

## **MINIMIZING POLITICAL INSTABILITY: A ROLE OF TECHNOCRACY GOVERNMENT ON NEPAL**

**Prabin Maharjan, Pramod KC**

Student in Combined Program of Master & Ph.D, Yonsei University, Wonju Campus

E-mail: prabin0712@gmail.com, kcpramod7@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

Political instability is deeply interrelated with every single output of a country. An unstable political environment leads to many consequences ultimately which the state has to pay and is one of the main causes of turmoil in every nation especially developing countries. Economic failure, civil war, suppression of opposition parties, corruption are some of the aftermaths of political instability in those countries. New beginnings or changes (either positive or negative) can be observed during the political instability. To avoid the serious consequences, political parties, particularly with the high number of representative in the parliament, or the coalition of parties signed an agreement to appoint and support the temporary technocratic government. In Nepal, time and again the deadline of constitution was increasing and subsequently the first Constituent Assembly got dissolved. The political parties cumulatively agreed to form a technocracy government to conduct second election and to promulgate constitution. The then chief justice of Nepal confidently accepted the position as the Chairman of Interim Councils of Ministers of Nepal to get the next election within the stipulated timeframe agreed by the major political parties and that view; he successfully conducted the second constituent assembly election. This paper analyses the circumstances of political instability, a leadership role played by the technocracy government and success or failure of technocracy government during the political crisis in Nepal. This paper uses fact-finding case to study of Nepal with the use of a qualitative approach. The findings of this paper examines the first the technocracy government, acceptance from the citizens and governance and the participation of people in the second election which became the initial path for the recent constitution promulgated in Nepal. Secondary data from various sources such as Election Commission of Nepal, various line ministries of Government of Nepal, multilateral agencies, election watch particularly visit by former President of United States of America, Jimmy Carter and his foundation were utilized for the research analysis process. Although a lots of ups and down of the political parties and government, there was successful completion of the election by the technocracy government, positive participation of the citizens who did not want to see the failure of the state; led to the recently declaration of Constitution of Nepal 2072 (2015 AD). Technocracy government is not the major actor to lead the government as it has a status of caretaker government. To be a successful nation, major political forces should need to come with common consensus to walk in the path of socio-economic development, solidarity in the governance and welfare of the citizens.

**Keywords:** Political Instability, Technocracy Government, General Election, Constitution, Nepal

## **Introduction: Political Context of Nepal**

Modern Nepal came into existence after King Prithvi Narayan Shah unified Nepal that started from 1768 to 1815. Since then Nepal has experienced various form of government, state structure and administrative processes. During the Shah dynasty, the administrative system was centralized with the autonomous power of legislative, executive and judicial authority vested to King. Jung Bahadur Rana masterminded the massacre and plotted to gain the full authority of the state in 1846, the beginning of autocratic rana regime. He abolished all his rivals and all the administrative system and state authority were centralized under the Rana prime minister with ceremonial kingship. Rana regime ruled Nepal for 104 years i.e. until 1950s. Anti-rana force in 1950s abolished the Rana regime and democracy was introduced for the first time in Nepal. The Interim Government Act of Nepal 1951, was enacted in 1951 that made Nepal governed by the political party. This law introduced the system of parliamentary governance in which the monarch was the head of state and the management of state affairs was assigned to the political parties. Although this law provisioned the separation of powers within three tier-legislatures, executive and judicial, the power was highly enjoyed by the king. During the period of 1950 to 1960, several reforms were initiated and the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal 1959 was enacted to replace the earlier constitution that paved the way to hold the general election of the House of Representatives and to elect the democratic government. This constitution did not last long as King Mahendra in 1960 coup d'état by abolishing the democratic government, dissolved the parliament, sentenced Prime Minister, members of cabinet and other political leaders to prison, eliminated the constitution and overtook overall power within himself introducing the 'Panchayat System' (party less political system). He enacted the Constitution of Nepal 1962 that gave him autonomous power of legislature, executive and judicial to run the country. The administrative system was centralized as he enjoyed the power to appoint and fire the civil servants. However, some positive changes were adapted such as the administrative system was divided into 14 zones, 75 districts and five development regions to deliver the public service; several reforms were undertaken for civil service and some development works. The popular people's movement of 1990s ended the 30 years party less political system and restored the multiparty parliamentary government. Once again the Constitution of Kingdom of Nepal 1990 was promulgated that provisioned the king as the head of state and political leader elected from the parliament as the head of government. Girija Prasad Koirala of Nepal Congress Party became the first prime minister under this constitution. Administrative Reforms Commission was formed under his leadership to make changes in the administrative system as well as for the new political system that is widespread in the democratic world. His government was lasted only for three years due to the hidden conflict or competitiveness within his office that followed another election that elect the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist Leninist). This CPN UML government also lasted for only nine months and number of coalition government was formed after 1994. The Nepal Communist Party (Maoist) started an armed agitation from the rural areas of Nepal to abolish the monarchy system and establish People's Republic in 1996. During the period of 1994 to 2002 the government was headed by the Nepali Congress and CPN-UML. King Gyanendra dismissed the elected government of Sher Bahadur Deuba in 2002 to claim the executive power, directly appointed

