International Journal of
Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences

e-ISSN : 3026-0892
p-ISSN : 3026-1422

Index: Harvard, Boston, Sydney, Dimensions, Lens, Scilit, Semantic, Google, etc

https://doi.org/10.58578/IJHESS.v3i1.4915

The Impact of Factionalism on Political Parties in Nepal

Santa Bahadur Thapa
Tri-Chandra Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
drsantabthapa7@gmail.com

Article Info:

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Jan 5, 2025	Jan 20, 2025	Feb 2, 2025	Feb 7, 2025

Abstract

This paper explores factionalism in Nepalese political parties and its causes and effects on party factions. Nepal's political culture is rife with factionalism, splinter groups, and power struggles. The paper traces the historical development of factionalization from ideological conflict and personal rivalry. The paper segments society into groups based on ideology, personality, geography, and one-off issues. It analyzes the negative impact of factionalism on party discipline, stability, policymaking, and government. This paper examines the social non-linearities of leadership in factionalism and shows how their presence makes effective leadership essential to combatting factionalism's effects. This case study of major Nepalese political parties is technically an objective and practical demonstration of factionalism. A global perspective can enhance many of the firm conclusions based on case studies of factionalism within political parties in various countries. The paper suggests ways of dealing with and tackling the issue of factionalism, including the importance of keeping its internal democracy and communication and showing how to deal with

IJHESS Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

elements that would not help. The paper concludes with possible driving factors behind this exclusive mirage of a political system. It suggests a few essential recommendations to subdue factionalism, like strengthening leadership, intra-party democracy, improving the legislative mechanisms, etc. It essentially places the responsibility on concern for factionalism, which can stymie effective government and dilute the moral legitimacy of democracy in Nepal.

Keywords: Democracy, Factionalism, Governance, Instability, Leadership, Party Unity, Political Parties

Introduction

Political parties are presumed to be the most significant agents of democracy and development in any society. In modern times, political parties are a natural part of democracy. They are vehicles to ensure people's participation in government and politics, formulate and create policies, create political stability, and ensure public accountability to the government. However, the political parties in Nepal, from the past to the present, have been marred by various problems. One of the significant problems is factionalism. A political party faction refers to a group of party members that band together within a political party in pursuit of ideas or policies that differ from those of the party's dominant coalition. In a broader sense, factionalism means divisions, internal disputes, infighting, and struggle for power and resources within a party. Factionalism in political parties is ubiquitous, leading to questions on parties' effectiveness, governance, and democratic stability (Surya Prasad & Prasad Pathak, 2012, pp. 149-170). Factionalism is deemed a chronic problem for Nepalese political parties. In their formative stage, the political parties were factionalized around ideological differences, and in later stages, they became factionalized over personal rivalries and struggle for control of the state resources. The public generally views party factionalism as a problem. Such factionalism potentiates the probability of parties fragmenting into new parties or sub-parties, limiting the parties' ability to exercise control over intra-party rivalries. Although factionalism is viewed as a problem, it is nevertheless common to political parties across time and space. Therefore, the need arises to examine the historical, social, and political contexts under which

factionalism proliferates in Nepalese political parties. More specifically, efforts are made to examine why political parties that were once liberating forces for democracy turn into oppressive and corrupt forces, suffocating democracy. The paper's objectives are to analyze factionalism in political parties in Nepal, examine the causes behind factionalism in Nepalese political parties, and analyze the impacts of factionalism in Nepalese political parties. To pursue these objectives, the following questions are raised: How is factionalism perceived in political parties in Nepal? What are the causes of factionalism in Nepalese political parties? What are the impacts of factionalism on political parties in Nepal? The paper adopts descriptive and analytical research design. Both primary and secondary sources of information are used. The content analysis method was adopted for the analysis of secondary sources. Political parties are assumed to be pivotal for democracy. Despite being central to democracy, parties often oscillate between progressive and regressive roles. In Nepal, the political parties that were once regarded as liberating forces for democracy turned oppressive and corrupt, suffocating democracy. Examining factionalism becomes relevant for academic discourse and Nepalese political practice in this context.

