

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN NEPAL

Krishna Hachhethu

Introduction

Political science in Nepal, in its five decade long history, has been passing through a paradox: expansion and diversification of its scope in both teaching and research on the one hand and decline and crisis of discipline on the other. Introduced at the certificate level in the name of civics in the early 1950s, this subject was later extended to the postgraduate level (MA) in 1960-61. The classes at the post-graduate, previously offered only by the Kirtipur Multiple Campus (KMC), has recently been expanded to eight other campuses outside Kathmandu. The number of Tribhuvan University (TU) political scientists increased from less than 10 in the early 1960s to 284 in February 2003. Is such numerical growth followed by a qualitative improvement in teaching and research of political science? Political science as a discipline has constantly been neglected by the state funded TU. The quality of teaching is eroding and research in TU is also declining. Political science has not yet developed as a relevant specialized subject in terms of the job market. Demand for this subject from society at large has decreased. Consequently, the number of students in political science has gone down in the last few years. All of this suggests a decline of political science in Nepal.

This paper first traces out general problems of social science in Nepal since a number of the problems facing political science are similar to those of other social science subjects. The second section of the paper concentrates on specific problems of political science. The third and fourth sections review contributions made to political study/research on Nepal by foreign and native scholars respectively. The fifth section deals with the diversification of political study on Nepal in different areas and subjects. Lastly, the conclusion makes a future projection of political science as a discipline in Nepal.

Decline of Social Sciences

A Short history of modern education

Only since the advent of democracy in February 1951 has educational opportunity for the people been made available. During the oligarchic Rana regime (1846-1951), education was virtually prohibited except for the members of ruling family and other privileged groups. For higher education

Nepal had only one institution, the Tri Chandra College established in 1918. The situation changed after 1951 and several private and government colleges were established. They were, however, affiliated with Patna University of India and followed its syllabus. Nepali contents were included in teaching at the college level only after the country established a university of its own, TU in 1959. The establishment of TU was a milestone for higher education in Nepal. The post graduate classes of all subjects were run by India trained Nepali teachers, Colombo Plan Indian teachers and American Fulbright teachers. This pattern remained till the late 1970s. In the first three decades, foreign scholars, Indian and Western, had contributed to both teaching and research in Nepal. Indian universities trained the first generation of educated Nepalis, including university teachers. Some native academics had been involved in teaching higher education from the early 1950s but research books produced by Nepali scholars appeared only from the mid-1960s, with the exception of history. This suggests a short history of research and teaching in Nepal by native scholars.

New Education Plan and its Priority

In the beginning, the social sciences were dominant subjects for two reasons. One was TU's limited ability to offer technical education. The other was that graduate and postgraduate social science subjects supplied the state's required manpower, particularly for the bureaucracy, educational institutions and corporations. But the eminence of social sciences has starkly declined since the introduction of New Education Plan (NEP) in 1972. The objectives of NEP was to spread science and technical education in order to meet manpower required for development (Shah 1978: 38). In pursuing this objective, TU created separate institutes in 1972-73 for each of the following subjects: forestry, agriculture and animal science, medicine, and engineering. TU expanded the technical campuses to different areas of the country. The collapse of the NEP in 1980 did not make a difference to the state's patronage to technical education. The state's constant and concerted effort to nurture technical and vocational education naturally had an adverse impact on social sciences. The figure of student enrollment in higher education can be taken as one indicator. In the 1950s and the 1960s the ratio between general education and technical education was roughly 80: 20, but it had shifted to 63: 37 by 1977 (Malla 1979). At present, the students in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (FHSS) constitute only 42 percent of the total 115,608 students of TU (Tribhuvan University 2001: 9).

Commercialization of education

The decline of social sciences is further evident as all of the three newly established universities, Purbanchal University, Pokhara University (state-funded) and Kathmandu University (private) do not yet have art, humanity and social science faculty. Education in Nepal has increasingly become commercialized and job oriented. Newly founded private and state funded universities offer courses which are in demand in the job market. Students are therefore attracted to them even though education in these universities is far more expensive than TU. Furthermore TU, particularly its FHSS is catering to students who have passed from public (government) school. The quality of education in public schools is now poor compared to that of private schools. This has impacted the quality of students entering TU.

It is difficult to find jobs for those educated in the social sciences. Engineering and medicine have long been popular because of the easy availability of 'prestigious' jobs for their graduates. From 1990 onwards, management as a subject has become increasingly popular. New universities and most private campuses mushrooming after 1990 have been providing courses in management, with a few offering basic science, engineering and medicine. On the benefit of taking management course, Kundan Dutta Koirala states, "The management programs are market-tailored to a large extent.... The demand for management graduates in the areas of marketing and finance is far more than its supply" (Koirala 1999b: 69). The relation between education and job availability also explains why some subjects i.e. English, Nepali, population, and sociology/anthropology are more popular than other social science subjects. To quote K. B. Bhattachan, "Due to ever-growing activities of international non-governmental organizations in Nepal and their increasing demand for sociology and anthropology graduates to work with them the discipline has become very glamorous" (Bhattachan 1997: 17).

Decline of TU

A general decline in the quality and standard of education provided by TU has a natural effect on the crisis of social sciences. Of the total five universities in Nepal, TU – the biggest and oldest university¹ - alone has taken responsibility

1 TU has five institutes (one each for science and technology, engineering, medicine, forestry, and agriculture and animal science), four faculties (humanities and social sciences, management, law, and education), and four research centres (CNAS, CEDA, RECAST and CERID). Apart from the 177 campuses affiliated with it, TU has 61 constituent campuses spread all over the country in which 115,608 students enrolled in 2001 (Tribhuvan University 2001: 9). This figure is around 80 percent

for social sciences. The erosion of TU standards is reflected in both teaching and research environment. A recent survey found that annual academic calendar prescribed for 228 teaching days but actual teaching accounted for 151 days only (Poudel 2003). In the central departments of KMC, both teachers and students of post-graduate classes have long been part-timers. Students regularly attending classes, particularly in most departments under FHSS, hardly exceed 20 percent of total students enrolled. Most teachers are overburdened by their involvement in other activities outside TU – in politics or in NGOs or in private campuses – which has seriously hampered the academic environment of the university.

Research is a much neglected area in TU. For the faculty members of teaching departments, teaching is their obligatory job and research is not binding. So research in TU has largely been carried out in the form of dissertation writings by MA and Ph. D students. Out of total 64 Ph. D. holders in four departments of KMC (political science, history, economics and sociology/anthropology) and two research centers, Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies (CNAS) and Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA), only 13 obtained their degree from TU. This suggests that TU is relatively an unattractive institution for aspiring Ph. Ds. One of the main reasons is the lack of funds. Only TU and the University Grant Commission (UGC) have programs which grant a small amount of fellowships for Ph.D.² Abuse of fellowships and the facility of five years of paid study leave have long been a norm. The office of FHSS records reveals that only 10-15 percent of those taking such study leaves have completed their Ph.D. Out of TU's four non-teaching research centres, CNAS and CEDA are assigned to the social sciences areas. CEDA and CNAS were at their pinnacles in the 1970s and 1980s. However, both have now reduced their own research activities. Worst of all, CNAS has not received a research budget from TU in the last few years. TU's financial crisis also compelled FHSS to drop its mini research program which it had run for the last five years with a budget of NRs 500,000

of the total students in higher education. Among TU teaching organizations, the humanities and social sciences faculty is the largest encompassing 26 departments covering different subjects that can be broadly divided into three categories: language and literature, liberal arts, and social sciences.

- 2 The FHSS has received 20 seats for Ph. D fellowship annually. Since its founding in 1995, the University Grant Commission (UGC) has granted fellowship to a total of 67 Ph. D. researchers, including 7 from history, 3 from political science, 7 from economics, and 1 from sociology/anthropology. See University Grants Commission's Annual Reports 1995/96; 1996/97; 1997/98; 1998/99 and 1999/2000.

per year. Other adverse conditions for research are: low salary; politicization of teachers; students and administrative staff; political consideration in appointment of academic heads; lack of new books and standard journals; mismanagement of the library and the separation of teaching and research.

Dominance of non-academic research

The decline of TU synchronised with the emergence of the non-university sector in producing social science knowledge through research. Research from the private sector started only in the 1970s except for the *Itihās Samśodhan Maṇḍal* (established in 1952). New Era and the Institute for Integrated Development Studies (IIDS) are pioneer institutions – both established in the 1970s – which have their own credentials of being consultancy and client-based research centers focusing mainly on areas of economic development. The post-1990 period witnessed the mushrooming of private research centres and NGOs due to the availability of foreign funds. Of several types of newly founded private organizations, only a few have contributed to the academic development of social sciences by involving themselves in one or more of these programs – manpower training, organizing seminars, producing journals and publishing books.³ The dominant groups are consultancy based and advocacy based NGOs in the research business as donors are not that interested in academic research. Their role in academic research is insignificant, as lobby and advocacy work rather than research concerns, have been their focus. Moreover research work has largely been confined to report writing. So their contribution is mainly limited to increasing the quantity of research and diversification of study areas.