several Prime Minister, imposed state of emergency, and put off the November election indefinitely. The political parties that were dissolved by the King signed 12-point agreement with the Maoist party that led to the second people's movement (Jana Andolan II) that reinstated the democracy and the step down of the King in 2006. This also ended the 10 years rebellion of the Maoist and they joined the interim government that takes them in the mainstream politics. The monarchy system was overthrown; the Interim Constitution of Nepal 2007 was promulgated and the Constitution election was held in 2008 in which the Maoist party became the largest party but could not get the majority of seats. The interim constitution of Nepal 2007 provisioned President as the head of state, prime minister as the head of government and made possible to elect 601 constituent assembly members until the new constitution was enacted. The government continued to change at least four times after the general election and the deadline to hold new election for new constitution was postponed two times due to the political turmoil. To avoid the serious consequences a consensus was must through another general election, by than political parties, particularly with the high number of representative in the parliament, or the coalition of parties signed an agreement to appoint and support the temporary technocratic government. The political parties cumulatively agreed to form a technocracy government to conduct the election and to promulgate the new constitution. The then chief justice of Nepal confidently accepted the position as the Chairman of Interim Councils of Ministers of Nepal to hold the next election within the stipulated timeframe agreed by the major political parties. This technocrat government at least for the time being relaxed the possible political crisis that might affect the overall democracy of Nepal.

### **Relationship between political instability and the technocracy government**

Alensina, Ozler, Roubini and Swagal (1996: 3) defined political instability as “the propensity of a change in the executive, either by “constitutional” or “unconstitutional” means”. They argued that economic efficiencies are the cause of political instability. There are so many factors that contribute to the political instability in the nations with the great impact on economic growth. Kobbi & Boujelbene (first draft-not published:4) provided some indicators, used by different scholars, of political instability to get the view on the relationship between political instability and economic growth such as “revolutions, coups and political assassinations” (Barro, 1991); “revolutions, political assassination” (Sala-iMartin, 1997); “the war victims” (Easterely and Rebelo, 1993); “the major change of government and revolutions” (Benhabib and Spiegel, 1997), and “the institutional quality & political violence” (Svensson, 1998). Many factors contribute to the political instability beside the above mentioned criteria which is mentioned below in the table 1. However, the objective of this study is not to measure impact of political instability on economic growth, rather its purpose is to demonstrate the how the technocracy government can somehow minimize the political instability and bring changes for betterment.

**Table 1: Causes of Political Instability**

- If the rights and freedoms of the people are not respected or are trampled upon, then it is very easy for instability to emerge.
- Corruption and mismanagement of the wealth of a country by the leaders. Corruption has over the years been shown to be one of the biggest factors responsible for political instability in many countries all over the world. The more corrupt a country is, the higher the likelihood of that country becoming unstable.
- Political instability occurs when elections are not free and fair. Many countries have suffered from political instability as a result of unfair elections characterized by rigging of votes and intimidations during elections. An election that is not free and fair is one of the major causes of political instability in many countries across the globe.
- Mass unemployment and poverty can easily trigger political instability in any country. When majority of the people in a country are impoverished and cannot find jobs to do, then they vent their anger on the government and that leads to instability in the country. Many countries have suffered from instability as a result of this.
- Suppression of opposition parties by the ruling government. When members of the opposition parties are deliberately targeted and prosecuted for no apparent reason, then this can easily give rise to instability in the country.
- Another cause of political instability in a country is when the government decides not to be open and transparent.
- When the citizens constantly live in fear because of a government that prevents them from freely expressing their views or opinions.
- Intolerance for the views and opinions of others can also lead to political instability.
- High level of prejudice in a country also leads to instability. Prejudice is the unreasonable hatred of people who are different from you. In many countries in Africa, ethnic prejudices have over the years led to some of the worst forms of instabilities in a country.
- Holding on to power for too long by heads of states is another major cause of political instability. A country can easily be plunged into political instability when the head of state decides not to step down from power when his or her time is up. So many countries in Africa and Asia have experienced political instabilities as a result of this. A good example of a country presently experiencing political instability as a result of this factor is Syria.