Historical Background of Nepalese Political Parties

Political parties are considered a prerequisite for the functioning of democracy. A political party is an organization of like-minded people who desire to acquire political power to materialize their shared ideologies and agendas. In a broader sense, political parties are considered indispensable institutions of representative democracy. The party system is an arrangement of political parties and their mutual interaction in a polity. A party system may be classified as single-party, two-party, multi-party, or dominant-party based on the number of parties and seats they control (Surya Prasad & Prasad Pathak, 2012, pp. 149-170). Nepalese polity has a multi-party system with constitutional provisions for political parties to conduct people's sovereignty. Although the democratic polity in Nepal is more than seven decades old, political parties have remained factionalized and polarized. Prior to the democratic exercise in 1951, political parties in Nepal were clandestine organizations. The Nepal Congress (NC) was established in 1947, and the Communist Party of Nepal (CPN) was established two years later. With the overthrow of the Rana regime in 1951, Nepal entered into a multi-party phase for the first time. Political parties, which mushroomed during the pro-democracy movement against the autocratic Rana regime, turned

competitive and factionalized immediately after the restoration of democracy. This experience was even during rival King Gyanendra's direct rule and post-2006 democratic uprising. There has been a rise in the number of factions within political parties since the restoration of multi-party democracy in 1990.

The democratic polity in Nepal has oscillated between stability and crisis since its emergence in 1951, with the political parties playing the leading role. The constitutional provision of political parties to conduct people's sovereignty and the charter of national rights enshrining freedom of political association rendered political parties inevitable in Nepalese polity. However, intra-party conflicts and unhealthy inter-party competitions have created a political crisis. The party system in post-1990 Nepal, a multi-party parliamentary democracy, has been marked by political instability and coalition government formations. The 1991 election victory by the NC, the largest party, led to the formation of the first democratic government, which lasted for the full five-year term. However, since 1994, the parliament has been dissolved three times, triggering new elections amid political intrigues. During the second democratic period (1990-2002), the party system became highly polarized and factionalized, contributing to political instability. In Nepal, political parties have a history of more than seven decades. The NC and CPN were formed in 1947 and 1949, respectively. These parties and the other fringe parties organized the pro-democracy movement that culminated in overthrowing the Rana regime in 1951. With the end of autocracy, King Tribhuvan's return from exile marked the beginning of democracy in Nepal. However, the monarch's intervention in party politics brought political instability, rendering the democratic experiment unsuccessful. After sixteen years of political wilderness, another pro-democracy uprising occurred in 1990, and political parties re-entered the polity. The 1990 constitution restored parliamentary democracy in the country, where a multi-party competition characterized the party system. Forty-four parties were registered at the election commission, and twenty parties contested the election, although only nine succeeded in gaining representation in the parliament in 1991. The post-1990 election scenario showed that, despite the parliamentary democracy's mushrooming party growth, a party system with representation was lacking. There was a single party in the 1991 parliament; however, there was a rise in the number of factions within the parties. In 1994, sixty-five parties were registered at the election commission, and twenty-four contested the election, but only seven gained representation in the parliament. Similarly, in

1999, one hundred parties were registered, with thirty-nine contesting the election, though only seven secured seats.

Conceptual Framework: Understanding Factionalism in Political Parties

The conceptual framework delineates the theoretical aspects of factionalism in political parties. While several arguments, analyses, and case studies have been put forward regarding factionalism in political parties, a few attempts have been made to develop a coherent conceptual framework to understand, theorize, and analyze factionalism. This section aims to develop a conceptual framework that can be used to understand the configuration and dynamics of factionalism in political organizations in general and political parties in particular. Initially, several definitions of factionalism are reviewed to highlight the complexities and multi-faceted nature of factionalism. Based on this review, some key features of factionalism are identified. Thereafter, factionalism is analyzed as a concept in its own right, independent of other party phenomena like unity, rivalry, and competition, to bring out the dynamics of factionalism in political organizations. Unlike other political phenomena, factionalism is portrayed as a 'contested concept' that is difficult to comprehend because it has been widely used and interpreted in different contexts and with different nuances (Welcome Ralo, 2012).

