

## THIRTY YEAR OLD PRIME MINISTER IS NEED OF NEPAL

- Prabin Subedi

A leader is the person who can influence the actions of other. He/she affect the deeds of other people. According to Newstrom and Davis, “leadership is the process of influencing and supporting others to work enthusiastically toward achieving objectives.” A good leader posses the qualities like sway, power of legitimate remuneration, coercion, referent, expert and assertiveness, friendliness, bargaining, inspiration, motivation etc.

Aging is inevitable. With age comes experience, with experience comes knowledge and with knowledge comes ability. Abilities, thus, come with time. Whether it be the ability to drive a car or to lead a country, one has to have experience in the related field. This conclusion, ironically brings to light a contradictory issue- ‘the age at which a person is supposed to be the most suitable to lead a country.’ From what I have portrayed above, a simple idea arises-the older, the better. And the irony is that, it need not necessarily be true.

We are flooded with examples. A simple peek into our own political system elucidates the topic to prove it. An 84-year old prime minister alone runs our country. Sights of the honorable prime minister being helped to make his way up to a stage are common in our visual media. One can’t help but wonder, how can a man who cannot even stand on his own feet without the help of others run a whole country? The answer is simple- he can, but the country ends up being ‘Nepal’. News of the prime minister missing several important meetings due to health complications or failing to address a crowd due to fatigue is no longer new. There is headline news that, his health is poor, he needs rest, and that result in the delay of cabinet meeting, which is hindering the political development of the nation. The result is an attitude of frustration among other political organs.

Another drawback to an old prime minister is his views. An old prime minister comes from an older time; his philosophies and beliefs are usually outdated. He is not in a position to keep up with the pace in which the current world changes. Rather his age doesn’t allow him to. The result is an imbalance between the governing party and the youth. Our country, again, may serve as a suitable example. The fact that our prime minister is still hovering around the outdated prospect of ‘the ceremonial king’ and that the youth are voraciously raising a voice for republic has created such political instability that is leading the country nowhere.

With age fades energy. Enthusiasm declines with time. An old prime minister fails to make an impact on his people. He fails to implant in them the ray of hope and dream of prosperity. He fails to create the air of authority and have situations under his control. The fact that our prime minister has been unable to calm the Terai riots shows that he no longer has the energy and persona that is required to have situations like these under control. The latest dispute in the ministry cabinet between the prime minister and the minister of forestry shows that he is losing his authority over his people as well. He has failed to create discipline and the reason is his age and fading personality.

In our context, history has shown, we are never leaded by the young enthusiastic leaders. Let us visualize the prime ministers after the democracy, our country is led by same, Krishna Prasad

---

\* Writer is student of Kathmandu School of law, LL.B 1<sup>st</sup> year.

Bhattarai, Girija Prasad Koirala, Manamohan Adhikari, Sher Bdr. Deuba, Lokendra Bdr. Chand, Surya Bdr. Thapa, all aged tedious leaders one after another. So, due to the elderly and outdated-viewed, monotonous mind, we Nepalese are lacking behind in technology and science. Country is not advancing towards the modern system and competing to the world of globalization due to old fashioned leaders. Though, their capability and intellectuality may be damn good but, the change in mind should also be fitted as per the need of nation.

An old prime minister might have followers but he fails to become a leader. A man whose future (as a live human being itself) is uncertain cannot promise a future for the million people he represents. An old prime minister stands as nothing but a weak pillar that supports a country, due to this weakness in the leading pillar, the country may be grounded. It is in his rule that antagonist powers dare to rise above their nests and devour the nation. It is in his rule that royal massacres occur. It clearly shows lack of versatility and diligence that gives rise to such situations. The result is again another 'Nepal'.

Youth is energy. It's a time when people are prepared to take intellectual risks. It is a time when one has the courage to uproot the fallacies in the current system and start afresh. It is a time when one can represent a nation and its people at the same time. Youth thus is the ideal time to lead a country. It is time to create new Nepal, with new constitution and new structure, which a young can do faster than old people and make the nation free from the transition period. A young prime minister is capable both physically and mentally of leading a country. He comes from the current generation, so he thinks in the way his country does. He knows exactly the kind of change his people want. He is not discouraged by failures as he always has the time to start all over again. The question that I want to put forward is that, the person who thinks that young cannot take the initiation then I would like to ask the questioner that, what were the ages of four martyrs' of 1997 and what were the ages of martyrs of 2063. So, I can say that the youth has enough capacity, courage, fortitude, guts, bravery, intellectuality, competence to lead the nation in the changed context of time.

There are lots of examples for making one's mouth shut who favors old age leader. David Lounge, prime minister of New Zealand was the one with courage and guts, he was young. What Lounge did was, he banned nuclear power and nuclear armed ships. Due to this act, Washington was angry and suspended New Zealand from security alliance. What we can wind up from this instance is that, a young is ever ready to take risk for the benefit of nation and not of himself/ herself. Chris Watson of Australia and J.F Kennedy of USA were the persons who led their nations in an ideal way and made their nation prosperous.

Thus for political stability, favorable changes, prosperity and calmness a young prime minister will be ideal to lead a country. Aged prime minister cannot devote the time, because he/she cannot do due to the health, out-dated attitude, unsuitable technology and changing society.

### **Bibliography**

- [www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)
- [www.ezilon.com](http://www.ezilon.com)
- Different national dailies of Nepal
- Principles of Management, Agrawal, G.R