Source: <http://hosbeg.com/political-instability-10-causes-political-instability/>

For this study we agreed with Jong-A-Pin's (2009: 3) "four dimension of political instability: civil protest, politically motivated aggression, instability *within* the political regime and instability *of* the political regime". All these four dimensions are suitable to describe the political turmoil of Nepal that affects the economic growth on one hand and on the other hand the emergence of the possible political crisis that might vanished the democracy brought by the people's movement.

Technocracy and technocrats are widely used term and the increasing complications in the political arena are tackled by the decision making of technocracy (Ribbhagen, C. 2013, Boswell, 2009; Fischer, 1990; Radaelli, 1999). Ribbhagen (2013) argued that this phenomenon is underdeveloped due to the lack of research and quoted Centeno (1993:309) that “few terms in political sociology are used as loosely as technocracy. Although persons with technological and administrative expertise are obviously critical to modern states, the concept of ‘technocrat’ remains vague and has limited descriptive, much less predictive, value. This has not prevented, however, the use of the term (with positive or negative connotations depending on the author’s opinion of the persons or governments being analyzed) to describe a variety of personnel in a wide range of political regimes. If the terms technocrat and technocracy are to have any scholarly value, the characteristics that are used as definitional criteria (e.g. education, professionalization, de-politicisation) must play a significant role in the type of policies advocated and followed by the relevant personnel or regimes as ‘technocratic’ not only should imply a set of definitional attributes, but also should indicate probable forms of behaviour.” Technocrats in the government or who run the government are the people with technical background (especially with high education and working experience in the related field). The definition of technocracy is “a system of governance in which technically trained experts rule by virtue of their specialized knowledge and position in dominant political and economic institutions... the rise to power of those who possess technical knowledge or ability, to detriment of the traditional politician’ (Meynaud, 1969:31, quoted in Ribbhagen 2013: 18 ). This definition terms the technocrats as the political elites with higher education and experience in the top position of government such as in China and Mexico (Li, 2001) to boost their economy and to reform its economic plan. Furthermore, ruled by people is democracy and by expert is technocracy. The characteristic of technocrat as defined by Bell (1973:348) “the technocrat is one who exercises authority by virtue of his technical competence. [...] In the post-industrial society, technical skills become the base of and education the mode of access to power” (quoted in Lindstam, 2014:6). Lindstam (2014) cited Putnam’s (1977) six ‘*technocratic mentality*’ to further clarify the characters of technocrats. They are

- “technics must replace politics and defines his own role in apolitical terms” (Putnam, 1977:387)
- “the technocrat is sceptical and even hostile toward politicians and political institutions” (Putnam, 1977: 386)
- “the technocrat is fundamentally unsympathetic to the openness and equality of political democracy” (Putnam, 1977: 386)
- “the technocrat believes that social and political conflict is, at best, misguided, and, at worst, contrived” (Putnam, 1977: 386)
- “the technocrat rejects ideological or moralistic criteria, preferring to debate policy in practical, ‘pragmatic’ terms when analysing public issues” (Putnam, 1977: 387)
- “the technocrat is strongly committed to technological progress and material productivity; he is less concerned about distributive questions of social justice” (Putnam, 1977: 387)

The above characteristics of technocrats do not suit in the democracy and the question is how technocracy government can tackle the political turmoil in developing country like Nepal. Lindstam (2014:7-8) summarized the definition of technocracy in two ways i.e. “distinguishable by whether they focus on the rise to power of new political actors or whether they focus on the mode and content of politics. The first definition views technocracy as a political system where experts take key decisions while the second one refers to a decision-making paradigm characterized by the technical management of politics”. The second definition can be taken into consideration while discussing the technocracy government of Nepal as Regmi government somehow manages the political turmoil with the technical expert. Looking all these transformative change, Nepal, on the other hand wanted to address many hidden issues through becoming a secular country in the format of republic federal. These issues could only be addressed if proper constitution is delivered, but the self-delay from major political parties was bringing the political turmoil within them and aggression to the citizens.

