in supporting the movement for democracy and have been very active in its support by organizing rallies, interactive programs and lobbying the US congress. Some of its notable achievements are listed below:

1. NAC, the coordinating body of many Nepali organizations issued a press release demanding restoration of democracy, civil liberties and human rights.
2. A group of Nepali organizations led by Free Nepal.Org and NYDC organized a rally in May 2005, in support of democracy in Washington in front of the White House and submitted a petition to president Bush. The rally was attended by more than 700 people coming from all walks of life. It was the largest rally of Nepalis in the USA. Letters of support from US Congressmen, senators and leaders of Nepali political parties were read to thunderous applause.
3. Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights organized a rally in front of the United Nations in October; it was attended by more than 450 people from NY City, adjoining areas and from places as far as Florida and Texas. It was also attended by human rights and political party leaders from Nepal.
4. There were many forums on human rights and political situations organized by many Nepali organizations in metropolitan areas and some are listed below.
 - a. Forums in Nepali Political Situations
 - b. Interaction Programs with Human Rights Activists
 - c. Forums on Nepali situation at the ANA & ANMA/NASeA conventions
 - d. Forum on Human rights situation in Nepal at the ANMA/ NASeA Convention
 - e. Interviews by Radio Dovaan
 - f. News coverage by Nepali Post
 - g. News Coverage by Sagarmatha TV
 - h. Collaboration with Human rights organizations and universities
 - i. Leading articles written in Nepali press
 - j. Lobbying in the NRNA for support of restoration of democracy, civil liberties and human rights.

Lobbying the Congress

As stated previously, NAPAC led the lobbying of Congress efforts for the restoration of democracy and human rights. It was joined by many other active Nepalis in letter writing and telephone campaigns. As a result of its concerted efforts, it was able to counter the lobbying of the Nepali

government officials and its representatives. Some of its accomplishments are listed below.

1. Joint letter by 11 Congressmen to King Gyanendra asking for immediate restoration of democracy and release of political detainees.
2. Press release by Senator Leahy and colleagues
3. Letters of support for the Washington rally by Congressmen and Senators on
4. Suspension of US military aid to Nepal
5. No White House reception or meeting with President Bush for the King in his planned visit to the UN
6. Recent letter by seven congressmen to Secretary Rice
7. Senate resolution to stop all military aid to Nepal

In addition to continuing lobbying Congress for support of the democracy movement in Nepal, future efforts will be directed to the following:

1. No RNA participation in UN operations until human rights are no longer violated in Nepal
2. No entry visas for government officials involved in human rights violations
3. Freezing of bank accounts of high government and security officials involved in human rights violations
4. No World Bank or IMF loans
5. Support for legal action for indictment of violators of human rights

The Nepali Diaspora is fully committed to support of democracy in Nepal and will do its utmost in mobilizing the support of the community, US mainstream, the US government and the US congress. It has very high respect for the sacrifices and valiant efforts of the Nepali public and its political leaders. However it feels that it is very important that the political parties and its leaders fulfill some expectations, which we have. They are listed below.

1. Acknowledgement of past errors like bad governance, infighting and too many efforts at jockeying for power and positions.
2. Be united and a firm assurance that they will remain united
3. A coherent roadmap for the future
4. Internal democracy in parties
5. Transparency in party operations

6. Good governance
7. No corruption and nepotism
8. Code of conduct and ethics for party leaders
9. Immediate and firm actions against leaders convicted of corruption, violation of criminal laws, and party code of ethics and conduct
10. Take proactive measures against corruption; public disclosure of property and tax returns by party leaders and high ranking government and security officials
11. No compromises with agreed principles and opportunism

During the presentation, Dr. Mahat had stated that item # 10 could be implemented immediately. We would like to see concerted action in this direction. We feel very important that these steps are necessary to regain the confidence of the Nepali public and maintain the trust and confidence of the international community and the Nepali Diaspora all over the world.