Crisis of Political Science

Commenting on B. C. Malla's paper "Development of the Study of Political Science in Nepal" in 1973, Prachanda Pradhan stated, "The problems that we identified almost a decade ago continue to remain the same" (Pradhan 1974: 147). A joint paper of Malla and Pradhan on "Political Science in Nepal," published in 1966 in an edited book, is perhaps the first attempt to review the

3 Some of the leading organizations contributing to social science development are the Centre for Social Research and Development, Nepal Foundation for Advanced Studies, Nepal South Asia Centre, Nepal Centre for Contemporary Studies, Martin Chautari, Political Science Association of Nepal, History Association of Nepal, Nepal Economic Association, and Sociological and Anthropological Society of Nepal, National Democratic Institution for International Affairs, ORG-MARG, Coalition for Actions for South Asian Cooperation, and South Asia Forum for Human Rights.

state of this discipline. Of several problems Malla identified in his separate paper, some of the noteworthy are: lack of specialist or trained political scientists, flight of qualified teachers from academic life, the lack of a centre to promote empirical research, and the question of making political science a specialized subject vis-à-vis job-oriented (Malla 1974). These conditions remained unchanged. Subsequent papers on the same theme – one published in 1978 and other in 1983, both written by Lok Raj Baral with Dwarika Dhungel and Dharma Bahadur Shakya (Baral et al. 1978), and Yasoda Suwal (Baral and Suwal 1983) respectively – illustrated further the same points identified in previous papers as the main challenges to develop political science in Nepal. One point that Malla did not mention but Baral and Suwal point to is the regimented nature of the panchayat regime and its impact on political science. They states that the, "... psychological reason that political studies would tend to create controversy seemed to have worked against political studies. Sometimes political scientists become over conscious of their prospective role and prefer to keep quiet"(Baral and Suwal 1983: 96).

The relation between the production of political literature and the degree of political freedom is historically examined by Sushil R. Pandey's paper – presented in a seminar in 1988 and published later (Pandey 1993: 22). However, his paper focuses more on the classification of political literature on Nepal into five sections: political development, social change and development, foreign relations, administration, and general. Ananta Raj Poudel in his paper presented in a seminar in 1988, also touches on how the panchayat regime discouraged critical study of Nepalese politics, although the paper mainly analyses the development of political science syllabus at the postgraduate level, particularly in the area of teaching of Modern Political Analysis (Poudyal 1988). The syllabus of political studies at the undergraduate and postgraduate level in TU is also the central focus of a paper jointly written by T. N. Jaisawal and Pannakaji Amatya, two senior political scientists of Nepal. They conclude, "Political Science, once considered as one of the most popular subjects, has progressively lost its erstwhile charm and appeal." They further explain "... political scientists of Nepal have miserably failed to bring home to the society what Political Science really means and why it is indispensable for the overall development of the country" (Jaisawal and Amatya 1997: 57).

The latest piece on this theme is Sridhar K. Khatri's paper on "Teaching of International Relations in Nepal". In addition to a review of familiar longstanding problems of political science discipline in Nepal, Khatri focuses on three more problems: the decrease in political science students; the restructure of the syllabus in an *ad hoc* manner, and the lack of specialized

manpower in campuses located outside Kathmandu where political study was extended to the postgraduate level recently (Khatri 2001). The following section concentrates on my own observation and analysis of the challenges of political science as a discipline in Nepal.

Regimented Education and Political Science

One year after the establishment of TU, the partyless panchayat system was introduced in 1960. Such a regime change had a profound impact on the overall educational environment, particularly in regard to the study of political science. Because of the sensitivity of the subject, political science cannot flourish in a regimented political system. This is shown by the history of Nepal. Till the Rana period, political science was a forbidden subject whereas history, economic and geography were taught in the art faculty of Tri Chandra College. Only Sanskrit students benefited from eastern philosophy and only a few who had had the opportunity to be in Indian universities were exposed to political study. So, political science in Nepal is a younger discipline in comparison to some other social science subjects. Only after the advent of democracy in 1951 was political science as an independent discipline introduced at the IA (Intermediate in Art) and BA (Bachelor in Art) levels. The extension of political science at the MA (Master in Art) level was synchronized with the establishment of panchayat system.

One of the regime's objectives, as spelt out in the NEP, was to construct the ideological and philosophical base for the partyless panchayat system. The government took a twin policy: to carry out research mostly via government offices and to control teaching institutes. Notable among government institutions concerned with political research were the Panchayat Training Centre, Nepal Administrative Staff College, and the Centre for Panchayat Policy and Investigation. The main reason behind patronizing government institutions for research was that the political environment in the university had always been hostile to the panchayat establishment. However, government research could hardly contribute to academic growth. Furthermore, the government also tried to control research output in other ways, including via recruitment. The ideological inclination of faculty members of the Central Department of Political Science (CDPS) of TU in the 1980s showed that pro-establishment people were in the majority and only a few were actively identified as democrats. A critic expressed the impact of limited academic freedom to political study in the following manner: "Political analysis of the country is acceptable to that extent which is superficial and dealing on legal and constitutional aspects only" (Poudyal 1988: 14).

The panchayat regime's intolerance was exposed with the abrupt dismissal of 17 university teachers in 1975, including B.C. Malla, the founder and incumbent Chairman of CDPS, on political grounds. Another case relates to Lok Raj Baral, successor of Malla as the Chairman of CDPS, who was asked to bring a clarification from the Prime Minister on his newly published 'controversial' book *Oppositional Politics in Nepal* (Baral 1977) in order to make a decision on his candidacy for the professor post.⁴ He ultimately managed to get the position. These were some of the instances which reveal how the panchayat regime harassed critical analysts and scholars. The fear psyche of native political scientists under the regimented panchayat system was manifested in different forms. Among those who did their Ph. D. during the panchayat regime (1960-1990), most selected foreign policy issues to avoid the risk in their research. The *Nepali Journal of Political Science*, published from 1979 to 1983 by the CDPS, also followed the trend. Out of 29 articles published in the total of 6 issues of this journal, papers on Nepali politics account for only 3. The remainder are on Nepal's foreign policy, regional affairs, international relations and political theory. Similarly out of 10 papers in the "Current Issue Series" brought out by *CNAS Forum*, 9 articles are related to Nepal's foreign policy and South Asian Affairs and one on development.

CNAS's political science wing also suffered suddenly in early 1989 because of the regimented educational system under the partyless panchayat regime. The difference between late Khadga Bikram Shah (Executive Director and brother in law of late king Birendra) and a senior political scientist, Lok Raj Baral, on Nepal-India relations and particularly on India's blockade of Nepal in March 1989, led to the abrupt decision to transfer many political scientists from CNAS to other campuses (Hachhethu 2002a: 55).

The study of political science and other disciplines has become largely free from regimentation after the restoration of multiparty democracy in 1990. A new environment of opportunity is opening up but mainly as an "outlet outside the traditional academic turf" (Khatri 2001: 141). However, only a few political scientists have shown their ability to fit themselves in the new trend of research largely carried out by private research centers and NGOs. TU has not only failed to cope with new challenges and opportunities, its academic environment is rapidly eroding. Political science in TU, both teaching and research, is suffering. One of the reasons for this relates to the question of the ability of TU political scientists to face new challenges and opportunities.

4 Related to the author by Lok Raj Baral.

Expertise and Syllabus

The expertise of political science teachers is first examined in terms of the curriculum. As mentioned above, the study of political science in Nepal began from 1951 at IA and BA levels according to the syllabus of Patna University. Those trained from Indian universities became pioneer native political science teachers i.e. Kulnath Lohani, Geha Raj Joshi, U.N. Sinha, Parimal and B.C. Malla. All of them confined themselves to teaching except for Malla who wrote a few papers. The inadequacy of native manpower was obvious when academic study was extended to the MA level in 1960-61. Some Colombo Plan Indian teachers i.e. H.N. Agrawal, D.C. Gupta, B.B. Gupta and S.M. Singh taught at the post-graduate level. Till the 1960s, the syllabus of political science was similar to Indian universities except for the addition of Nepali politics and administration. Teaching at the postgraduate level was mainly on political thought, comparative government and administration.

The early 1970s marked a departure on the study of political science with regard to curriculum and manpower. The change of education by the NEP from that of the British-Indian model to the American semester system was reflected in the revision of the political science curriculum. Some new courses i.e. Modern Political Analysis, Comparative Politics, Development Administration, Foreign Policy and Diplomacy, and Regional Studies were introduced, while other subjects from the old syllabus, such as Political Thought, Comparative Government and Public Administration were retained. The change in the course of study was defended in the following manner, "What we have tried to achieve is a synthetic blend of the empirical approach and the formal constitutional approach" (Malla 1974: 135). But the problem of having sufficient skilled manpower to take on new courses was revealed when a new course "Nature, Method and Recent Trends in Political Science" (later revamped as a chapter in Modern Political Analysis) was introduced in 1966-68. As Nepali and Indian teachers were not familiar with the new courses, some visiting Fulbright American scholars (Hoyes and Herz in 1968-69, and Gunnel and Stephen Sloan in 1974-75) covered these areas. By the mid-1970s, all foreign teachers were given a farewell with the assumption that there was sufficient native manpower to teach political science in TU. In the early 1980s, TU had 145 political scientists, including 1 Professor 2 Readers and 142 Lecturers and Assistant Lecturers (Baral and Suwal 1983: 94). In 2002, the number increased to 12 Professors, 69 Readers, 182 Lecturers, 7 Assistant lecturers and 14 instructors.⁵ However, the question is: do we have specialized political scientists on different areas/subjects to match the

5 Record of TU Personnel Administration.

diversification and expansion of the discipline? Let us first briefly touch upon the present political science curriculum at the higher level of education in TU.

For IA, two papers – Political Theory (1st year) and Government and Administration of Nepal (2nd year) – are prescribed. For the three-year BA course, there are five papers: Political Theory (including Modern Political Analysis) and Political Thought (1st year), Government and Politics of Nepal and India, and Comparative Governments of UK, USA, France and China (2nd year) and one from two optional subjects, International Relations/International Law or Administrative Studies (3rd year). A political science teacher with simply an MA degree can teach papers prescribed for IA and BA levels because of the general nature of the subjects in the syllabus. But the case is different at the MA level since there are several subjects that require specialists. The courses for the MA level are as follows: 1. Modern Political Analysis 2. Political Thought 3. International Politics 4. Public Administration 5. Research Methodology (for 1st year) 6. Domestic Politics and Foreign Affairs of Nepal 7. Comparative Government and Politics 8. International Studies (any one of these three papers: International Law, International Organization, and Foreign Policy and Diplomacy) 9. Regional Studies (any one of these four papers: South and South East Asia, West Asia and Africa, Western Europe, and Western Hemisphere) and 10. Thesis or Political Sociology or Environmental Politics (2nd year). The question of the expertise of teachers has become more relevant because of the expansion of postgraduate classes to other campuses outside Kathmandu.