### **Democracy through technocracy**

Democracy rightly claims to be a valuable adjustment which does not rest in one merit but rather to plurality of different dimensions such as: political participation, freedom to human life, responsible government and accountability, and formation of values with clearly understanding the needs, rights, and duties of all citizens. In the progressive scenario there are many changes democracy has to face, because democracy is ‘by the people, for the people and to the people’. Democratic reforms are likely to be observed when the policies are directed to towards the promotion of social welfare, economic justice and to revive civil society. All through human history, democracy has been considered as the method of government essential for the improvement of citizens. “holding competitive and free elections on regular basis, democracy also requires political leaders to implement policies that would benefit a majority rather than the minority” (Shin, D. C., & Lee, J. 2003: 72; Cardoso, 2001; Powell, 1982). In the modern politics technocracy should be analyzed not in the separate form of government, but more to a set of expansive rehearsal of democratic systems of government. If we see the place of technocracy in the mainstream politics it has become one of key requirements for adjusted discourse to democracy.

**Table 2: Core attributes of technocratic discourse**

Depoliticisation	Technocratic modes of governance or thought involve the advocacy of technical solutions to political problems and fear of ‘political’ solutions and debate. They entail also the prioritisation of ‘rational’ and ‘efficient’ decision-making/policy implementation over protracted normative debates, and the rejection of a normative value-based level of debate in favour of a practical and programmatic level of debate.
Ideal of social harmony	Technocratic modes of thought prioritise the ideal of social harmony and mutual interest. They are reluctant to explore the conflictual interests or aspects in society or policy areas.
Prioritisation of the role of rational technical experts and rationalistic or ‘economistic’ aims	Technocratic governance seeks to move political and social decisions to the realm of administrative control defined in technical terms and seeks to use instrumental technical criteria to measure political substance or meaning. Emphasis is on rational solutions, efficiency and cost-effectiveness, and hence ‘economistic’ solutions to social and policy problems. This also entails emphasis on constant monitoring of effects and costs of policy solutions.
Positivist objective knowledge	Emphasis is on knowledge and expert knowledge as crucial to decision-making and in feeding the right knowledge and learning to the public and political decision-makers. The type of knowledge emphasised is positivistic in nature. Technocrats envisage a rationalistic world view with precision, measurements and clearly defined and functioning ‘systems’. Emphasis is also on problem-solving, instrumental knowledge.
Minimal democracy	There is an aversion to openness and open-endedness of democratic politics: it makes decision-making messy and inefficient. While nowadays democracy is a key context accepted by many technocrats, its meaning tends to be interpreted in a minimal (procedural) sense, and legitimisation for policies is still sought through reference to other policy frameworks (policy imitation) rather than any direct reference to democratic publics.

*Source: Shin, D. C., & Lee, J. (2003). Democratization and its Consequences (pp. 71-92).*

*Adapted from Fischer 1990, pp. 17-22, 35, 40-42*

Technocratic government is in a way very efficient. It flawlessly suited in the context of Nepal where the main agenda of the government was to conduct the second general election and to open the doors for consensus to promulgate constitution. The purpose of technocratic government is to open the sense of hope for consensus without any delay for the

better welfare of the country. Taking out the political solution, prioritizing the social and mutual interest, efficiency, solution to the political problem and enhancing proper strategy with technical expertise are some core attributes in the technocratic government. Technocracy in the matter of democracy refers to promoting the character of technical expert in policy making process over fundamentally to political or democratic actors. It also be noted that technocracy, is not the form of governance which is latterly defined by its content or decisions made, rather the mode of deciding or knowing that is applied to public affairs. When all major political party of Nepal came to common agenda in support of technocracy interim government in 2013, main motive was to successfully conduct the election peacefully by respecting the social harmony and mutual interest. The decision was very efficiently created, with quick decisions in support of all and henceforth broke the deadlock of political instability by technocratic government. The one year government made a very systematic approach in conducting the election which furthermore paved the way to making constitution.