I would like to end my presentation by quoting President Kennedy “Let us never fear to negotiate. But let us never negotiate out of fear” and assuring you that we strongly feel that it is time for all of us Nepalis inside and outside Nepal to unite for democracy and bring prosperity to Nepal.

Thank you very much for your attention and time.

Appendix-5

Short introduction of the Nepali delegates

Chakra Bastola: Nepali Congress (NC)

Varsha Gyawali: NGO official - Nepal

Anil Jha: Nepal Sadbhavana Party – Anandidevi (NSP-A)

Jhalanath Khanal: Communist Party of Nepal – United Marxist Leninist (CPN-UML)

Dr. Prakash C Lohani: Rastriya Janshakti Party (RJP)

Dr. Ram S Mahat: Nepali Congress (NC)

Bimalendra Nidhi and Anamika Nidhi: Nepali Congress – Democratic (NC-D)

Dhruba Pradhan: Rastriya Prajatantra Party (RPP)

Ashok Rai: Communist Party of Nepal – United Marxist Leninist (CPN-UML)

Dr. Minendra Rijal: Nepali Congress – Democratic (NC-D)

Vivek Shah: Former military secretary to King Gyanendra

Duman Thapa: NGO official - Nepal

Pari Thapa: National Peoples' Front - Rastriya Janamorcha

Padma R. Tuladhar: Human rights activist, former Member of Parliament, and former facilitator for peace dialogues between the government and Maoists.

Appendix-6

Brief Bios of speakers/moderators/coordinators

1. Alok K. Bohara Ph.D.

Alok K. Bohara is a tenured full professor of economics at the University of New Mexico. He has published extensively in the areas of environmental economics, development, gender and ethnicity, and inflation uncertainty. He is a founding director of the Nepal Study Center there and serves as editor of e-journals: Himalayan Journal of Development and Democracy, and Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin .

2. Ambika P. Adhikari, Dr. Des., AICP

Ambika Adhikari is an Urban Planner with the City of Phoenix, and a Faculty Associate at Arizona State University School of Planning. Ambika was the Country Representative of IUCN - the World Conservation Union - in Nepal. He has authored one book and has co-edited four, and published numerous reports, and refereed and other articles in international and national journals.

3. Mr. Aditya Jha

Aditya Jha is CEO and co-founder of a software company, Osellus Inc., based in Canada and Thailand. He is Member of the Faculty of Business Campaign Cabinet of Ryerson University, Toronto. He has been a software entrepreneur after a very successful career at Bell Canada and Bell Nexxia. He has published in several international journals and was invited to speak at various international conferences. He has founded the POA Educational Foundation.

4. Dr. Gaury S. Adhikary

Gaury S. Adhikary is Clinical Assistant Professor in the Department of Anesthesiology at the University of Michigan Medical Center, Ann Arbor. He was president of America Nepal Medical Foundation 1998-2001 and currently he is on the ANMF Board of Directors. Dr. Adhikary has worked as President of Association of Nepalese in Midwest America and as a President of Nepalese Americas Council.

He is actively involved in the restoration of Human rights, democracy and civil liberties in Nepal.

5. Dr. T. N. Niraula

Dr. TN Niraula is an educator with over 20 years of experience in education research and policy development. Dr. Niraula is currently a Senior Research Scholar and Research Director at Columbia University. He is also the President of America-Nepal Friendship Society, General Secretary of Nepalese Americas Council, and advisor to a number of local Nepali and non-Nepali organizations.

6. Vijaya R. Sharma, Ph.D.

Vijaya R. Sharma is a senior instructor at the University of Colorado at Denver, with research interests and publications in the areas of natural resources, environment, and health care demand. He has directed teams of local professionals and consultants engaged in the tasks of industrial sector planning, policy, and program formulations in Nepal, which were sponsored by multilateral agencies, like the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the UNDP.