Factionalism is further theorized to illustrate its dynamics regarding the tension and interaction between party factions' inherent and ascribed functions. A distinction is drawn between healthy competition in a party organization that engenders diversity, creativity, and renewal and destructive factionalism that leads to division, disintegration, and even demise. The theoretical exposition also underscores the impact of internal democratization on the factional character of political parties. Conceptual models have been developed to analyze the configuration of factionalism in political organizations at a given time and examine the dynamics of factionalism in political organizations over time. The implications of factionalism for party organization and intra-party electoral behavior have been discussed in widely divergent party systems, contexts, and countries.

Finally, the approach is illustrated in the context of Nepalese political parties to highlight the framework's utility in analyzing factionalism's complexity and diversity. By providing a robust conceptual understanding of factionalism, this section can serve as a point of

departure for other scholars to undertake similar analyses in varying contexts, thereby contributing to a more sophisticated understanding of factionalism in political parties.

Causes of Factionalism in Nepalese Political Parties

Factionalism is a common characteristic of political parties in Nepal. Factionalism refers to a trend wherein a specific group of party members segregates themselves from the main body of party members based on personal differences, rivalries, or ideological divergences. Political parties in Nepal, big or small, have become factionalized. Factionalism creates internal problems in parties, extending to the entire polity and hamstringing the good governance process. The problem of political party factionalism is primarily viewed from its internal dynamics. However, civil society's impact in promoting factionalism is also examined alongside internal party problems and external political pressures. Other parties outside the panchayat and civil society were also responsible for its factionalization. Ethnic or regional concerns of political parties, which are founded upon socio-economic disparities, are categorized as factional parties. The question is raised whether these parties are factional or non-factional but narrowly based.

With the restoration of democracy in 1990, political parties in Nepal became factionalized for and against monarchical ideology. Although the Nepal Communist Party (NCP) was formed in 1949, it was bifurcated into several party groups. In 1960, King Mahendra ousted the democratically elected government and banned all political parties. Political parties had gone underground, and some established foreign links, bringing different ideologies into Nepal. However, different ideological orientations could not bemuse factionalism's germination within these parties. The Rashtriya Prajatantra Party (RPP) was founded in 1990 based on pro-Hindu and pro-monarchy ideology. In the beginning, many members had joined this party believing that King Birendra Shah would reinstate the multiparty parliamentary system based on the pro-Hindu view. This party bifurcated along the loyalties to King Gyanendra Shah and King Birendra Shah before the 2002 election. This factionalization is also examined in the context of party culture. Nepali political parties' role in party factionalism is assessed in light of upholding their leadership's ideological integrity. To some extent, individual case study analyses are delved into, such as the Nepali Congress (NC) party factionalism's struggle for leadership integrity vis-à-vis NC and Indian National Congress link, and the parties'-grouped decoupling from the main

party deliberated upon in the context of ideological differences. Most factors causing party factionalism in Nepal are unexamined and need more scrutiny, covering questions such as: What have the causes behind political parties' factionalization outside parliamentary polity since 2002? What are intendments of such factions? What are the responsibilities of civil society regarding the political parties' factionalization? Broadly, the causes of factionalism in the political parties are examined with special emphasis given to the NC party factions and middle-class civil society's impacts regarding the choice of party faction's interests at the expense of national concerns (Surya Prasad & Prasad Pathak, 2012, pp. 149-170).