Table 1 clearly shows the discrepancy of manpower in campuses running postgraduate classes on political science. The CDPS, KMC, is in a highly advantageous position as it has 8 Professors, 8 Readers and 2 Lecturers. Half of its faculty members have Ph. D.s. The Political Science department of P. N. Campus (Pokhara) and Thakur Ram Campus (Birjung) have a fairly good number in terms of manpower but neither of them have Professors, while most of their faculty are at the level of Lecturers. Other campuses are poor in number, position and degree in regards to their political science teachers. The postgraduate classes in these campuses have been taught mostly by junior and young teaching staffs, despite being overloaded with teaching IA and BA level classes as well.

After granting permission to run MA classes, TU authorities have done nothing to enhance the capabilities of campuses concerned. As these campuses are poorly equipped, in terms of manpower and other facilities, it is surprising that they were permitted to run MA classes in the first place. Perhaps Khatri rightly points out, “The expansion in the number of campuses

Table 1: Manpower in Campuses running MA class on Political Science

Campuses		Prof.	Reader	Lect.	Asst. Lect.	Instr.	Total	Ph. D
1	Central Department of Political Science, KMC, Kirtipur	8	8	2	-	-	18	9
2	P.N. Campus, Pokhara	-	2	14	1	-	17	-
3	Thakur Ram Campus, Birjung	-	3	10	1	1	15	3
4	RR Campus, Janakpur	-	5	3	-	-	8	2
5	Mahendra Campus, Nepaljung	-	1	3	1	-	5	1
6	Snatakotar Campus, Biratnagar	-	2	2	-	-	4	-
7	Mahendra Campus, Dang	-	-	5	-	-	5	-
8	Birendra (pvt), Surkhet	Na						
9	Sidhanath (pvt), Kanchanpur	Na						
10	Other Campuses	4	48	143	4	13	212	16
Total		12	69	182	7	14	284	31

Source: Record of TU Personnel Administration

teaching postgraduate level courses have taken place not only due to increasing demands, but also largely as a result of pressures from political leaders in their constituency to bring higher level education to their community” (Khatri 2001: 144).

Of course, CDPS, KMC is top heavy but the expertise of most of its faculty members on the subject is not beyond doubt. Some of them are specialists with Ph.D's and/or papers and books in their respective areas i.e. administration, Nepali politics, Nepal's foreign policy, and research methodology. However it can be argued that papers like Modern Political Analysis, Political Thought, Comparative Government and International Politics are taught by generalists who have turned into specialists after having been in the teaching profession for long. The CDPS lacks experts on International Studies (International Law, International Organization, and Foreign Policy and Diplomacy), Regional Studies (South and South East Asia, West Asia and Africa, Western Europe, Western Hemisphere), Political Sociology, and Environmental Politics. The absence of expertise in such subjects is clear. There are hardly any papers written by Nepali political scientists on these areas. The shortage of qualified manpower on regional and international study is also evident: "There are no centers of learning in Nepal where security studies are pursued with a full blown programme" (Kumar 2000a: 161-162). It needs to be recalled here that the lack of specialized and trained political scientists has been noticed repeatedly since the mid-1960s in the writings on the state of political science in Nepal. However, the discipline has not yet been able to overcome stated problems.

The problem of expertise in teaching faculties of political science indicates a lacuna of sorts and a limitation in research in this area. The separation of research and teaching in TU leads to the fact that teaching faculties do not have research projects. A research project here means additional work for which a person gets extra money in addition to his/her regular salary. Self financed research is a fantasy given the poor salary that a Professor of TU draws monthly (NRs 15, 000/US \$ 200). The participation of political scientist faculty in seminars/workshops is rare indicating the poor state of research activities in the teaching faculty. The faculty members of CDPS have suffered for not being able to update their knowledge through research. Consequently, political science teaching has largely been confined to text books.

In such a situation, a teaching faculty can seek the help of research centers for both manpower and materials. While making this argument one should not, however, ignore the limitations of research centres in at least two respects. One, the study of political science in Nepal was confined to classroom teaching before CNAS made a concerted effort and opened a political science wing in 1978. Political research from private sector was unknown until 1990. So political research in Nepal has no strong foundation. Before 1990 under the regimented panchayat system, there was an adverse situation for critical research on domestic politics. The other limitation of

research centres relates to areas of study. In the late 1970s and the early 1980s, CEDA produced some reports on Nepal's foreign policy and South Asia regional cooperation. CNAS's political science wing concentrated on South and East Asia area studies until 1980s. Since then it has mainly turned to domestic politics of Nepal. Political research from private sectors has concentrated on only domestic politics. So the research centres inside and outside of TU could back up the teaching faculty – both in terms of manpower and materials they produced – only in two areas: domestic and foreign policy of Nepal and the regional study of South Asia.

But do teaching faculties take up such benefits? The exclusion of political literature published by CNAS and the Political Science Association of Nepal (POLSAN) in “recommended readings” in the postgraduate syllabus of political science, despite their usefulness to both students and teachers, indicates the bias of teaching faculty members towards the research centres. It has been rightly observed that teaching and research have never been seen as complementary to each other (Dahal 2000). The teaching faculty appear to have some sort of psychological tension vis-à-vis research staff of TU. Book reviews of newly published political literatures by teaching faculty is almost zero. This can lead to questions of whether the latter feel the need to update themselves on newly available knowledge. The dependence on text books also indicates continuous adherence to knowledge produced in the West and to some extent India.

The expertise of TU political scientists can also be questioned from the current wave of ‘development-centered’ studies in the research market. In the post-1990 period, research on political and other subjects by the private sector is thriving with the availability of foreign funds. From strictly defined politics-related research, donors’ interest and funding is shifting from the study of legal-structural aspects (political parties, parliament, election) in the early 1990s, to the question of empowerment of local bodies and marginalized groups (women, dalit, *Janajāti*, local governance, decentralization etc.). Above all, conflict resolution – owing to the intensification of the Maoist problem – is the hot topic at present. Since donors are interested in studies on such issues, the focus of research has shifted from core (political parties, parliament, election etc) to the peripheral areas. Do we have political scientists capable of dealing with such new areas of research? Only a few political scientists have kept themselves busy doing research constantly, but all of them have been trained with qualitative study and academic research on core areas, i.e. political parties, parliament, government, governance, decentralization, foreign policy, regional cooperation etc. The new areas of research demands different skills and methods, i.e. field survey, empirical and

quantitative study, multidisciplinary approaches, and consultancy based report writing, areas in which even the active political scientists are less trained. For many political scientists, learning research methodology was confined to listening to a few lectures as a MA student. Very few among the MA political science students take a course on thesis writing, and both supervisors and students have a tendency to ignore the methodology section regardless of quality. Dilli Ram Dahal, currently a member of the research committee of FHSS, observes that most Ph. D. dissertations submitted by political scientists are methodologically very weak. However, these faults have been ignored in the granting of degrees. Consequently they lag behind sociologists/ anthropologists in being able to take advantage of research opportunities on issues that broadly fall into the category of 'political sociology' and 'political economy' rather than conventional 'political science'.

Political Science: special or general subject?

In Nepal, political science has been an independent discipline since 1951. But its status – whether it is a special or general subject – has long been debated. Consequently, the relevance of political study in Nepal to society and state has always been perceived skeptically. Its relevance to the state is largely concerned with the government's response to the work of political scientists, whether it considers political literature as policy inputs and consults leading political scientists in policy making. In this regard, Baral and Suwal made a pessimistic note:

It has been said that three important processes characterize [sic] knowledge industry: creation, diffusion, and utilization. When we examine these three elements in political science in Nepal, all of them are not necessarily present. Creation is possible through research, diffusion through teaching and utilization through the policy making process. Research is at its lowest ebb, teaching is suffering a setback due to several intervening factors, and policy makers care very little to go through the ordeals of consultation with the persons concerned (Baral and Suwal 1983: 98).

This remark was made in the past when the country had an authoritarian panchayat regime. But the situation, by and large, remains the same after the restoration of multiparty democracy in 1990. This suggests that the policy makers – in the past during panchayat regime and under democratic dispensations – do not consider political science a special subject and relevant to their business. Though political science is not a mechanical subject, experts of this subject could contribute in many areas, i.e. foreign policy, legislation,

institutionalization of political parties and parliament, and political process etc. However, these experts have not been taken seriously by political parties and government leadership. Talking of his resignation as advisor to the then Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala, Professor of political science Krishna P. Khanal revealed that there is no system of taking advice from advisors. This is an indication of the gulf between politicians and political scientists.

Analysing the discipline from a job perspective, political science appears to the public as a general subject, except for teaching/research in the university. Consequently, the relevance of political study to society has declined considerably. It has been urged that some government institutions – i.e. the Ministry of General Administration, the Ministry of Local Administration, the Local Development Training Center, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs etc., – be made places where the knowledge of political science is considered important if not essential. However, this has not yet been considered.

In the post-1990 period, jobs in the private sector is expanding. The students of economics have their own traditional job bases in banks, corporations and financial companies. Similarly those trained in sociology and anthropology have new avenues for jobs in NGOs and INGOs. But for the students of political science, there is hardly any work area that they can claim as their domain. Government employees have been more attracted to the public administration campus since it was expanded to the MA level in 1982. New incoming students are more interested in sociology/anthropology, population, rural development etc. The recent introduction of a postgraduate course in law has also adversely impacted student enrollment for MA in political science, which once attracted law graduates. Overall, student enrollment in political science has been rapidly declining at all levels, IA, BA and MA. This has never happened before in the history of political science in Nepal.