7. Mr. Puru Subedi

Puru Subedi is a Technical Director in the Information Technology Division of DDL OMNI Engineering, LLC a US Government contractor based in McLean, VA. He is currently a Senior Vice-President of Nepalese Americas Council (NAC), a national coordination body of Nepali organizations in the US and Canada and founding member of Liberal Democracy Nepal (LDN).

8. Dr. Shyam D. Karki

Shyam D. Karki is the Director of Pharmacy at Northwest Hospital Center, Randallstown, MD and an Associated Clinical Professor, School of Pharmacy, SUNY at Buffalo, NY. He has presented and published more than 100 research papers and is a reviewer for six pharmacy and medical journals. He is a former Vice-President of the global Non Resident Nepali Association. He is affiliated with many organizations in various capacities working on issues impacting Nepal and Nepalis.

9. Anup Pahari Ph.D.

Anup K. Pahari works at the Foreign Service Institute (Arlington, VA), the Foreign Service national training academy of the US Department of

State. He has taught at the Catholic University, Washington DC and Goucher College, Baltimore. He has been the president of America Nepal Society (DC) and helped found the local Nepali Language School. He is a frequent participant in seminars and conferences on Nepal and has spoken at Cornell University, the Mountain Film Festival, Williams College, University of British Columbia, and UC Berkeley.

10. Bed P. Giri Ph.D.

Bed P. Giri is Assistant Professor of English at Dartmouth College. He teaches postcolonial literature and theory.

11. Mukti Upadhyay, Ph.D.

Mukti Upadhyay is associate professor at Eastern Illinois University and has also taught at University of Connecticut and Oregon State University. He has worked as a consultant to the World Bank, UNDP, and IDRC/Canada. He has published in high-level development, macroeconomics, and international trade journals. His current research explores relationships between democracy, income distribution, and development; migration and remittances; and productivity, human capital, and trade.

12. Mr. Suman R. Timsina

Suman Timsina works in MBNA America Bank in corporate strategy. His other areas of interest have been substance abuse and health care policy and he has numerous policy papers on these issues. He is also adjunct faculty in Temple University in Philadelphia. He has been affiliated with many Nepali organizations in different capacities and he founded the Timsina Foundation to promote Nepali literature and art. He is actively involved in the campaign for the restoration of Human rights, democracy and civil liberties in Nepal.

13. Mahendra Lawoti, Ph.D.

Dr. Mahendra Lawoti is assistant professor, Department of Political science, Western Michigan University and is the author of the book "Toward a Democratic Nepal: Inclusive Political Institutions for a Multicultural Society". He specializes in Public and International Affairs and Asian Studies and also has degrees in Urban and Regional Planning as well as Architectural Engineering.

14. Shiva Gautam Ph. D.

Shiva Gautam is an Assistant Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School. Prior to coming to Harvard, he was an Associate Professor at Vanderbilt University School of Medicine. He serves on the editorial boards of clinical journals and has authored several research articles in prestigious journals. He is affiliated with various Nepali and US organizations including the Kathmandu University Medical School and the America Nepal Medical Foundation.

15. Mr. Kul Chandra Gautam

Kul Chandra Gautam is currently an Assistant Secretary-General of the UN and Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF. As a member of UNICEF's top management he provides leadership and guidance for its policy-making, program development, resource mobilization, advocacy and alliance building for children and development among UN agencies, multi-bilateral donors and civil society organizations. For the past 22 years he has been with UNICEF in positions of increasing responsibility and visibility all over the world. In recent years, he has been very interested in and speaking out on Nepal's political situation in his personal capacity as a Nepali citizen.

16. Mr. Tamrat Samuel

Tamrat Samuel is in charge of the South Asia in the Asia and the Pacific Division in the Department of Political Affairs in the UN. His expertise is in conflict resolution. He was most recently in charge of the East Timor and Indonesia desk and has had responsibilities at different times for the Sri Lanka, Korean Peninsula and Philippines desks.

