

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu



Bishnu Prasad Dahal, Ph. D.

Anthropology

Patan Multiple Campus, Patan Dhoka Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal

Abstract: It is very clear from the foregoing that living together relationships or cohabitation and premarital sex are new trends that are on the rise and are becoming more practiced and increasing day by day in Nepalese context. Marriage makes a new social relation, rights and duties between spouse and their relatives, and defines children's rights and status in birth time but not by living together relationships. Living together represents a private choice for individuals or has implications for society as a whole and when individual behaviors are invested with a public discourse or carry a value for the society as a whole, they acquire social meaning. On the one hand, the differences between cohabitation and marriage may have substantial implications for social welfare (e.g., union stability, children's outcomes, well-being), especially since cohabitation is often not as well-recognized in the legal system as marriage, which may have implications for how states support vulnerable individuals. On the other hand, living together relationship contributes to family diversity and may indicate greater acceptance of alternative lifestyles.

This paper seeks to apply anthropological theories to the concepts of marriage and living together in Kathmandu in present context. I have tried to examine living together relationship using sociological micro-theories such as phenomenology theory and the macro-theories such as conflict theory, functionalism, and post modernism are used in order to analyze love as it relates to marriage and the ways in which the meanings of these concepts and their positions in society have changed.

Key words; living together, cohabitation, marriage, kinship, norms, values, social, cultural etc.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rise in living together in an intimate union without marriage has been one of the greatest changes and challenge to the urban life all over the world over the past few decades. In most of the European countries, living together relationship and behavior has shifted from a marginal behavior to one that has become acceptable and normal. In a way, it is a kind of behavior or relationship which helps to expect way of starting a family in many countries (Hiekel 2014). The rise in such living together relationship or behavior has challenged the institution of marriage, leading to uncertainty about the reasons for marriage or whether marriage is even necessary.

Although living together relationships have increased in Europe (Hiekel 2014) and it is also rising in Asia, South Asia and in urban area of Nepal. The countries have varied socio-cultural and legal provision living together relationships including others. Now some countries of the south Asian countries including Nepal is also experiencing rapid increases, with living together relationships and childbearing within living together or cohabitation becoming common, while some societies and cities have experienced only a slow diffusion of such relationships of living together.

Socially, living together relationships has transformed social roles and kin relationships, making it more difficult for others to gauge partners' commitment levels in a way and it has also provided a challenge to legal institutions, since unions no longer have clear markers for when serious relationships begin and end (Perelli-Harris and Sanchez Gassen 2012). Hence, the rise of living together relationships is changing the nature of partnership formation and dissolution, with implications not only for couples but also for other family members, social networks, state support, and society in general (Sanchez Gassen and Perelli-Harris 2015).

The study of marriage is an important part of anthropology because marriage creates family and household groups play a central role in defining relationships between people and making society function. Maintaining social bonding was the process of prohibiting incest marriage that has originally established humankind passage from a state of nature to state of culture anthropologists focused on determining legitimate marriageable human culture that delimits the relations as too close for marriage as universality of proscriptions and their variability.

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

Marriage is one of the fundamental social institutions. Observance of criterions and agreements of this institution in religions, traditions and different societies is different. Genealogy, mythology, anthropology and history show that marriage and familial ties always is a systematic series. It means that some people because of inbreeding or marriage call themselves relative with others. It can be said that marriage is an interaction that causes a relation between two sexes based on mutually beneficial sexual relation and requires making a social contract which leads to legitimating of physical relations and forms the basis of starting a family.

Living together relationship is an arrangement where two people are not married but live together. They are often involved in a romantic or sexually intimate relationship on a long-term or permanent basis. People may live together for a number of reasons; they could live together in order to save money, because of the convenience of living with another, or a need to find housing. Simultaneously, lower income individuals, people with facing financial uncertainty, people those who may delay or avoid marriage but want to satisfy the sexual desire but also because of fear of financial hardship (Rhoades, et. al. 2012). Another reason is to enjoy a sexual relationship while avoiding responsibility and commitments.

As parallel with marriage, living together relationship shares many qualities, often couples who are cohabiting share a residence, personal resources exclude intimate relations with others and, in more than 10% of cohabiting couples, have children (Brown & Booth, 1996) but, living together relationship or cohabitation is a good way to test their relationships prior to marriage (Rhoades, et. al. 2009) and living together couples plans to marry before moving in together or who are engaged before cohabiting typically marry within few years of living together. Living together relationship can be an alternative to marriage in situations where marriage is not possible for financial or family reasons such as same-sex, interracial or interreligious marriages (Murrow & Lin, 2010) and sometimes called de facto marriage, is becoming more commonly known as a substitute for conventional marriage.