Decline of Interest of Foreign Scholars

The study of politics in Nepal has also suffered due to a decline in interest of foreign scholars. It was once a centre of attraction to the people of the world when this “Shangri-La” was relatively unknown to the world. There was an unprecedented flow of foreign social scientists, particularly Indians, Europeans and Americans during the period 1950-1970. The most important reason behind the interest shown by Indian and American political scientists at that time was the location of Nepal between China and India and its strategic importance in cold war politics at regional and international levels. But as the importance of Nepal declined in the changing regional and global strategic

setting due to several developments – détente in Sino-India relations, the fall of Soviet Union and the end of the cold war to mention a few– so did interest in Nepal. This was reflected in the decrease of foreign scholars' interest on Nepal. American scholars, who had done remarkable work on Nepali politics and foreign policy in different time frames from the 1950s to 1970s, left this area in the later years. The exception here is the publication of a joint article by Gaige and Scholz (1991), which was an outcome of their direct observation of the 1991 parliamentary elections of Nepal.

The escalation of the Maoist's armed insurgency in Nepal has drawn American attention at a different level – connected as it has become to the US's post 9/11 foreign policy. There has been an increase in short-term visits of US based conflict experts in Nepal. However, these experts appear to focus on giving prescriptions of mitigating 'terrorism' rather than trying to truly understand the roots of the conflict and troubles. Thus the increasing concern of the US government in the conflict in Nepal is not yet likely to lead to a revival of US political scientists' interest in Nepali politics.

Political research on Nepal by Indian scholars has also decreased considerably since the 1980s. The end of area studies in Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), which initiated Nepal study in India for the first time as the then Indian School of International Studies, is an indication of the declining trend. Two other centers located in India, the South Asia Study Centre (SACS) of the University of Rajasthan in Jaipur and the Centre for the Study of Nepal (CSN) in Banaras Hindu University in Varanasi, which have over the years produced several specialists as well as books on Nepal, have also reduced their research projects on Nepal. A general survey of two journals, JNU's *International Studies*, and SACS's *South Asian Studies*, reveals many published articles related to Nepal before 1980. However in later issues, articles on Nepal are found only occasionally. Nepal study in India is now mostly limited in producing M. Phils and Ph. Ds. The new generation of Indian scholars confine themselves to the publication of their own dissertations on Nepal and then move into other areas for better prospects and careers.⁶

The cost of the decline in the study of Nepali politics and foreign policy by American and Indian academics is unrecoverable as scholars of other countries are not that interested in this area. Even within India, the interest in Nepal is found only among the scholars and universities located in the Northern part of the country. Neither has Nepal come to figure in the serious academic works of other South Asian countries, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri

6 For details about decline of Nepal study in India, see Onta 2001.

Lanka. The absence of Chinese scholarship on Nepali politics is also surprising. There are no British nor European political scientists, except T. Louise Brown (Brown 1996), in the list of foreign scholars who have recently written a book on Nepal.

Contributions by Foreign Scholars

The interest of outsiders is important in at least two respects. One, the pioneer authors of Nepal politics are foreigners. And secondly, political science in Nepal is relatively more influenced by foreign scholars in terms of research. These foreign writers fall into two categories, Westerners and Indians.

Western Scholars

Leo E. Rose is the most prominent American professor of political science. He has contributed four outstanding books on Nepal, in addition to several articles. One book on foreign policy was single authored (Rose 1971) and the other three on domestic politics were written in collaboration with Bhuwan Lal Joshi, Margaret Fisher, and John Scholz respectively (Joshi and Rose 1966; Rose and Fisher 1970; Rose and Scholz 1980). His book *Nepal Strategy for Survival* (Rose 1971) is the first of its kind. No other book has yet to match Joshi and Rose's *Democratic Innovations in Nepal* in its understanding of Nepali politics in length and depth, although the book covered only the limited time frame of 1950-64 (Joshi and Rose 1966). Their study was however Kathmandu centric and Kathmandu based in terms of methodology. This pattern – both style and methodology – was followed by subsequent western scholars – T. Louise Brown (1996) and Hoftun et al. (1999) in their own separate studies of political development in Nepal in the post-1990 period. Michael Hutt's edited volume (Hutt 1994) also falls in this category. These three books have come out after a long gap in terms of contributions made by Western scholars on political development in Nepal. However political development under the panchayat regime (1960-1990) was a missing part of Western scholarship, though the panchayat polity was studied from different perspectives and issues.

The above mentioned studies did not address local politics. Western political scientists rarely made field studies outside Kathmandu, except Frederick Gaige who did extensive fieldwork in the Tarai and contributed a book on regionalism in Nepal (Gaige 1975). European scholars who have not been trained in political science, particularly anthropologists, are ahead in doing extensive field work in different parts of the country and in producing articles and books on Nepal, including those related to politics. David Seddon, who had visited different parts of Nepal in the 1970s, produced several books

(Seddon 1987, Seddon et al. 1979, Blaikie, Cameron and Seddon 1980, 2000[1979]) – single and jointly authored – exploring poverty and development in Nepal from a political-economy approach.

Bengt-Erik Bergstrom (1980) applied anthropological methods to study local elections in a particular village. Lionel Caplan has the credit of publishing two books on caste-ethnic problems of Nepal from the perspective of political anthropology (Caplan 1970, 1975). Patricia A. Caplan's book is another piece of anthropological study on social inequality in Nepal (Caplan 1972). David N. Gellner et al. (1997) edited the latest publication on nationalism and ethnicity, His other edited volume on resistance and state (Gellner 2003) is an indication of the increasing interest of European anthropologists on politics related issues and areas in Nepal. Their interest is increasing as the Maoist problem in Nepal intensifies. Two books on the Maoist's armed insurgency have been published recently in collaboration with European and Nepali scholars (Karki and Seddon 2003, Hutt 2004). Some other European scholars, all historians or anthropologists and non-political scientists except for Karl-Heinz Kramer, contributing to research on politics related issues of Nepal are: John Whelpton, Phillip Ramirez, Anne de Salles, Mark Turin, Marie Lecomte-Tilouine, and Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka.

Indian Scholars

Anirudha Gupta is a pioneer author of Nepali politics. His book covers political development in Nepal 1950-60 and focuses on origin, ideology and leadership of Nepali political parties (Gupta 1964). His contemporary Indian scholars i.e. Satish Kumar (1967), Kanchanmoy Mojumdar (1973), K.C. Chaudhuri (1960), Ramakant (1968), Girilal Jain (1959), and H.N. Agrawal (1976), contributed in initiating research on Nepali politics. Most of their contribution has been on the history of Nepali politics, foreign policy and administration. Their books are considered to be of a high standard.

Credit also goes to SASC of Jaipur in expanding the organizational efforts of Indian academics to study Nepal and in producing a second generation of Indian experts on Nepal, i.e. S.D. Muni, R.S. Chauhan, M.D. Dharmadasani, and B.C. Upreti. Each of them has published several books.⁷ S. K. Jha (1975) and Parmanand (1982) are also part of the second generation of Indian political scientists who did research on Nepal. This generation has made considerable contributions in mainly in two aspects. One is the expansion and

7 See Muni 1973, 1977, 1992; Chauhan 1971, 1989; Dharmadasani 1976, 1984a, 1984b, 1992, 1997, 2000 and Upreti 1988, 1993a, 1993b, 1999, 2001.

diversification in areas of political research on Nepal. The other is the production of a new generation of manpower, both Indian and Nepali.

JNU, SASC and NSC are known as institutions in India that have produced several Ph.Ds and M. Phils., both Indian and Nepali students, on Nepal. Sangeeta Thapliyal (1998), Mollica Dastider (1995) and Deeptima Shukla (2000) are among the new generation of Indian scholars trained on Nepal. However, it has been observed that most current Indian scholarship on Nepal is mediocre and deficient in terms of quality and variety. Lack of proficiency in Nepali language, inadequate fieldwork, and failure to develop new perspectives different from earlier writings, have been pointed out as the main problems of the new Indian scholarship on Nepal (Onta 2001:72-74). Irrespective of different generations, the writing style among the Indian experts on Nepal is almost the same, with the emphasis on the qualitative, descriptive, narrative and analytical.

Political Study and Nepali Scholarship

Central Department of Political Science

CDPS, KMC is the main centre in producing political science manpower at the postgraduate level. Most of its graduates are in the teaching profession with a few in research centers and government jobs. In terms of academics, most are confined to teaching since teaching faculties in TU do not have research budgets. The lack of institutional research is common to all teaching departments of TU. For instance in terms of economics it has been said that, "Academic research [is] confined to Ph. D. (and some times Master's) dissertation" (Sharma 1997: 69). Most TU economists are busy in projects sponsored by the government, NGOs and INGOs. The case is similar to faculty members of the sociology/anthropology department most of whom appear to be development sociologists/ anthropologists and have largely kept away from pure academic research. Despite such commonalities, CDPS is relatively behind other faculties in terms of research output. Other faculties, i.e. history, economics, and sociology/anthropology at least have their own departmental journal, *Voice of History*, *The Economic Journal of Nepal* and *Occasional Papers in Sociology and Anthropology* respectively. CDPS has not been able to revive its journal since it was stopped in 1983, although one volume was published in 2002. Research on history in Nepal, nurtured mostly by native scholars, has a relatively strong foundation. In the 1950s, history writing became a fad in Nepal, more so than any other social science subject (Sharma 1974: 116). Academic research on Nepali politics by native writers started only since the mid-1970s.

Rishikesh Shaha, Prachanda Pradhan and Lok Raj Baral are pioneer native authors on Nepali politics. Shaha has the credit of publishing several books, all on history and contemporary politics of Nepal (Shaha 1975, 1978, 1982, 1990a, 1990b, 1992). Pradhan confined himself to writing on the administration of Nepal (Pradhan 1976). Baral's research started from Nepali politics but expanded later to Nepal's foreign policy and the regional affairs of South Asia (1977, 1983, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1996, 2000). Later, he was involved in major projects of CEDA and CNAS on the internal and external affairs of Nepal. Indeed, the contributions of pioneer political scientists of Nepal are remarkable despite the fact that examining Nepali politics critically during the panchayat regime was a risky job.

Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies (CNAS)

The opening of the political science wing in CNAS in 1978 with the recruitment of three fresh political scientists marked a new beginning in terms of institutional initiatives to carry out political research in Nepal. Before that, CEDA had already produced a report on local leadership of the Panchayat system and, in the early 1980s it also produced some volumes on Nepal's foreign policy and regional cooperation in South Asia. But CEDA's interest on politics related subjects has been sporadic since its permanent focus is on development related issues. However, CNAS has remained the focal institution for academic research on social sciences, including political science. Originated as the Institute of Nepal Studies (INS) in 1969, it changed its name to the Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies (INAS) in 1972 and finally became the Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies in 1977. CNAS was established to conduct social science research in the university. In the initial phase, it focused on study and research related to history, sociology, anthropology and language. Political science was added in 1978 but the focus of this newly established wing was area studies as the research on domestic politics was discouraged by the panchayat establishment.

CNAS took a new turn in the 1980s with the appointment of Kumar Khadga Bikram Shah to the post of Executive Director in 1984. He strengthened the political science wing to materialize his vision of making CNAS a think tank on foreign affairs. Previously CNAS had three political scientists but later the number increased to 11, specializing respectively on Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Japan, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, regional affairs and international relations. CNAS's political science wing grew in importance with the publication of the journal, *Strategic Study Series*, and *CNAS Year Review*, in addition to its contribution to *CNAS Forum*. To facilitate research, CNAS subscribed to a number of international journals

and leading newspapers from all South Asian countries. But this wing suffered suddenly in early 1989 by a decision to transfer many political scientists from CNAS to other campuses. The publication of *Strategic Study Series*, *CNAS Year Review* and *CNAS Forum* stopped permanently. This event led eventually to a swing in the focus of the CNAS political science wing from foreign policy to domestic politics, though the switch occurred partly because of the change in focus of research after the restoration of democracy in 1990. However, CNAS's political science wing has not yet completely broken from the past. In addition to his publication of an edited book, *Nepal's India Policy* (Kumar 1992), Dhruba Kumar – the senior most among the present five political scientists of CNAS – has continued to publish articles on foreign affairs related subjects in journals, occasional papers and edited volumes.⁸ Most of the latest publications of CNAS's political scientists, however, are on domestic politics (Kumar 1995, 2000b; Hachhethu 2002b.)

As CNAS has been suffering for many reasons – lack of institutional approach in setting research agendas, insufficient funds for research, ever increasing bureaucratization, inadequate use of library resources, and involvement of some of its academics in consultancy research outside the university to mention a few – the decline of its stature is obvious. Furthermore, the Centre's political science wing has obviously been affected by the general decline of TU and CNAS.

Private

In the post-1990 period, research on Nepali politics has largely shifted to the private sectors. Political Science Association of Nepal POLSAN appeared as the most active organization with its record of producing books⁹ and one journal, *Nepali Political Science and Politics*. But its split into three groups led to a reduction in its vibrancy. The split occurred as consequences of personality factors (between organizational head Professor Lok Raj Baral and some who disliked Baral) and to some extent some political reasons as well. Originally one group was known as the Baral group and is primarily considered as the 'democrat group.' The other was a mixture of the people having rightist and leftist background. The latter group has further split on the eve of the separation of the Marxist Leninists (ML) from the United Marxist-Leninist (UML). The split of POLSAN has an adverse impact in cultivating donors for research funds and it has obviously affected the capacity for

8 Kumar is also the author of *Mao and China's Foreign Policy* (1989).

9 See POLSAN (1991, 1992, n.d.), Baral (1992), Thapa (1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1999) and Khanal (2000).

generating research projects. At present, all the three POLSANS confine their activities to organizing occasional talk programs and seminars.

The Nepal Centre for Contemporary Studies (NCCS) is another institution focusing on political study. In addition to the publication of a journal – *Nepali Journal of Contemporary Studies* – and a few books on domestic politics,¹⁰ the Centre is running ambitious programmes, including workshops/seminars, data generation, fieldwork-based research, publication of occasional papers, and the training of youngsters in political science and other social sciences. But its sustainability, like other NGOs, depends on whether it will continue to receive funds from donors. For all intents and purposes there is no other private research centre or NGO in Nepal that is political study specific. Nevertheless there are many organizations, which include politics as a component of their larger research.

In terms of quality, the contribution of most private research centres and NGOs cannot be said to be that important since a large part of their research activities are confined to organizing seminars and publication of seminar proceedings. Indeed, donor-sponsored studies hardly meet academic standards. However, with the entry of private research centers and NGOs, the study of Nepali politics has increased and proliferated in both content and methodology. Unlike the traditional method of study – qualitative, descriptive, narrative and analytical – adopted mostly by TU political scientists, different institutions have applied empirical and quantitative studies on areas like elections, public opinion, leadership, government, parliament, and party.¹¹ To show the diversification and expansion of research on Nepali politics, it will be relevant here to mention the name of some leading non-university organizations located in Nepal and the main areas in which they have contributed: Society for Constitutional and Parliamentary Affairs (SCOPE) on the constitution and parliament; Institute for Integrated Development Studies (IIDS) on election; South Asia Partnership/Nepal (SAP-Nepal) on peace and conflict resolution; Informal Service Sector (INSEC) on human rights; Nepal Foundation for Advanced Studies (NEFAS) on governance and civil society; National Democratic Institution for International Affairs (NDI) on gender, corruption, parliament, political parties and governance; Coalition for Actions

10 See Baral et al. 2001, Baral (2004, Forthcoming), Baral et al. 2004.

11 See Development Research for a Democratic Nepal (DREFDEN) 1992; Nepal Opinion Survey Centre (NOSC) 1993; SEARCH 1994; Chalise 1995; Council of Retired Public Servants (CRPS) and DEAN 1994; Centre for Consolidation of Democracy (CCD) 1996; Institute for Development Studies (IFDS) 1999 and Sharma and Sen 1999.

for South Asian Cooperation (CASAC) and South Asia Forum for Human Rights (SAFHR) on peace, conflict resolution and regional cooperation and the Institute of Foreign Affairs (IFA) on external affairs.

Diversification of Study Areas

Pulling together the contributions made by native and foreign writers, the development and diversification of political study in Nepal can be seen in many aspects. Literature on Nepali politics can be broadly categorized into six groups: political development, foreign policy, political events, biography, administration, and social change and development.

Political development

Most of the scholarly works concentrate on the description of political development and analysis of major events and trends in Nepali politics. The pioneer authors, Anirudha Gupta, Bhuwan Lal Joshi and Leo Rose, and R.S. Chauhan, give comprehensive pictures of Nepal's first experience of democracy in 1951-60. Gupta makes general observations on origin, ideology and leadership of different political parties, whereas Joshi and Rose focus more on personalities, events, trends and inter-personal, intra-party and inter-party conflicts to bring out the main characteristics of the emergent democracy in Nepal. Chauhan provides an alternative approach to understanding the post-Rana politics of Nepal. He interprets all political developments after the demise of the Rana regime as the struggle between the traditional and the modern forces for political power in the country.

The pioneer native authors of Nepali politics have followed foreign writers of the first generation while focusing their study on political development under the panchayat regime (1960-1990). Rishikesh Shaha and Lok Raj Baral analyse a wide spectrum of Nepali politics from the inception of the panchayat system to its demise. Shaha mainly focuses on the inside politics of the panchayat regime, which he treats as a patrimonial system (Shaha 1978, 1982, 1990a, 1992). His most remarkable contribution is the exploration of the authority system and composition of the elite in the panchayat system. Shaha identifies the groups and individuals in the framework of the patrimonial elite of Nepal with the King at the apex. Baral, in his first two books (Baral 1977, 1983), analyses Nepali politics from the time of the end of the parliamentary system to the post-referendum period in the framework of the centrality of oppositional roles of political parties. The author examines the overall roles of banned political parties against the panchayat system in the theoretical perspective of systemic and extra-systemic opposition. He finds that the larger part of the parties' activities, characterized as extra

systemic opposition, suffered because of factionalism in the Communist movement and the lack of internal and external support for the struggles being launched by the Nepali Congress party (NC) in various ways. Bhim Rawal analyses Nepali politics of 1960-1990 from left perspective (Rawal 1988). He gives a brief history of the communist movement in Nepal up to the mid-1980s and elaborates more thoroughly the problems of fragmentation in the left movement, which produced several splinter communist groups. He also discusses the leadership composition and ideological differences among several communist groupings in Nepal. Rawal's contribution is important as apart from historian Surendra K.C.'s work (K.C. 1999), book length academic work on the Nepali communist movement are not available.

Of the few foreign authors who wrote on Nepali politics during the panchayat time (1960-1990), Parmanand (1982) focuses on the development of the Nepali Congress (NC) since its inception to the 1980 referendum. He describes the changing positions of the NC in different periods, as a revolutionary before 1951, as the government in 1951-52, as the opposition from 1952 to 1958, as the government again in 1959-60, and finally as a movement after the December 1960 royal coup. The author assesses policies, programmes and strategies adopted by the NC in different times and in different situations. S.D. Muni's edited volume *Nepal: An Assertive Monarchy* also helps to trace out the then political development in Nepal as part one of this book includes seven articles on different topics, i.e. political change, political development, monarchy, elite, student politics, elections, and district administration (Muni 1977). Part two of the book is on foreign policy issues.