### **Technocracy Government in Nepal**

In 2002, then king of Nepal Gyanendra Shah took over the administration by abolishing the parliament. This step was taken when the government of Nepal could not bring the peace to country and politicians were blamed for not coming in negotiations with Maoist rebels. End of Civil war was noticed in 2006, when Maoist rebel signed the peace agreement with then government prime minister Girija Prasad Koirala. All citizens were very happy and accepted the rebellions with open arm. This was the end of bloodsheds for 10 years people were living in fear. Maoist was introduced to the mainstream politics and included in interim government of 2007, in the same year they were also successful in giving the interim constitution of 2007. This constitution opened the windows to hold general election of 2008 and to promulgate the new constitution of Nepal. Maoist came into power winning the largest number of seats but could not manage to get the majority. However, after the general election of 2008, the major political parties could not have consensus which further delayed the deadline of constitution making process. As this was the coalition government, Nepalese had to see four prime ministers from 2008 to 2012. Despite the political turmoil which was called ideological difference, a sense of hope was seen in the first half of 2012 where major political parties were ready to resolve the issues by bringing all groups together (Stiftung, 2014). The then Prime minister Dr. Baburam Bhattarai had to dissolve the Constituent Assembly (CA) that failed to promulgate a new constitution. After the dissolvent of CA, the prime minister did not resign and acted as caretaker of the government for the time being and proposed to have a new election for 22 November 2012, nor a new deadline of March 2013 but the political parties could not keep the promise and all four major parties agreed on one platform by forming High Level Political Committee (HLPC) to have technocracy government headed by the chief justice of the Supreme Court, Khil Raj Regmi, as chairman of council of minister as well as the head of Interim Election Council (IEC) to lead a technocratic government and hold elections by June 21, 2013 (Felbab-Brown, 2013). His appointment on April 14, 2013 gave Nepalese a sign of hope.



The eleven point agreement between four major political parties- Unified CPN (Maoist), Nepali Congress, CPN-UML and United Democratic Madhesi Front- on March 13, 2013 specified the responsibilities for Regmi government. According to the agreement, it is stated that, “As the term of the Constituent Assembly expired before the task of constitution making was completed and also in consideration of the Supreme Court’s verdict, to institutionalize federal democratic republic in the country by guaranteeing the rights of the Nepali people to draft a constitution on their own, Also considering that the Constituent Assembly does not exist after May 27, 2012 and the subsequent political consensus reached for holding fresh elections to the new Constituent Assembly and the principle of necessity to constitute a national consensus government for the same, and the need to form a Constituent Assembly through fresh elections to the Constituent Assembly by a government formed under the leadership of the Chief Justice on a political consensus and, To form a government of national consensus by removing the existing constitutional and legal difficulties and thereby pave the way for a democratic political way out by holding elections to the Constituent Assembly in a fair, free and fearless atmosphere” (Asian Center for Human Rights<sup>1</sup>, 2013:7). Under this eleven point agreement, the attributed list was: (1) Structure, function-duties and term of election government; (2) Formation of a high-level political mechanism and jurisdiction; (3) The number of Constituent Assembly members and tenure; (4) Voter’s List; (5) Process to remove difficulties and issues; (6) Necessary arrangements regarding election; (7) Appointments in the Supreme Court and Constitutional Bodies; (8) About the ownership of the works of the dissolved CA; (9) Remaining task of the Peace Process; (10) On Citizenship; and (11) On local body elections. (Asian Center for Human Rights, 2013). Among all these eleven point agreement, the first point clearly mentioned the responsibilities of Regmi government (Table 3).

**Table 3: Structure, function-duties and term of election government as per the eleven point agreement**

1.1 The election to the Constituent Assembly shall be held within June 21, 2013. For this an Interim Election Council of Ministers would be formed comprising of a Chairperson and Ministers.
1.2 The Chairperson of the Interim Election Council shall carry out all the functions and task of the Prime Minister as mentioned in the Constitution. The allocation of portfolios of the Ministers shall be carried out as per the Constitution by the Chair of the Council of Ministers.
1.3 The ministers to the Interim Election Council shall be appointed from among the former distinguished class civil service officers of the Government of Nepal.
1.4.1 The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court shall chair the Interim Election Council.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.achrweb.org/briefingpapers/BPNepal-01-2013.pdf>

1.4.2 The major task of the Head of the Interim Election Government shall be to hold the election to the Constituent Assembly Legislature-Parliament within the stipulated timeframe.

1.4.3 The Interim Election Council of Ministers shall perform all other tasks to be carried out by the Council of Ministers. But, the interim election council shall not carry out any task of long-term nature.