17. Mr. Murari Sharma.

Murari Sharma is the former Permanent Representative of Nepal to the United Nations. Prior to that he served as Foreign Secretary. He is currently affiliated with the UN. Mr. Sharma also taught Economics at Tribhuvan University, Nepal before entering the Civil Service. His expertise is in Public and International Affairs and law.

Appendix-7

Program Outline



Workshop on Opportunities and Challenges For Nepali Political Parties

**Organized by
National Democratic Institute
Liberal Democracy Nepal
At
Washington D.C.**

October 20-24

Table of Contents

Introduction

NDI Introduction and Logistics

Schedule:	Arrival	Thursday, October 20, 2005
		Friday, October 21, 2005
		Saturday, October 22, 2005
		Sunday, October 23, 2005
	Departure	Monday, October 24, 2005

Short introduction of the Nepali delegates

Description of the thematic sessions

Introduction

On behalf of the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and the Liberal Democracy Nepal (LDN) forum, we welcome distinguished delegates from Nepal and out of town participants to the greater Washington DC metropolitan area. The LDN project evolved into a productive collaboration between the Nepal Study Center (NSC) of the University of New Mexico (UNM) and some members of the North American Nepali Diaspora. The academic focus of the Center and its intellectual assets and research base at UNM has helped LDN become a dynamic forum for thoughtful exchanges on the issues of development and democracy. LDN derives its scholarly strength from its affiliation with these academic entities and from participation by various scholars and policy makers.

This NDI/LDN joint workshop program in Washington D.C. has been made possible by the contributions of NDI, LDN, and NSC. NDI has assisted by arranging meetings with U.S. policy makers on Thursday and Friday, by providing meeting space on Saturday and Sunday, and by covering some of the transportation and event expenses. The Washington Nepali community has generously supported part of the program, while many LDN members have personally provided financial support. LDN is thankful for the generosity of Mr. Aditya Jha in supplementing the resources for this program, and would also like to express its gratitude to the Baltimore American-Nepalese Association (BANA), the Washington D.C. events coordination committee.

LDN will be compiling the proceedings of this workshop and will include them in the Liberal Democracy Bulletin, published by the Nepal Study Center of the University of New Mexico.

This packet provides a detailed itinerary of the events that are scheduled in the Washington DC area. A list of local contacts and other logistical information are also included.

We look forward to welcoming you all in this important program. We hope your participation will be pleasant and productive.

On behalf of LDN:

Dr. Alok Bohara
Dr. Anup Pahari
Dr. Ambika Adhikari
Mr. Girija Gautam

On behalf of NDI:

Mr. Blair A. King, PhD
Mr. Terence Hoverter
Ms. Allison Lince-Bentley

⁴ BANA (Baltimore Area Nepali Association) organized event will be held at Baltimore. NDI office is about 23.5 miles from the hotel.

--	--

Thursday, October 20, 2005

Arrival of Nepali Guests and LDN Participants

12:10pm	Nepali guests Arrive from Boston at Washington (DCA), Delta Flight # 5346, LDN participants arrive on their own by different flights.
12:45pm	An NDI representative will greet the delegates at the airport and escort them in a van to NDI's office in Washington DC. A separate van will deliver the delegates' luggage to the Hawthorn Suites Hotel.
1:30pm – 2:30pm	Welcome Lunch and Orientation with NDI Director for Asia, Peter Manikas
3:30pm – 4:15pm	Meeting with Tim Rieser , Clerk for Senator Patrick Leahy; Lisa Curtis and Jonah Blank , Senate Committee on Foreign Relations 123 Hart Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510-6031
4:30-5:00pm	Congressman Jim Walsh Rayburn Building Rm. 2369 Washington, D.C. 20515
5:30-6:30pm	Michael Green Senior Director, National Security Council Office of East Asian Affairs (Meeting will be at NDI)
Evening	Free

⁵ Please feel free to contact Puru Subedi: 703-930-2598, Bishal KC: 202-281-8211, or Sugandha D. Tuladhar: 703-309-7211 for logistical information or any other assistance.