Political development remains the dominant theme in intellectual out-puts by native and foreign scholars on the post-1990 politics and democracy. Michael Hutt's edited volume covers the early phase of transition towards democracy, followed by the *Jana Āndolan*, constitution making and the 1991 parliamentary elections (Hutt 1994). All contributors to this book perceive the prevalence of the age-old authoritarian political culture of Nepal as an obstacle to the consolidation of multiparty democracy. Lok Raj Baral analyses the problems of governance in multiparty democracy in a comparative perspective with the partyless panchayat system (Baral 1993). He notes that some problems are inherited from the past and some are new. He identifies some factors which hinder effective governance e.g. lack of ideological clarity of political parties, absence of strong leadership, intra-party conflicts, lack of proper relations between the organizational and the governmental wings of the ruling party, and undue animosity in relations between the ruling and opposition parties.

Borre et.al.'s study of the post-*Jana Āndolan* politics assesses the role of parties in the democratic process in the country (Borre et al. 1994). The authors examine public opinion on policies and programmes, leadership, and support bases of major political parties of the country. Jana Sharma (1998) presents a chronological account of the performances of the post-*Jana Āndolan* governments, the NC's majority government, the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist-Leninist or UML)'s minority government and the NC led coalition government. Considering politics, economic issues, water resources and foreign policy as common variables to evaluate the performance of the given three governments, Sharma draws a pessimistic conclusion. Martin Hoftun et al. (1999) find the rise of the people's voice in democracy in various forms i.e. ethnic resurgence, gender movements, movements of the backward people etc., but political parties and the governments fail to address a number of outstanding problems of the country. T. Louise Brown (1996) also considers the restoration of democracy, which brought substantial change in the position of Nepali political parties with new roles and responsibilities, as failing to remedy to the country's problems of poverty and economic stagnation. Dhruva Kumar's edited volume examines the transition politics of Nepal with a critical assessment of the roles and performances of political parties, leaders and governments (1995). The gist of the book is that democracy exists in Nepal only in form and structure but not in substance and function. Krishna Hachhethu examines and analyses the role and performance of the NC and the UML in the post-1990 period (Hachhethu 2002b). Unlike others, Hachhethu examines party politics at the local level.

Foreign policy

Foreign policy of Nepal is another area in which a number of prominent scholars have contributed. Ramakant (1968), Kanchanmoy Mojumdar (1973), K. C. Chaudhuri (1960) give in-depth analyses of the history of Nepal-India relations in the pre-1950 period when Nepal adopted a isolationist policy with its allied role to the British empire. Nepal came out from its long isolation policy from the 1950s onwards. Leo E. Rose (1971) explores a number of survival strategies taken by Nepal while confronting the conflicting interests of two giant neighbors, Indian and China, and the two super powers, the USA and the former Soviet Union. S.D. Muni elaborates the limitation and importance of the diversification policy Nepal adopted since the mid-1950s (1973). S.K. Jha assesses the continuity and change in Nepal's foreign policy (1975). Native scholars have come later to study Nepal's external affairs mainly from the time of inception of regional cooperation in South Asia. Lok Raj Baral (1988, 1990, 1992, 1996, 2000), Sridhar Khatri (2001) and Dhruva

Kumar (1992, 2000a) are the main persons working continuously on the areas of regional cooperation and security in South Asia. Baral and Kumar each have separate publications on the bilateral relations of Nepal with India. Others who appear as occasional contributors on Nepal's foreign policy and regional cooperation are: Sita Shrestha (1974), Jagadish Sharma (1986) and Bishow Pradhan (1996). Scholars from other disciplines, i.e. Yadu Nath Khanal (1988), Badri P. Shrestha (1988), Narotam Bansokata (1990), and Narayan Khadka (1997) have also helped to enrich the study of Nepal's foreign policy from different perspectives.

Political events

Major political events of Nepal are covered by seasonal contributors, mostly journalists. Bhola Chatterji, a journalist and activist of the Indian Socialist Party who took part in the 1950-51 anti-Rana revolution, gives a detailed account of this period including his involvement in bringing arms from Burma to *Mukti Sena* (Chatterji 1967). D. P. Kumar, based on his interviews with political personalities of different camps, produced a book covering the 1980 referendum in detail (Kumar 1980). William Reaper and Marten Hoftun give a detailed diary of the 1990 mass movement, from February 18 to April 8 (Reaper and Hoftun 1992). Nripendra Purush Dhakal (Dhakal 1992) also provides an account of the 50 days *Jana Āndolan*, which led to the end of the panchayat system and restoration of multiparty democracy. Unlike previous writings on political events of Nepal, Japanese journalist Kiyoko Ogura presents an oral history of the 1990 *Jana Āndolan* based on direct observation and interviews with political personalities (Ogura 2001).

Biography

The contribution of non-political scientists to the study of Nepali politics is also evident in writings of biographies of political personalities of Nepal. Late B.P. Koirala, the founder and leader of the NC, achieved prominence in this area. Bhola Chatterji has the credit of producing three books (Chatterji 1977, 1980, 1982) which are semi-biographic in nature. Based on his interviews with B.P. Koirala, Chatterji unfolds many inside stories of high politics that had developed around the personality of B.P. Koirala. The author also covers a wide spectrum of Nepalese politics, i.e. internal politics of the NC, its ideology of democracy and socialism, its changing strategies from confrontation to national reconciliation, and conflict between the NC and the King. However all the issues revolved around the personality of the charismatic NC leader B.P. Koirala. In sum, his contribution in highlighting the leadership quality of B.P. Koirala is distinctive in the literature of Nepali

politics. There is a long list of other writers who have written on B.P. Koirala¹² and their contributions are useful to understand more about the NC's role and position in Nepali politics during the lifetime of B.P. Koirala. These authors confine themselves to B.P. Koirala's political beliefs and his struggle for democracy in Nepal. Two recent publications – *Jail Journal* and *Ātmabritānta* – are unique autobiographical contributions of B.P. Koirala (Koirala 1998, 1999). Some books have also been recently published on the personalities of Tanka Prasad Acharya, Ganesh Man Singh and Krishna Prasad Bhattarai.¹³

Administration

H.N. Agrawal, who had been involved in teaching in Nepal as well as research, is the pioneer scholar on administration of Nepal (Agrawal 1976). He has a lengthy study of the administrative system and structure during the Rana regime. Prachanda Pradhan, first Nepali scholar on the area of administration, explores the panchayat administration of 1960-1980 (Pradhan 1976). Other contributors on this area are Poudyal (1984), Bhim D. Bhatta (1987) and Tulsi N. Shrestha (1981, 1996) who make in-depth studies on the development of administration in Nepal at both local and central levels.

Social change and development

The study of Nepali politics in the areas of social change and development has been done mostly by native and foreign scholars who are not trained in political science. Mahesh C. Regmi (1978, 1999) is the prominent scholar who explored the political economy of Nepal and elite-land holding interface. Peasant, land and rulers are the key components of his writings. David Seddon, in his independent and collaborative studies with Blaikie and Cameron, has made in-depth analyses of state, class, and communities in Nepal and the linkages between state institutions and rural masses (Seddon 1987, Seddon et al. 1979, Blaikie, Cameron and Seddon 1980, 2000[1979]). Sushil R. Pandey is the lone political scientist who used the political economy model in his study of land reform in Nepal (Pandey 1985). Bergstrom (1980) explores the prevalence of patron-client culture in state-society relations in Nepal. The pluralistic nature of caste and ethnicity in Nepali society is made the central theme in the study of diverse issues of Nepal by many anthropologists. For example, Lionel Caplan (1970, 1975), Patricia A. Caplan

12 See Mishra 1985; Mishra 1994; Pokhrel 1990; Adhikari 1994; Mishra 1996 and Acharya 1998.

13 See Fisher 1997; Singh 1998, 2000 and Gautam 2000.

(1972), contributors in David N. Gellner (2003) and Marie Lecomte-Tilouine and Pascale Dollfus (2003) examine the existence of varieties of conflict between the communities of caste groups and between caste and ethnic groups. One common finding of scholars who have worked in this area is that the state has long patronized one caste group, the Brahmin. A Nepali anthropologist Dor Bahadur Bista (1991) popularized the word ‘Bahunbad’ in explaining the state’s discriminatory behaviour and its impact on the development of the country.

Conclusion

Development and diversification, in both content and methodology, are the main points that need to be considered in the growth of political science in Nepal. Much of the credit goes to European anthropologists and the private research organizations of Nepal. But one cannot be optimistic about the future of political science in Nepal. There are some serious lapses in the study and research on Nepali politics. Generally, the literature on Nepali politics, particularly those written by Nepali and Indian scholars, is less theoretical and more descriptive. They are conventional in choice of methodology and subject for study. Most of their research was/is largely based on literature review, document study, media reporting, interview with political leaders, and is Kathmandu centric. TU political scientists are not comfortable with scientific and sophisticated research tools, i.e. field survey, questionnaire designing, preparation of checklist for interviews, pretest, and cross tabulation of quantitative data. They have not yet embarked on theory and concept building. Their horizons are largely national in scope, i.e. domestic politics. Those who do go beyond the latter limit themselves to foreign policy and regional cooperation. These research associated problems could be reduced later with the maturity of the discipline.

But other parts of the problems of political science as a discipline are unlikely to improve in the near future. Societal demand is for job-oriented education, but political science is unlikely to become a specialized subject as far as jobs are concerned. Pure research is largely possible only in the university. TU is a gateway for the goal of promoting social sciences and political science knowledge in Nepal. But TU has been going down rapidly in academic excellence in recent years and is unlikely to improve in the near future. The situation will continue to remain so long as the CDPS and CNAS are unable to revive themselves as platforms of intellectual exercise. Erosion in personal honesty and integrity of TU academics – political scientists are no exception – is another reason to anticipate dark days ahead. Those political scientists who are able and active are enjoying the fruits of the consultancy

business. They seem to be little motivated and interested to return to academic work on a full time basis. Taking all these into account, one can therefore conclude that the future of political science in Nepal is bleak.