1.4.4 All the tasks of the Chief Justice will be carried out by the Acting Chief Justice.

1.4.5. The task of the Executive and the Judiciary will be executed as per democratic norms and values and the principles of independent judiciary, separation of powers, checks and balance.

1.5. The maximum number of members of Council of Minister shall be 11. The Chairman of Council of Ministers shall elect the ministers and the principle of inclusion shall be considered while doing so.

1.6. The tenure of the Interim Election Council of Ministers shall automatically come to an end with the new prime minister, to be elected from the Legislature Parliament following election to the Constituent Assembly-Legislature Parliament, takes charge.

1.7. If CA-Parliament election cannot take place within June 21, 2013 due to technical causes or intractable situation, the Council of Ministers shall fix the date for holding the election within December 15 based on a consensus of the high-level political mechanism.

1.8. The Chairman of the Interim Election Council of Ministers shall return to his previous post following the nomination of the next Prime Minister.

*Source: 2013 Proposed Elections in Nepal: An agenda for international community, AHRC, 2013*

Regmi government under this agreement, without wasting anytime appointed eleven cabinet ministers who were the senior and former bureaucrats of Government of Nepal. This is the new case in any democratic country where all the ministers were bureaucrats. So this basically can also be called as bureaucratic technocracy government. Within 100 days in office, Regmi government gradually gained the momentum by announcing the election date for second CA polls, set the laws necessary to hold CA elections, managed to seat for dialogue with disgruntled political parties, and passed pending civil service ordinances and fill the vacant post in various government organizations (Nepal Times<sup>2</sup>). This specifies that the technocrat government in Nepal was successful in reclaiming its task with ease. It was also challenging job for the political parties as they had different ideologies and perhaps the citizens were not so satisfied with this lingering process.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.nepalnews.com/archive/2013/jun/jun23/news15.php>

Despite various obstacles within the political arena, Regmi government announced the second CA election date for November 19, 2013 and all major parties agreed to the mandated date. The election was well received even though a lot of security concern was observed opposing the CA election. As compared to 2008 election, the voters were quite low as many of the people were not in the country and also due to the general strike announced by other agitating parties. According to the report of Election Commission of Nepal, 78.34% of voter turnout was observed as compared to more than 61 percent of the election of 2008 (The Carter Center, 2013; 2008). Regmi government successfully conducted the second election as mandated by the eleven point agreement between four major political parties and minimizes the further political crisis that has been observed since 2008. Blunck (2014:7) stated that, “it already seems clear that what the elections gained through process efficiency, they lost through superficiality. The elections were able to secure legitimacy for the election process. Results were eventually recognised by all main political parties.” This technocracy government led to the formation of new elected government under the governance of Nepal Congress party headed by Mr. Shushil Koirala. Krämer (2014:11) viewed that, “Despite of all these constitutional concerns, however, one has to certify in retrospect that the transitional government of Khil Raj Regmi has accomplished its task of holding elections to a new CA in an exemplary manner despite numerous adversities. The elections of 19 November 2013 were very peaceful, had an enormous turnout and gave the country back the lost legitimacy basis.” The Maoist party who was the leading party in the first election had to be satisfied in third place. Though they were protesting the election result but many of the reports suggested that the election was fairly conducted. The second CA election was a solid pathway towards crafting new constitution which has been delayed for so long. The Constitution of Nepal 2015 was promulgated in September 2015 by the elected constituent assembly members.

## **Conclusion**

A doubt of concern is always there in the democratic countries why a need of technocracy or technical expert to move beyond the political turmoil. But whenever the crisis is observed, technical expert have always come forward to prioritize the task which other political parties cannot do. Technical expert are very intellect and can swing to both ways. They can lean to right and if needed can also lean to left for mutual and social interest. This so happened in the context of Nepal, as major political forces despite many meetings and negotiations could not come to common ground, then stepped Mr. Khil Raj Regmi, having ample amount of experience in judicial field to held election for which he was chosen, and he successfully flourished in his duties as a true man with stipulated time. Technocrats do not spend time on unnecessary activities but rather be efficient in running the government with accumulating every group. This technocratic government in Nepal was also successful due to involvement of senior bureaucrats who took the responsibility to join the interim government and bring a hope to Nepalese citizen. The issues of disagreement among major political parties were getting worse after the first election of CA which led to delay of the constitution. These four years from 2008 to 2012 saw a deep political turmoil that had to be broken with adjustment but inflexibility among them were causing a lot of problem. Many literature have