Friday, October 21, 2005

Program Day-1: NDI Events and Dinner Reception

8:15am	Shuttle pickup at hotel
9:30am – 10:30am	Meeting with Sen. Thomas Daschle Alston & Bird LLP 601 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW North Building - 10th Floor Washington, DC 20004
11:00am – 12:00pm	TBD
12:30pm – 1:30pm	Lunch with Ivan Doherty , NDI Director for Political Party Programs NDI Boardroom
2:00pm – 3:00pm	Meeting with Assistant Secretary Christina Rocca U.S. Department of State, 2201 C Street NW Washington, DC 20520
3:30pm - 4:30pm	Meeting with USAID Officials Eric Picard , Nepal Desk Officer; Kay Freeman , Assistant Administrator, ANE; Cheryl Jennings , USAID Nepal Program Officer; Naren Chanmugam , Economic Growth Officer, USAID Nepal U.S. Agency for International Development Ronald Reagan Building, conference room 4.9-32, Washington, D.C. 20523-1000
6:30pm – 9:30pm	Dinner Reception hosted jointly by NDI and LDN, Welcome remarks from NDI, LDN and leader of the Nepali delegation. NDI Main Board room, fifth floor

Saturday, October 22, 2005

Day-2: LDN organized thematic sessions

7:45am	Shuttle pickup at the hotel
8:30am – 9:00am	Welcome and opening remarks, introduction of participants. Dr. Anup Pahari, Dr. Alok Bohara, Mr. Aditya Jha and leader of the Nepali delegation.
9:00am – 11:00	<u>Dealing with the Monarchy and Royal Nepal Army⁶</u> Moderators: Dr. Gaury Adhikary, Assistant Professor School of Medicine, Univ. of Michigan Dr. Shiva Gautam Assistant Professor, Harvard Medical School Time manager and Q & A moderator Dr. Mukti Upadhyay, Associate Professor, Eastern Illinois University
11:00am – 11:15am	Coffee break
11:15am – 1:15pm	<u>Dealing with the Maoists</u> Moderators: Dr. Mahendra Lawoti Assistant Professor, Western Michigan University Dr. Anup Pahari Independent Consultant Time manager and Q and A moderator, Dr. Vijaya Sharma Asst. Professor, University of Colorado
1:15pm – 2:30pm	Lunch break
2:30pm – 3:00pm	Wrap-up session with closing remarks, Representatives from the Nepali delegation and LDN (Dr. Vijaya Sharma)

⁶ All thematic sessions will include 30 minute guest presentation, 60 minute moderator probed questions to the guests and their responses, and 30 minutes Q & A with participants. Shorter sessions will have proportionately less time.

3:15pm	Depart for Baltimore
6:00pm – 8:00pm	Town hall meeting with the Nepalese community, organized by (BANA). ⁷
8:00pm – 9:30 pm	Dinner at Kumari Restaurant, Baltimore, and socialization
9:30pm	Shuttle leaves for the Hawthorn Suites, Herndon

Sunday, October 23, 2005

Day-3: LDN organized thematic sessions

7:45am	Shuttle pickup at hotel
8:30am – 8:45am	Welcome
8:45am – 10:00am	<u>Managing the Movement for Democracy</u> Moderators: Dr. Ambika Adhikari Planner, City of Phoenix & Faculty Associate, Arizona State University Mr. Suman Timsina Senior Project Manager, MBNA America Time manager and Q and A moderator Dr. Vijaya Sharma Asst Professor, University of Colorado
10:00am – 10:15am	Break
10:15am – 11:30 noon	<u>Parties Managing Themselves</u> Moderators: Dr. Alok K. Bohara Professor, Univ. of New Mexico

⁷. Opening remarks will be provided by the BANA and DC area representative (15 minutes). This session will be moderated by Mr. Girija Gautam and Mr. Puru Subedi from LDN and representatives from BANA and Washington area community. Nepali delegates have 45 minutes to speak, which will be followed by an hour of Q and A.