Types of Factions in Nepalese Political Parties

The political parties in Nepal comprise varying types of factions. The different types of factions are as follows:

Ideological Factions: The ideological faction represents different political beliefs and aspirations. A dispute over party ideology creates tension between party cadres. For instance, fundamentalists within the CPN-UML criticized Chairman Jhala Nath Khanal for fostering a centrist trend after he became party chairman. The fundamentalists accused Khanal of pushing UML's Marxist-Leninist ideology into the background by bringing the party closer to the Nepali Congress party, which is regarded as a right-wing party.

Personality-based Factions: Factions driven by individual ambition and charisma to lead the party or hold influential positions within the party create personality-based factions. All the parties in Nepal have factions based on revered party leaders. For instance, CPN-UML is divided between K. P. Sharma Oli and Madhav Kumar Nepal factions. The Maoist party also witnessed factionalism based on individual leaders like Baburam Bhattarai and Mohan Baidya.

Regional Factions: The geographical disparity of development and the rise of local interests give rise to the regional faction within political parties. As per historical context, the influence of hill-based elites in national politics deprived Madhesi, Janajati, and other marginalized communities of their political rights. Hence, the political parties formed a regional faction to mitigate the concerns of their respective communities. After the restoration of multiparty democracy in 1990, the Madhesi community formed a regional faction represented through the Madhesi People's Rights Forum, which later transformed

into a political party. Similar factionalism came in the context of Janajati representation with the formation of the Nepal Sadbhawana Party and the Gorkha Janmukti Morcha.

Issue-based Factions: The issue-based faction emphasizes particular political agendas or social issues rather than party ideology. As per the need of time, specific issues that were ignored earlier by political parties turned into factionalism. For instance, the women's faction in political parties advocates the advancement of women in decision-making positions at the central and local levels in compliance with the constitutional provisions. The youth faction within political parties claims that at least 50 percent of the central and local levels should comprise youths aged 18 to 40 (Mixon, 2016). Understanding the types of political factions is essential to mitigate the adverse effect of factionalism on the political party. Moreover, factionalism will persist in political parties until the provisions in the constitution and the inclusive political environment are adequately addressed.

Effects of Factionalism on Party Unity and Stability

Factional disputes directly impact party coherence, undermining collective decision-making, common strategies, and joint action. Parties tend to lose loyalty among members as factions emerge. In the context of Nepal's political parties, factional divisions are interpreted as an obstacle to development, progress, and integrity. Factionalism within political organizations disrupts their unity. Factionalism is party to the political drama's tragic folly, as it fortifies the fragmentation and weakening of political organizations. The public's perception of the parties may be shaped by visible factional conflict. Factionalism may be the means for grassroots mobilization, as it allows different electorate segments to be engaged with similar desires and demands. Recently, party leaders and supporters largely failed to secure parliamentary seats and lost party relevance to factionalism, arguing that the party had been going downhill since it split in two. Factionalism was cited as one of the main reasons for electoral failure. Likewise, the Nepali Congress claimed the loss was due to factionalism, as many sitting parliamentarians became victimized in intra-party disputes despite having run in the elections from the same party. Triangulated competitiveness afflicted by factionalism veiled definitive party identity despite each contesting under a common electoral symbol. Notably, factionalism has brought about failures in two major parties and a diminishing status to a once-massive party. With the apparent disregard for party unity, factionalism has dominated the party landscape, engendering doubt about

effective governance. A political party should be an alliance of interests coordinated by a common representative perspective directed toward the outside environment. The outside environment is often the electors and the public, so the party as a collective entity requires stability and unity to conduct operations effectively (Ceron, 2015, pp. 1469–2112).

Impact of Factionalism on Policy-making and Governance

The focus is on how factionalism affects policy-making processes within political parties in Nepal. It begins by examining the implications of internal disputes for consensus-building and the parties' legislative effectiveness. While factions are often seen as an obstacle to coherent policy agendas, there are also instances where they can complicate a party's policy-making as they pursue different interests (Welcome Ralo, 2012). Factional power struggles within a party can lead to stagnation or ineffectiveness in its policy-making, and a discussion on how disputes among rival factions can hamper efforts to build consensus on policy issues is provided. This problem is particularly pronounced when parties are internally divided, as is often done in the Nepali context.