Acknowledgements

This paper was written as a part of the project on Social Sciences in Nepal run by the Institute for Social and Environmental Transition-Nepal (ISET-Nepal). It was presented at a seminar in Kathmandu organized by ISET-Nepal in early 2003. I would like to thank the participants in that seminar for constructive comments. I would also like to thank SINHAS editors for their comments on the previous draft of this article and Seira Tamang and Pratyoush Onta for considerable editorial help. However I alone am responsible for the errors and interpretations.

References

- Acharya, Nara Hari. 1998. *Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala: Nepālī Congress kā Cār Daśak*. Kathmandu: Sambastar Prakashan.
- Adhikari, Shiba. 1994. *Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pushtak Bhandar.
- Agrawal, H.N. 1976. *The Administrative System of Nepal*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Banskota, Narotam. 1990. *Regional Economic Cooperation in South Asia: Nepalese Perspective*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Baral, Lok Raj. 1977. *Oppositional Politics in Nepal*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.
- Baral, Lok Raj. 1983. *Nepal's Politics of Referendum: A Study of Groups, Personalities and Trends*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Baral, Lok Raj. 1988. *The Politics of Balanced Interdependence: Nepal and SAARC*. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Baral, Lok Raj. 1990. *Regional Migrations, Ethnicity and Security: The South Asian Case*. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Baral, Lok Raj, ed. 1992. *South Asia: Democracy and the Road Ahead*. Kathmandu: Political Science Association of Nepal (POLSAN).
- Baral, Lok Raj. 1993. *Nepal: Problems of Governance*. New Delhi: Konark.
- Baral, Lok Raj, ed. 1996. *Looking to the Future: Indo-Nepal Relations in Perspective*. New Delhi: Anmol.
- Baral, Lok Raj. 2000. *The Regional Paradox*. New Delhi: Adroit.
- Baral, Lok Raj, ed. 2004. *Political Parties and Parliament*. New Delhi: Adroit.
- Baral, Lok Raj, ed. Forthcoming. *Election and Governance in Nepal*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Baral, Lok Raj, D.N. Dhungel and D.B. Shakya. 1978. Rājñītik Śāstramā Anusandhān. *Tribhuvan University Journal* 10(1): 248-265.

- Baral, Lok Raj, Krishna Hachhethu and Hari Sharma. 2001. *Leadership in Nepal*. New Delhi: Adroit.
- Baral, Lok Raj, Krishna Hachhethu, Krishna Khanal, Dhruba Kumar and Hari Sharma. 2004. *Nepal: Local Leadership and Governance*. Delhi: Adroit.
- Baral, Lok Raj and Yasoda Suwal. 1983. Political Science in Nepal: Infrastructure and Development. In *Social Sciences in Nepal: Infrastructure and Programme Development*. Mohan P. Lohani, ed., pp. 91-101. Kathmandu: Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- Bergstrom, Bengt-Erik. 1980. *The Patron and the Panca: Village Values and Panchayat Democracy in Nepal*. Delhi: Vikas.
- Bhatta, Bhim Dev. 1987. *Development Administration in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Mrs Indira Bhatta.
- Bhattachan, Krishna B. 1997. Sociological and Anthropological Research and Teaching in Nepal: Western Adaptation Versus Indigenization. In *Social Sciences in Nepal: Some Thoughts and Search for Direction*. Prem K. Khattry, ed., pp. 7-30. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Bista, Dor Bahadur. 1991. *Fatalism and Development: Nepal's Struggle for Modernization*. Calcutta: Orient Longman.
- Blaikie, Piers, John Cameron and David Seddon. 1980. *Nepal in Crisis: Growth and Stagnation at the Periphery*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Blaikie, Piers, John Cameron and David Seddon. 2000[1979]. *The Struggle for Basic Needs in Nepal*. Delhi: Adroit.
- Borre, Ole, Suhil R. Pandey and Chitra K. Tiwari. 1994. *Nepalese Political Behaviour*. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Brown, T. Louise. 1996. *The Challenge to Democracy in Nepal: A Political History*. London: Routledge.
- Caplan, Lionel. 1970. *Land and Social Change in East Nepal: A Study of Hindu-Tribal Relations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited.
- Caplan, Lionel. 1975. *Administration and Politics in a Nepalese Town: The Study of a District Capital and its Environs*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Caplan, Patricia. 1972. *Priest and Cobblers, A Study of Social Change in a Hindu Village in Western Nepal*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Centre for Consolidation of Democracy (CCD). 1996. *Nepal People, Polity and Governance: A Survey Analysis of People's Response to the Democratic Experiment, 1991-95*. Kathmandu: CCD.
- Chalise, Suresh C. 1995. *Sociology of the Legislative Elite in a Developing Society: An Empirical Study based on the Members of the First Parliament of the Himalayan Kingdom of Nepal after the 1990 People's Revolution*. Kathmandu: Nepal Foundation for Advanced Studies.
- Chatterji, Bhola. 1967. *A Study of Recent Nepalese Politics*. Calcutta: The World Press.
- Chatterji, Bhola. 1977. *Nepal's Experiment with Democracy*. New Delhi: Ankur Publishing House.

- Chatterji, Bhola. 1980. *Palace, People and Politics: Nepal in Perspective*. New Delhi: Ankur Publishing House.
- Chatterji, Bhola. 1982. *Portrait of a Revolutionary, B.P.Koirala*. New Delhi: Ankur Publishing House.
- Chaudhuri, K.C. 1960. *Anglo-Nepalese Relations from the Earliest times of the British Rule in India till the Gurkha War*. Calcutta: Modern Book Agency.
- Chauhan, R.S. 1971. *Political Development in Nepal, 1950-70*. New Delhi: Associated Publishing House.
- Chauhan, R.S. 1989. *Society and State Building in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pushtak Bhandar.
- Council of Retired Public Servants (CRPS) and Development Associates Nepal (DEAN). 1994. *Peoples' Verdict: An Analysis of General Elections 1994*, Kathmandu: CRPS and DEAN.
- Dahal, Dilli Ram. 2000. Future of Research Centres in Tribhuvan University. In *TU Special Bulletin 2000*, pp. 19-25. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.
- Dastider, Mollica. 1995. *Religious Minorities in Nepal*. New Delhi: Nirala.
- Development Research for a Democratic Nepal (DREFDEN). 1992. *Report on the Study and Research on the Local Elections in Nepal, 1992*. Kathmandu: DREFDEN.
- Dhakal, Nripendra Purush. 1992. *Jana Āndolan 2046*. Kathmandu: Bhupendra Purush Dhakal.
- Dharmadasani, M.D. 1976. *Indian Diplomacy in Nepal*. Jaipur: Aalekh.
- Dharmadasani, M.D. 1984a. *Political Economy of Foreign Aid in the Third World: A Case Study of Nepal*. Varanasi: Konark.
- Dharmadasani, M.D. 1984b. *Political Participation and Change in South Asia in the Context of Nepal*. Varanasi: Shalimar.
- Dharmadasani, M.D., ed. 1992. *Democratic Nepal*. Varanasi: Shalimar.
- Dharmadasani, M.D., ed. 1997. *Nepal in Transition*. Jaipur: Rajdhani Publications.
- Dharmadasani, M.D, ed. 2000. *India-Nepal Partnership and South Asian Resurgence*. New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers.
- Fisher James F. 1997. *Living Martyrs*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Gaige, Frederick H. 1975. *Regionalism and National Unity in Nepal*. Delhi: Vikas.
- Gaige, Fredrick and John Scholz. 1991. The 1991 Parliamentary Elections in Nepal: Political Freedom and Stability. *Asian Survey* 31(11): 1020-1039.
- Gautam, Rajesh. 2000. *Karma Yogī Rājñitijña: Krishna Prasad Bhattarai*. Kathmandu: B. P. Prakashan.
- Gellner, David N., ed. 2003. *Resistance and the State: Nepalese Experience*. New Delhi: Social Science Press.
- Gellner, David N., Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and John Whelpton, eds. 1997. *Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom: The Politics of Culture in Contemporary Nepal*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Gupta, Anirudha. 1964. *Politics in Nepal: A Study of Post-Rana Political Developments and Party Politics*. Bombay: Allied Publishers.

- Hachhethu, Krishna. 2002a. Social Sciences in Nepal. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 29(1): 49-95.
- Hachhethu, Krishna. 2002b. *Party Building in Nepal: Organization, Leadership and People*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.
- Hoftun, Martin, William Raeper and John Whelpton. 1999. *People, Politics and Ideology: Democracy and Social Change in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.
- Hutt, Michael, ed. 1994. *Nepal in the Nineties*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Hutt, Michael, ed. 2004. *Himalayan People's War: Nepal's Maoist Rebellion*. London: C. Hurst and Company.
- Institute for Development Studies (IFDS). 1999. *Third General Election: Emerging Scenario*. Kathmandu: IFDS.
- Jain, Girilal. 1959. *India meets China in Nepal*. Bombay: Adia.
- Jaisawal, T.N. and Pannakaji Amatya. 1997. Development of Political Science in Nepal. In *Social Sciences in Nepal: Some Thoughts and Search for Direction*. Prem K. Khatry, ed., pp. 54-59. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Jha, S.K. 1975. *Uneasy Partners: Nepal-India Relations in the Post-Colonial Era*. New Delhi: Manas.
- Joshi, Bhuwan Lal and Leo E. Rose. 1966. *Democratic Innovations in Nepal: A Case Study of Political Acculturation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- K.C., Surendra. 1999. *Nepālmā Communist Āndolan ko Itihās*. Kathmandu: Vidyarthi Pustak Bhandar.
- Karki, Arjun and David Seddon, eds. 2003. *The People's War in Nepal: Left Perspectives*. Delhi: Adroit.
- Khadka, Narayan. 1997. *Foreign Aid and Foreign Policy: Major Powers and Nepal*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Khanal, Rabindra, ed. 2000. *Transparency and Accountability Against Corruption in Nepal*. Kathmandu: POLSAN.
- Khanal, Yadu Nath. 1988. *Essays in Nepal's Foreign Policy*. Kathmandu: Murari Prasad Upadhaya.
- Khatri, Sridhar K. 2001. Teaching of International Relations in Nepal. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 28(2): 139-154.
- Koirala, B.P. 1998. *Jail Journal*. Kathmandu: Jagadamba Prakashan.
- Koirala, B.P. 1999. *Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala ko Ātmabritānta*. Kathmandu: Jagadamba Prakashan.
- Koirala, Kunda Dutta. 1999. Management Education in Nepal. *TU Special Bulletin 1999*, pp. 41-45. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.
- Kumar, D. P. 1980. *Nepal Year of Decision*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Kumar, Dhruba. 1989. *Mao and China's Foreign Policy*. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Kumar, Dhruba, ed. 1992. *Nepal's India Policy*. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.