⁸. Opening remarks will be provided by the BANA and DC area representative (15 minutes). This session will be moderated by Mr. Girija Gautam and Mr. Puru Subedi from LDN and representatives from BANA and Washington area community. Nepali delegates have 45 minutes to speak, which will be followed by an hour of Q and A.

Dr. Mukti Upadhyay.
Associate Professor, Eastern Illinois University
Time manager and Q and A moderator,
Dr. Tara Niraula
Senior Research Scholar and Research Director
Columbia University
Expert observer
Nepal expert from NDI

11:30am – 11:45am

Coffee break

11:45am – 12:45pm

Resources for conflict resolution and
democracy in Nepal:

A brief presentation on Nepal Study Center by Dr.
Alok Bohara (15 minutes).

Remarks by Mr. Murari Raj Sharma on the current
Nepali crisis (10 minutes).

Presentation by Mr. Aditya Jha on Knowledge
economy in Nepal (15 minutes).

Remarks by Dr. Shyam Karki on the views of the
Diaspora (10 minutes).

Comments and closing remarks.

Moderators

Dr. Anup Pahari and Dr. Ambika Adhikari

12:45pm – 2:00pm

Lunch break

2:00pm – 4:00pm

Analysis of the Nepali crisis and possible
UN role

Keynote speech: “What might the political parties do
to create conducive environment for peace,
reconciliation and democracy?”

Mr. Kul Chandra Gautam

Assistant Secretary-General of the UN and Deputy
Executive Director of the UNICEF

Opinion: UN's experience in conflict resolution,
lessons learned, and how the UN might be helpful in
Nepal's situation”

Tamrat, Samuel

United Nations Head Quarters, New York

Speaker introductions and moderation

Mr. Girija Gautam

4:00 – 5:00pm

Possible workshop declaration (Dr. Anup Pahari)

Vote of thanks (Mr. Aditya Jha)

Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin, Special Issue, 2005

Summary of the workshop by Dr. Alok Bohara
Closing remarks by LDN representatives and
representative of Nepali delegation.

6:00pm Dinner (by invitation) hosted by Mr. Kul
Chandra Gautam for the delegates

Monday, October 24, 2005: Departure

9:00am	Hotel shuttle pickup
11:05am	Nepali delegates depart by Delta Flight # 1897 at Washington National (DCA)
12:49pm	Nepali guests arrive at Atlanta
Morning/afternoon	LDN participants depart by various flights

Appendix-8

Description of the Thematic Sessions

The principal challenges facing the parties can be summed up under the following thematic headings. These four themes will be addressed in separate sessions of the workshop.

1. Dealing With the Monarchy and the RNA

The monarchy in Nepal is a looming political force that derives most of its power from the Royal Nepal Army (RNA). The recently assertive monarchy has shifted the balance of power and its current actions have delivered a major setback to democratic process in Nepal. The parties must devise strategies to effectively deal with the monarchy, with a view to bring the monarchy completely and irretrievably within the bounds of the constitution. Due to the new behavior of monarchy, the Nepali elites, students and civil society are gearing more and more towards a system with ceremonial monarchy or even republicanism.

This session will explore various ways to influence and pressurize the monarchy to agree to a well defined constitutional role in a democratic Nepal. Adequate guarantees, and checks and balance must be built in the system to ensure that such a contract between the monarchy and the people remains valid and enforceable. In the recent past, all democratic forces have converged in the belief that the RNA should be solidly under the control of an elected government and parliament, and not under the king. To advance this agenda, the parties may also need to explore direct dialogues with the RNA on political matters.

This thematic session will involve the delegation members presenting their individual party as well as seven-seven party collective views on dealing with the monarchy. A round table discussion will follow the presentations.

2. Dealing with the Maoists

Through their violent means and paramilitary resources, the Maoists have, unfortunately, displaced the political parties as the primary political force in the Nepali countryside. The Maoists are armed, organized, and have already changed the political landscape of the Nepali state, squeezing the political space for parties and other actors. As the Maoists have taken effective control of a vast portion of the country, dealing with the Maoists, whether through dialogues, pressures or force is a critical issue at present.