In addition, factionalism makes policy decisions difficult in governance arrangements where factions face off against each other with conflicting priorities. Another concern is how the public accountability of a faction-ridden party is undermined by a lack of clarity about which faction is responsible for implementing particular policies. Broader considerations about the implications of factionalism for the political climate within parties and inter-party relations follow this. An attempt is made to illustrate general observations with as many specific Nepali examples as possible. Finally, it is concluded that while factional disputes constitute a significant challenge to ensuring effective governance, without addressing these disputes, the very governance arrangements sought to be put in place are unlikely to be effective, asserts.

Role of Leadership in Managing Factionalism

This section examines the role of leadership in factional dynamics, focusing on how leaders can positively or negatively shape factional issues. It explores the qualities and strategies of leaders who effectively manage factionalism and discusses how leaders can nurture cohesion among factions while minimizing conflict. The section also considers how

different leadership styles can exacerbate or mitigate factional tensions. To illustrate these points, it presents case studies of successful and unsuccessful leadership in factionalism. The challenges leaders face in aligning diverse interests within their parties are also acknowledged (Ceron, 2015, pp. 1469–2112). Finally, the impact of leadership transitions on factionalism is analyzed.

Factionalism is often viewed as detrimental to party stability, suggesting a need for leaders to contain it. However, it is argued that factionalism can also be beneficial, providing flexibility and accommodating diverse interests. A middle-ground perspective is proposed, viewing factionalism as a "double-edged sword" that brings opportunities and challenges. Leaders play a crucial role in managing this "double-edged sword," and their responses shape factional outcomes. Where factionalism is unacknowledged, leaders cannot manage it, leading to a cycle of emergence and implosion. Strong and adaptable leadership is essential in recognizing and responding to factionalism throughout its lifecycle (Chidex Awuzu, 2019). Ultimately, this section emphasizes the pivotal role of leadership in navigating the complexities of factionalism.

Case Studies of Factionalism in Major Nepalese Political Parties

Political parties are the main engines of democracy. In a democratic political system, political parties contest elections, form government, and run the state procedures. Democracy leads to nation-building, economic development, and social change in a country. Modern democracy began in Nepal in 1950 BS. From 1950 to 2006 AD, Nepal underwent democratic experiments for seven decades. During this time, multi-party democracy was implemented and dismissed several times. Political parties are the primary basis of multi-party democracy. Besides achievements, political parties also bear responsibility for the failures of democracy in Nepal. Political parties drafted constitutions, formed government, and ran the state after the restoration of democracy in 1990. Nonetheless, Nepal plunged into political instability in 1994. The King dismissed the then CPN-UML-led government. Civil war erupted in 1996. Maoists boycotted the elections of 1999 and waged an armed insurgency against the parliamentary democracy. Nepal witnessed nearly a decade-long brutal civil war. During the peace process, the political parties could not handle the situation, resulting in the abolition of the monarchy and the declaration of a federal democratic republic in 2008. Political parties could not address the

disputes and differences of the parties, thus failing to promulgate a new constitution on time. Political parties factionalized split, and merged several times, threatening the stability of the elected government and hampering the state procedure. Factionalization of the party system contributed to political instability in Nepal (Surya Prasad & Prasad Pathak, 2012, pp. 149-170). Political parties in Nepal have a history of more than seven decades. The Nepali Congress (NC) and Communist Party of Nepal (CPN) were formed in 1947 and 1949 respectively. With the overthrow of the Rana regime in 1951, Nepal entered a multi-party phase for the first time. Political parties mushroomed with the restoration of democracy in 1990. Political party factionalization created political instability and provided fertile ground for anti-democratic forces.