researched that technocracy government are fully fledged towards reducing financial crisis and making economic growth, but if we consider to Nepal, it's a different case to minimize the deadlock of politics turmoil and make a pathway to conduct general election to promulgate new constitution accumulating to every diverse group of Nepal. Technocrat bureaucratic as described by many literatures feel that they are nominal and work under proceeding of laws and regulation. The desire to work exists among them without any hidden motive. They in somehow are very straight forward in working and have systematic approach under the mandate assigned to them. In the view of Kurki (2011) technocratic tendencies were observed positively to serve the EU system for advocating foreign policy. Technocratic tendencies not only to developed countries but can also be positively taken in developing countries like Nepal to of course minimize the political turmoil in order to take the country in the right path.

Lastly, technocracy government is not the major actor to lead the government as it has a status of caretaker government. To be a successful nation, major political forces should need to come with common consensus to walk in the path of socio-economic development, solidarity in the governance and welfare of the citizens.

## References:

- Alesina, A., Özler, S., Roubini, N., & Swagel, P. (1996). Political instability and economic growth. *Journal of Economic growth*, 1(2), 189-211.
- Asian Center for Human Rights, (2013). 2013 Proposed Elections in Nepal: An agenda for international community, Briefing paper on Nepal, Embargoed for: 23 May, 2013, [www.achrweb.org](http://www.achrweb.org)
- Barro, R.J. (1991). Economic growth in across-section of countries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 106, 407–443
- Benhabib, J. & Spiegel, M. (1997). Growth and investment across countries. Working Papers in Applied Economic Theory 97-03, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
- Blunck, M. (2014). *Between a Rock and a Hard Place*.
- Boswell, C. (2009) *The Political Uses of Expert Knowledge: Immigration Policy and Social Research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Easterly, W. and Rebelo, S. (1993). Fiscal policy and economic growth. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32, 417–458. *Economic Review*, 40, 869 – 887
- Felbab-Brown, V. (2013). *Getting Smart and Scaling Up: The Impact of Organized Crime on Governance in Developing Countries*.
- Fischer, F. (1990) *Technocracy and the Politics of Expertise*, Newbury Park: Sage.

- Jong-A-Pin, R. (2009). On the measurement of political instability and its impact on economic growth. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 25(1), 15-29.
- Kobbi, H., & Boujelbene, Y. (first draft-not published) Measurement and analysis of political instability in the MENA countries and Africa and its impact on economic growth.
- Kurki, M. (2011). Democracy through technocracy? Reflections on technocratic assumptions in EU democracy promotion discourse. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 5(2), 211-234.
- Li, H. (2001). Technocrats and democratic transition: the cases of China and Mexico. *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 67-86.
- Lindstam, E. (2014). Support for Technocratic Decision-Making in the OECD Countries: Attitudes toward Apolitical Politics.
- Meynaud, J. (1969). *Technocracy*. New York: Free Press.
- Putnam, R. (1977). Elite transformation in advanced industrial societies. an empirical assessment of the theory of technocracy. *Comparative Political Studies*, 10(3):383–410.
- Radaelli, C.M. (1999) ‘The Public Policy of the European Union: Whither Politics of Expertise?’ *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(5): 757–774.
- Ribbagen, C. (2013). *Technocracy within Representative Democracy. Technocratic Reasoning and Justification among Bureaucrats and Politicians*.
- Sala-i-Martin, X. (1997). I just run four million regressions. NBER Working Paper No. 4186.
- Shin, D. C., & Lee, J. (2003). Democratization and its Consequences. In *The Quality of Life in Korea* (pp. 71-92). Springer Netherlands.
- Stiftung, B., (2014), BTI 2014-Nepal Country Report. Gütersloh
- Svensson, J. (1998) Investment, property rights, political instability: theory and evidence. *European Economic Review*, 42, 1317–1341.
- The Carter Center (2013), Observing Nepal’s 2013 Constituent Assembly Election, Final Report One Copenhill 453 Freedom Parkway Atlanta, GA 30307 (404) 420-5188, [www.cartercenter.org](http://www.cartercenter.org)
- The Carter Center (2008), Observing the 2008 Nepal Constituent Assembly Election, One Copenhill 453 Freedom Parkway Atlanta, GA 30307 (404) 420-5188, [www.cartercenter.org](http://www.cartercenter.org)