In this thematic session the delegation members will be asked to present the seven-party position on dealing with the Maoists, including the special events that have emerged on the political landscape after Feb.1, 2005 (party-Maoist alliance, cease-fire etc.). One or more insurgency experts may be invited to participate in this roundtable session to make the discussion more comprehensive and contextual.

3. Managing the Movement for Democracy

The timetable for the restoration of full democracy in Nepal depends on the success of parties to organize a non-violent movement that harnesses the national aspirations and international resources. In this session the delegation will brief the participants on the nature, scope and limitations of organized democratic agitation in Nepal in the post Feb. 1 era. They will further discuss the strength and weaknesses of their own movements and highlight the reasons why the movement has not picked up expected momentum. This will also be a time to review the gaining strength of the civil society movement in favor of democracy and republicanism in Nepal, and how the parties and civil society can collaborate to build synergy in the movement.

There will also be a special discussion between the delegation and LDN members about cooperation and coordination of pro-democracy activism between North America based Nepali Diaspora and those on the ground in Nepal.

4. Parties Managing Themselves

The inability of political parties to address the issues related to operational and internal party democracy has cost the parties dearly in lost legitimacy and stature. This failure was also provided a fertile ground for the rise of extremism in Nepal, both to the left and to the right. A principal objective of LDN is precisely to urge the democratic political leadership and structures in Nepal to engage with these often overlooked issues, which ultimately determine the success of democratic movement. Some external experts on political parties in the developing world may be invited to inject comparative and contextual grounding to the roundtable discussion.

5. Proceedings

Dr. Pramod Mishra (Assistant Professor, Augustana College), Dr. Bed Giri (Assistant Professor, Dartmouth College) and Dr. Gyan Pradhan (Associate Professor, Westminster College) will join as guest editors Dr. Ambika P. Adhikari and Dr. Alok K. Bohara to publish the proceedings as a special issue of the Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin journal.

Appendix-9

Guidelines for Moderators

As shown in detail in the information packet, LDN has organized four thematic sessions for the DC workshop, plus one session for overall analysis of crisis in Nepal. Each of the four sessions will have a time manager to keep different sections of the meeting within the scheduled time. All sessions will follow the same format as described below:

Introduction, 5 min.: One moderator will introduce guests and describe the ground rules.

Guest presentations, 30 min: We expect to have three guests to give their opening talks lasting 8-10 minutes each. The visitors will select the three speakers from among themselves for each session. If they so desire, however, they may choose more than three speakers for the 30 minutes of time allocated for them.

Moderator Q&A, 60 min: Each moderator takes his turn and asks probing questions. The moderator takes about a minute per question and directs it to two guests. The guest may take up to 3 minutes each for their answer, or one may yield his time partly or fully to the other. The moderator retains some flexibility in having a third guest to contribute should a strong need arise. At least 8 questions from the two moderators can be addressed in this way. In addition, the moderators will have more questions prepared in order of importance prior to the meeting, and will pose some of them as well depending on time. The moderators may use questions from the audience collected before or during a session or integrate them into some of their own

Floor discussion, 20-25 min: This is the Q&A session with the audience. The time manager takes over at this point as the Q&A moderator and facilitates direct interactions between the audience and the guests. He picks a person from among those raising a hand. He directs the question to the speaker as desired by the questioner, or to a volunteer or another member in the guest group. He continues to serve as the time keeper as well. The audience should not be allowed to give speeches, analysis or rebuttals except for brief and to the point comments or rebuttals. The length of a question should not be more than 1 minute.

Conclusion, 1 min: The second moderator thanks the guests and ends the session.