Factionalism in Nepal's Political Parties and Global Illustrations

This section undertakes an analytical comparison of factionalism in Nepalese political parties with similar phenomena in political parties of other countries. By examining parties' experiences in five countries, the paper delves into the depth of factionalism while noting the divergences and particularities. A cross-party comparison is drawn to identify common patterns in factional behavior and the existing differences. Attention is drawn to the motivations of factionalism in different political systems and the consequences posed by these factions. Countries with factional political parties, such as Nepal, are suggested to examine and find solutions for these problems, using foreign countries as examples. What is meant by factional political parties is briefly elucidated in the context of other countries, and Nepal's political environment is drawn closer to this definition. There is factionalism in the political parties of Italy, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, India, and Pakistan, which are studied here. However, these countries' party situations and political environments differ from those of Nepal despite having similarities (Surya Prasad & Prasad Pathak, 2012, pp. 149-170). Therefore, caution is exercised in drawing too many parallels between Nepalese parties and parties framed within different contexts. Nevertheless, this exercise is worthwhile as it provides an understanding of the nature of factionalism, which is found across the globe. It is hoped that the findings of such a study will assist in determining the course of action for Nepalese parties regarding factionalism and what Nepalese parties might do to curb the adverse effects of factionalism, drawing on successful practices from abroad as possible frameworks. Finally, it is asserted that as

factionalism is a global phenomenon, the need to contextualize it within a broad framework is acknowledged.

Strategies to Mitigate Factionalism in Nepalese Political Parties

Factionalism is a widespread issue in Nepalese political parties, often rooted in the personal ambition and ego of factional leaders rather than principle-based disagreements. Its persistence leads to party fracturing and complicates the formation of party alliances. This paper aims to comprehensively evaluate the impacts of factionalism on Nepalese political parties and propose mitigation strategies. Adopting a qualitative approach, relevant literature is reviewed, and semi-structured interviews are conducted with party leaders and an academic expert. Findings indicate that factionalism obstructs party effectiveness, damages party integrity and unity, hampers firm decision-making, and can ignite violent confrontations. To counter these challenges, leaders should foster internal democracy, promote communication between conflicting factions, and develop a shared vision and goals for party members. Establishing effective conflict resolution mechanisms, conducting negotiation training programs, and involving civil society can curb factionalism and enhance inclusivity within parties (Surya Prasad & Prasad Pathak, 2012, pp. 149-170).

Despite being a political party stronghold, Nepal faces persistent factionalism, internal disputes, and political instability. In political parties, factions emerge as subgroups, often arising from ideological differences or disagreements within the larger party group. Politically, factionalism is when a political party is divided into factions or rival groups. Political party factionalism, which grew as a system in Nepal after the restoration of multi-party democracy in 1990, has severely challenged party efficiency and governance. Although political parties were seen as transformational agents after the 2006 People's Movement, most have become rigid and stagnant, solely focusing on preserving party structures while quenching internal disputes that compromise public service.

Theoretical Perspectives on Factionalism in Political Parties

Factionalism has been a significant aspect of organized politics since the inception of political parties (Carothers, 2006, pp. 241-266). Over the last century, political parties have evolved into a ubiquitous component of representative democracy, with factionalism

persisting within these entities (Sartori, 2005). Various efforts have been made to mitigate factional dynamics; however, factional disputes frequently emerge in public discourse (Heller, 2009, pp. 1457-1480). Consequently, these disputes provide a platform for rival groups, which may either depart from the party or realign with opposing factions (Blais & Massicotte, 2002, pp. 49-81). As the number of political parties increases, the implications of factionalism pose critical questions regarding the long-term stability of multi-party democracy (Dalton, 2008, pp. 19-44).

The debate surrounding factionalism in political parties is rich, featuring a variety of perspectives and positions. Different scholars have proposed different theoretical perspectives on factionalism. Some argue that factionalism arises from ideological underpinnings, while others contend that factionalism emerges from non-ideological realms. The theoretical perspectives on factionalism have been classified into classical and contemporary categories. The classical (or early) perspective encompasses parties' views as a 'necessary evil,' internal democracy, ideological vs. non-ideological factionalism analysis, and the effects. The contemporary perspectives analyze organizational theory, the behavioral approach, and the impact of factionalism on parties (Gherghina et al., 2019).