- Kumar, Dhruva, ed. 1995. *State, Leadership and Politics in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Kumar, Dhruva. 2000a. Trends in Security Studies in Nepal: Recent Trends and Future Directions. In *Security Studies in South Asia: Changes and Challenges*. Dipankar Banerjee, ed., pp. 159-192. Delhi: Manohar.
- Kumar, Dhruva, ed. 2000b. *Domestic Conflict and Crisis of Governance in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Kumar, Satish. 1967. *Rana Polity in Nepal: Origin and Growth*. New Delhi: Asia Publishing House.
- Lecomte-Tilouine, Marie and Pascale Dollfus, eds. 2003. *Ethnic Revival and Religious Turmoil: Identities and Representations in the Himalayas*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Malla, B. C. 1974. Development of the Study of Political Science in Nepal. In *Social Science in Nepal*. Prayag Raj Sharma, ed., pp. 131-146. Kathmandu: Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Malla, Kamal P. 1979. *Higher Education in the Sixth Five Year-Plan: An Approach Paper*. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.
- Mishra, Dev Chandra. 1996. *Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala aur Nepālī Rājnīti*. Kathmandu: Mishra Prakashan.
- Mishra, Kiran. 1994. *B.P. Koirala: Life and Times*. New Delhi: Wishwa Prakashan.
- Mishra, Sashi P. 1985. *B.P. Koirala*. Varanasi: Konark Publishing House.
- Mojumder, Kanchanmoy. 1973. *Anglo-Nepalese Relations in the Nineteenth Century*. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay.
- Muni, S.D. 1973. *Foreign Policy of Nepal*. Delhi: National Publishing House.
- Muni, S.D., ed. 1977. *Nepal: An Assertive Monarchy*. New Delhi: Chetana Publications.
- Muni, S.D. 1992. *Nepal and India: A Changing Relationship*. Delhi: Konark.
- Nepal Opinion Survey Centre (NOSC). 1993. *Political Opinion Survey of Kathmandu Valley*. Kathmandu: NOSC.
- Ogura, Kiyoko. 2001. *Kathmandu Spring: The People's Movement of 1990*. Kathmandu: Himal.
- Onta, Pratyoush. 2001. Regional Area Studies in South Asia: Dark Days Ahead. *Nepali Journal of Contemporary Studies* 1(2): 60-89.
- Pandey, Sushil R. 1985. *The Political Economy of Nepalese Land Reforms*. Kathmandu: HPPSR Publications.
- Pandey, Sushil R. 1993. Research Methodology in Political Studies and Nepalese Politics. *Nepali Political Science and Politics* 2: 16-27.
- Parmanand. 1982. *The Nepali Congress Since its Inception*. Delhi: B.R. Publishing.
- Pokhrel, Ram Chandra 1990. *Prajātantrakā Mahān Senānī Bishweshwar Pasad Koirala*. Kathmandu: Bani Prakashan.
- POLSAN. 1991. *Nepalese Voters*. Kathmandu: Political Science Association of Nepal (POLSAN).

- POLSAN. 1992. *Political Parties and Parliamentary Process in Nepal: A Study of the Transitional Phase*. Kathmandu: POLSAN.
- POLSAN. n.d. *Civil Society and Democratisation*. Kathmandu: POLSAN.
- Poudel, Keshab. 2003. Compromise with Quality. *Spotlight*, 24-30 January, pp. 16-21.
- Poudyal, A. R. 1988. Recent Trends in Political Science: Some Observations in Nepal's Experiences. Unpublished ms.
- Poudyal, Madhab P. 1984. *Public Administration and Nation Building in Nepal*. Delhi: NBO Publishers.
- Pradhan, Bishow. 1996. *Behaviour of Nepalese Foreign Policy*. Kathmandu: Mrs Durga Devi Pradhan.
- Pradhan, Prachanda. 1974. Critique on Political Science in Nepal. In *Social Science in Nepal*. Prayag Raj Sharma, ed., pp. 147-149. Kathmandu: Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Pradhan, Prachanda. 1976. *Public Administration in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Curriculum Development Centre, Tribhuvan University.
- Ramakant. 1968. *Indo-Nepalese Relations, 1816-1877*. Delhi: S. Chand and Company.
- Rawal, Bhim. 1988. *Nepālmā Sāmyabādī Āndolan*. Kathmandu: Samana Publication.
- Reaper, William and Martin Hoftun. 1992. *Spring Awakening: An Account of the 1990 Revolution in Nepal*. New Delhi: Viking.
- Regmi, Mahesh Chandra. 1978. *Thatched Huts and Stucco Palaces: Peasants and Landlords in 19th-century Nepal*. Delhi: Vikas.
- Regmi, Mahesh Chandra. 1999 [1976]. *Landownership in Nepal*. Delhi: Adroit.
- Rose, Leo E. 1971. *Nepal: Struggle for Survival*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Rose, Leo E. and Margaret W. Fisher. 1980. *The Politics of Nepal*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rose, Leo E. and John T. Scholz. 1980. *Nepal: Profile of a Himalayan Kingdom*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- SEARCH. 1994. *The Three District Political Opinion Survey*. Kathmandu: SEARCH.
- Seddon, David. 1987. *Nepal: A State of Poverty*. Delhi: Vikas.
- Seddon, David, Piers Blaikie and John Cameron. 1979. *Peasants and Workers in Nepal*. Delhi: Vikas.
- Shah, Moin. 1978. Institute of Medicine: Training Physicians for Nepal. In *Tribhuvan University: An Overview of Its Programme*, pp. 38-47. Kathmandu: Research Division, Tribhuvan University.
- Shaha, Rishikesh. 1975. *An Introduction to Nepal*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Shaha, Rishikesh. 1978. *Nepali Politics: Retrospect and Prospect*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Shaha, Rishikesh. 1982. *Essays in the Practice of Government in Nepal*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Shaha, Rishikesh. 1990a. *Three Decades and Two Kings (1960-1990)*. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Shaha, Rishikesh. 1990b. *Modern Nepal: A Political History 1769-1955*. Two Volumes. New Delhi: Manohar.

- Shaha, Rishikesh. 1992. *Politics in Nepal 1980-1991*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Sharma Jagadish. 1986. *Nepal: Struggle for Existence*. Kathmandu: Communication Inc.
- Sharma, Jana. 1998. *Democracy without Roots*. Delhi: Book Faith India.
- Sharma, Prayag Raj. 1974. Critique on History in Nepal. In *Social Science in Nepal*. Prayag Raj Sharma, ed., pp. 109-119. Kathmandu: Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Sharma, Shankar P. 1997. Economics Education and Research Capacity in Nepal. In *Social Sciences in Nepal: Some Thoughts and Search for Direction*. Prem K. Khatri, ed., pp. 65-78. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies,
- Sharma, Sudhindra and Pawan Kumar Sen. 1999. *1999 General Election Opinion Poll: How Voters Assess Politics, Parties and Politicians*. Kathmandu: Himal Association.
- Shrestha, Badri P. 1988. *SAARC: An Economic Perspective*. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Shrestha, Sita. 1974. *Nepal and the United Nations*. New Delhi: Sindhu.
- Shrestha, Tulsi N. 1981. *Nepalese Administration: An Image*. Kathmandu: Sajha.
- Shrestha, Tulsi N. 1996. *The Concept of Local Government and Decentralization*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Shukla, Deeptima. 2000. *Monarchy in Nepal*. Delhi: Kalinga.
- Singh, Ganesh Man. 1998. *Mero Kathākā Pānāharu*. Vol.1. Kathmandu: Ayam Publication.
- Singh, Ganesh Man. 2000. *Mero Kathākā Pānāharu*. Vol. 2. Kathmandu: Ayam Publication.
- Thapa, Ganga B., ed. 1996. *Democracy and Decentralization*. Kathmandu: POLSAN.
- Thapa, Ganga B., ed. 1998a. *Local Self Government in Nepal*. Kathmandu: POLSAN.
- Thapa, Ganga B., ed. 1998b. *Promoting Participatory Democracy in Nepal: An Assesment of Local Self-government*. Kathmandu: POLSAN.
- Thapa, Ganga B., ed. 1999. *Decentralization and Good Governance in Nepal*. Kathmandu: POLSAN.
- Thapliyal, Sangeeta. 1998. *Mutual Security: the case of India-Nepal*. New Delhi: Lancers Publishers.
- Tribhuvan University. 2001. *Tribhuvan University Today, 2001*. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.
- Upreti, B.C. 1988. *Dynamics of Foreign Aid: A Case Study of Indian Aid to Nepal*. Jaipur: Printwell Publishers.
- Upreti, B.C. 1993a. *The Nepali Congress*. Jaipur: Nirala.
- Upreti, B.C. 1993b. *Politics of Himalayan River Waters*. Jaipur: Nirala.
- Upreti, B.C. 1999. *Indians in Nepal: A Study of Indian Migration to Kathmandu*. Delhi: Kalinga.
- Upreti, B.C. 2001. *Uneasy Friends: Readings on Indo-Nepal Relations*. Delhi: Kalinga.