More on do's and don'ts for a moderator: The moderators will not make statements, offer analyses or provide rebuttals, but will stay focused on asking probing questions. They may, however, use the essence of the ideas presented to help steer a discussion, connect various responses, and make the discussion coherent. They should ensure that the discussion revolves around the topic at hand but not digress too far. It is the duty of a moderator to display courtesy and restraint to all even in heated moments, and be fair with respect to time allocation among guests, and to the tone of questions and follow ups.

Appendix-10

Pictures Highlighting the Workshop

Please follow the link below to view the pictures of the Workshop:

http://pg.photos.yahoo.com/ph/stimsina/album?.dir=/7f98&.src=ph&.tok=phwc3.DB72lBh_s

Editorial Team

Editor

Alok K. Bohara, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Economics
The University of New Mexico
Bohara@unm.edu, Tel: 505-277-5902
Fax: 505-277-5304

Editorial Board Members

Ambika Adhikari, Ph.D.
Urban Planner, City of Phoenix
Faculty Associate
Arizona State University

Professor Surya P. Subedi, Ph.D.
School of Law
University of Leeds, UK

Matthew Ingram
Associate Editor
United States - Mexico Law
Journal
Law and Political Science
University of New Mexico

Mark Turin, Ph.D.
Director
Digital Himalaya Project
Department of Social Anthropology
University of Cambridge
Free School Lane
Cambridge, CB2 3R, UK

Douglas Hecock
Political Science
University of New Mexico

Jeff Drope, Ph.D.
Political Science
University of Miami

Production

Prakash Adhikari
Department of Political Science
UNM

Graphic Designer

Jeff Bjarke
Department of Economics

Mission Statement

Liberal Democracy Nepal Bulletin (LDNB), a journal of the Nepal Study Center, is dedicated to publish a broad range of topics related to political economy affairs of Nepal. LDN Bulletin focuses more on *essays* and *commentaries* that can be read by both professionals and non-experts with ease, and it discourages quantitative modeling and mathematical formulation. Articles with long-term policy implication are given priority rather than those that are topical.

Acknowledgement

LDN Bulletin would like to thank the members of the LDN Policy Council for their support and encouragement. It also acknowledges the administrative and research assistantship help provided by the Department of Political Science and the Department of Economics at the University of New Mexico.

Manuscript Submission Guidelines for LDN Bulletin

LDN Bulletin publishes a broad range of topics related to political economy affairs of Nepal. LDN Bulletin focuses more on essays and commentaries that can be read by both professionals and non-experts with ease, and it discourages quantitative modeling and mathematical formulation. Articles with long-term policy implication are given priority rather than those that are topical.

LDN Bulletin invites five categories of material.

Essays are more extensive 6,000-10,000-word pieces of analysis or reportage.

Commentaries are 2,000-4,000-word pieces that make a single, provocative point.

Book Reviews are 1,000-3,000-word discussions of new books.

Comments represent feedback on material that has been published in previous issues.

Letters to the editor are 500 words thought and feedback.

Mailing Address: Manuscripts should be submitted as word attachments. Please email materials to Editor: Professor Alok K. Bohara Bohara@unm.edu, 505-277-5903, Department of Economics, University of New Mexico.

Style: We encourage the prospective authors to examine the previously published materials for style guidelines (abstract, references, footnotes, headers) You may also follow any social science professional journal style as a preliminary guideline. A set of preliminary instructions is given below.

Manuscripts should be typed in Times Roman fonts (11 points), double-spaced, on standard 8 1/2" x 11" formatting, using 1 inch margin on all sides. Authors are encouraged to include an abstract of 100 words and some key words. The references should be presented at the end of the manuscript. If applicable, appropriately numbered tables and charts should also be provided at the end of the manuscripts rather than in the main body of the text. The front page should have the title, date, and the author's name and affiliations. The second page should contain abstract and the key words (if applicable). The main article should begin starting from the third page.

Short Bio: Authors are required to submit a short biography describing the current and past positions, recent publications, and relevant experience.

We normally do not accept already published articles, and no article accepted for publication will be published elsewhere simultaneously in any form without our knowledge. An excerpt or a survey article based on a new book may be considered for publication