Parties can be examined from a neo-institutional perspective, focusing on formal and informal rules that create boundaries for party action. Drawing from this tradition, party organizations are understood as systems consisting of interrelated elements. Internal party factionalism can be coherent with the viability of party organizations if external threats stimulate negotiated settlements between factions to preserve the party's electoral base (Ceron, 2015, pp. 1469–2112). Different theoretical approaches can be chosen to examine the causes and implications of factional behavior within political parties. Some approaches focus on the role of ideological versus non-ideological underpinnings of factions in parties as the key explanatory variable. Other approaches analyze factors emerging from the realm of party organization, which are focused on the party as an organization emphasizing structure, rules, and systems that occur at a level removed from individual actors. Some approaches examine the dynamics of factionalism in parties from a behavioral perspective, focusing on the motivation of party members and how this drives factionalism

Empirical Studies on Factionalism in Political Parties

Factionalism is widespread among political parties in both developed and developing countries. Many empirical studies have been conducted on factionalism within political parties. This section reviews some of these studies, focusing mainly on the qualitative and quantitative research findings. The studies are reviewed based on the methodologies used to assess the dynamics of factionalism and their impacts on the functionality of political parties. Most of the studies have used mixed methods approaches to assess intra-party factionalism. However, there is a significant representation of qualitative and quantitative approaches, too.

The intra-party conflict between youth and elderly cadres in the Khmer People's National Unity Party is assessed using a qualitative approach based on the primary data collected through in-depth interviews (Gherghina et al., 2019). Similarly, youth and elderly factionalism in Cambodia's National Rescue Party is examined using a qualitative approach (Ceron, 2015, pp. 1469–2112). The intra-party conflict between a political party and its councilors has been examined quantitatively, focusing on the Belgian Liberal Reformist Party and emphasizing ideological incongruence as a dependent variable. This paper also underlines the role of ambition and intra-party competition in reducing conflict.

Factionalism is a common phenomenon in political parties around the globe. Despite efforts to curb factionalism, factionalism persists in political parties with diverse characteristics across time and space. There is no commonly agreed definition of factionalism; however, it is usually defined concerning groups within the parties. Political party factionalism is often termed intra-party factionalism. Intra-party factionalism occurs when party members operate in factions against a party's interest. Party factionalism can be classified as coalescence, tribalism, and liquidity. Coalescent factionalism is when factions are established permanently around interest groups. Tribal factionalism is when faction leaders control the factions more in a personal capacity than as a group representative. Liquidity factionalism depicts a situation when party members move in and out of factions as they chase their political ambitions. Considering party factionalism typologies, this paper explores the nature, causes, and impacts of factionalism on the functionality of Nepalese political parties.

Conclusion

Factionalization, the presence of ideological and organizational splits within parties, is a common feature of most political parties (Hasan, 2009, pp. 226-241). Political parties have become a principal institution of contemporary democracy. The emergence of parties is vital for a multi-party representative governance system. Nonetheless, in many countries, including Nepal, political parties, which are inherently democratic institutions, have undergone undemocratic practices such as autocracy, oligarchy, factionalism, personality cults, and others. Factionalism is a cursed child of any historical and contemporary understanding of political party to achieve unity. Factionalism is one of the significant obstacles to the party's unity, even within the framework and the understanding of historical and contemporary terms (Thapa, 2015, pp. 120-135). It brings the contending parties face to face, blocking their way to implementing their political programs, agendas, and good governance. Moreover, political parties in Nepal are no exception to this. Despite their common ideological foundation, even the factions started to face ruptures from the moment they formed. The effects of factionalism on the party's unity and good governance have been analyzed by considering CPN-UML and Nepali Congress as cases of Nepalese political parties. After the restoration of democratic polity in 1990, political parties in Nepal mushroomed. Nevertheless, the parties factionalized and confronted each other from the very beginning. Management of factionalism through effective leadership, reformative approaches focussing on inner democracy and party statutes and legislative arrangements through the requirement of party register to furnish the details of its internal proceedings, good governance, and democracy are recommended to the concerned stakeholders, including party leaders and policymakers for the minimization of factionalism in these parties (Surya Prasad & Prasad Pathak, 2012, pp. 149-170). Factionalism is a legitimate characteristic of all political parties that have developed as important institutions in a modern democracy. Nevertheless, a political party, a democratic institution by nature, has undergone undemocratic practices in many countries, including autocracy, oligarchy, personality cult, factionalism, and many others. The party system remained factionalized in Nepal even prior to its experiment with democracy in 1951, and hence, it had a confrontation with the monarchy and the brunt of its banishment. Return to democracy in 1990 reinstated the party phenomenon in the polity. However, political party factionalization not only became the cause of its confrontation with the monarchy and, hence, the brunt of its reinstatement again but also created political instability. These

studies have discussed the two institutional factors and their roles in the breakdown of democracy in Nepal: factionalization of the party system and the monarchy.

References

Blais, A., & Massicotte, L. (2002). Electoral systems. In K. J. Newton & D. E. Norris (Eds.), *Comparing Democracies 2: Elections and Voting in Global Perspective* (pp. 49-81). Sage Publications.

Carothers, T. (2006). The Programmatic Challenge of Political Party Development. *Political Parties and Democracy*, 8, 241–266.

Dalton, R. J. (2008). The Involved and the Apathetic: Youth and Political Engagement in America. Political Participation in America. In *Youth & Participation: A New Perspective on Democracy* (pp. 19–44). Cambridge University Press.

Heller, W. B. (2009). Democratic Transitions and Democratic Consolidation: Rethinking the Relationship. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(11), 1457-1480.

Sartori, G. (2005). *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. ECPR Press.

Ceron, A. (2015). The Politics of Fission: An Analysis of Faction Breakaways among Italian Parties (1946–2011). *British Journal of Political Science*, ISSN: 1469–2112. DOI: 10.1017/S0007123413000215.

Chidex Awuzu, F. (2019). *Leadership Issues and Organizational Dynamics That Shaped the 2016 Republican Primaries*. PhD dissertation, Oklahoma University. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissanddoc

Gherghina, S., Close, C., and Kopecký, P. (2019). The Dynamics and Dimensions of Intraparty Conflict: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Party Politics*, University of Glasgow. (doi:10.1177/1354068819836048).

H. Best, R. (2012). *Negotiation in the Shadow of an Extremist Threat: Insurgencies and the Internal Commitment Problem*. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. DOI: 10.17615/CHKB-BQ20.

Mixon, Jehdeiah (2016). Demise from Within: Factionalism in Maoist Parliamentary Politics in Nepal. Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection, 2503. https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/2503?utm_source=digitalcollections.sit.edu%2Fisp_collection%2F2503&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages

Mueser, Benjamin Wolf Lehr. Let's Talk About It: Political Relationships in Nepal (2011). Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection, 1066. https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/1066

Surya Prasad, P., & Prasad Pathak, S. (2012). Political Instability in Nepal: Examining the Roles of the Parties and Monarchy in the Second Democratic Period (1990-2002). The Journal of Social Sciences, 73, 149-170.

Welcome Ralo, M. (2012). Assessing Internal Contestations within the ANC: The Post-Polokwane Political Landscape: The Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality Case Study. Thamar University. https://core.ac.uk/download/145042427.pdf

Griffiths, M., & Hasan, M. (2015). Playing with fire: Islamism and politics in Bangladesh. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, *23*(2), 226–241.

Thapa, K. (2022). Democracy and political parties in Nepal. *Journal of Nepalese Studies, 25*(2), 120–135.