There are many reasons why people choose to live together without getting married. Many couples view it as a trial period before marriage. Some avoid marriage because they have gone through a messy divorce. Many people live with partners for economic reasons, especially in expensive urban areas with high-cost housing. In case of Nepal, the antisocial relationship defined by society and culture; the living together relationship needs to be recognized by law so victims can seek legal recourse in case of domestic violence or disputes related to children who may be born out of marriage and there is no such legal recourse. It is illegal, antisocial and it is against the law. That's why this paper is try to identify the various, effects, and consequences of living together relationship in Nepalese society and culture in individual level or institutional level.

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

Marriage is social relationship conceived as the formal and legal relationship between men and women and relation of subordinates the unequal, discriminatory and oppressive relation in society.

The functionalist perspective views society as interrelated structures of, such as social institutions, social relations, social phenomena and processes, that have specific functions to work together through consensus to operate properly and to reproduce society successfully (Bert, 1998). If a part of such society, system, institutions and relations if not work, the organism will find expire (Ritzer, 1996). So as to live such institutions, system or say society, there must be inter connectedness, interrelationships, interdependency to maintain the equilibrium among all elements or components (Cuff et. al. 1990). Thus, if there are behaviors that are perceived as upsetting to the balance of the social structure, the society will find a way, based on shared norms and values, to discourage or eliminate it.

Malinowski insists that the basis of all marriage is romantic love and there is nothing more important to realize with regard to the institution of marriage than that it is everywhere based on love and affection (Bert, 1998). Marriage and family relations would satisfy the reproduction need, the individual was central to Malinowski's studies; individuals have their own social identities, or sense of self and throughout the whole history of human social evolution (Craib, 1997), any significant variation in the forms by which societies organized their members for sexual and reproductive purposes.

Marriage rules over time create social structures, as marriages are primarily forged between groups and not just between the two individuals involved. Profoundly influenced by the work of Marcel Mauss on the central role of reciprocal gift giving in "primitive" societies (Mauss, 1967), Lévi-Strauss held that the transition from the animal world of "nature" to the human one of "culture" was accomplished through the medium of exchange: it was in the act of giving that the category of the self in opposition to another, or of one's own group to another group, was actually constituted. Thus, the first social categories originated not in the realm of ideas but through the exchange of gifts.

Women's fertility is necessary to the reproduction of the groups; women are the "supreme gift" with no fair return for a woman except another woman, they must have been reciprocally exchanged rather than simply given away. The simplest form of exchange in this schema involved men exchanging their sisters and this set up a distinction between those who give wives ("wife givers") and those who receive them ("wife takers"), thus creating the first kinship categories, later, more-complex forms of exchange marriage were developed (Levi-Strauss, 1963).

In general, conflict theorists tend to study areas of marriage and life that involve inequalities or discrepancies in power and authority, as they are reflective of the larger social structure. Conflict theory highlights the role of power in family life and contends that the family is often not a haven but rather an arena where power struggles can occur. This exercise of power often

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

entails the performance of family status roles. Conflict theorists may study conflicts as simple as the enforcement of rules from parent to child, or they may examine more serious issues such as domestic violence (spousal and child), sexual assault, marital rape, and incest. The modern individual family is based on the open or disguised domestic enslavement of the woman; and modern society is a mass composed solely of individual families as its molecules (Engels, 1988). Marxist conflict theory sees marriage as a result of the human relationships that develop as a result of economic structures while, functionalists perceive marriage and the family as institutions whose preservation is vital for the maintenance and reproduction of society.

The main difference between the functionalist theories and the conflict theories is that functionalist focus their explanations on the assumption that society naturally seeks to maintain its equilibrium and that control is derived from consensus regarding a specific set of values while, conflict theories base their understanding of society on the assumption that change is constant and inevitable and based on the struggle between different interests and that control is often achieved by means of coercion.

While discussing about living together relationships there are few theoretical explanations which are studying about the increase in living together relationships rely on the concept of ideational change that shifts social norms, attitudes, and values (Perelli-Harris et al. 2010). Among them the demographic transition perspective insists on the “profound shift in norms and attitudes regarding personal relationships, fertility, and the family that has led to dramatic rapid change in Europeans’ demographic behavior” (van de Kaa 1987). The rise of individualization rather than group, institutions, social organizations in the west and rest or the world emphasizes self-realization and freedom as valuable orientations for life course choices and personal relationships.

According to the Demographic Transition theory, the changes in family behaviors are driven by changes in value orientations that are culturally specific. In particular, the degree of individualization within a society explains the variation in living together relationship, pre-marital sex relationships and separation across contexts and predicts the convergence of partnership behaviors in the long run (Lesthaeghe 2010). While the demographic transition theory has been criticized, especially for predictions of unidirectional change (Perelli-Harris & Gassen, 2012), it has the merit of drawing attention to the role of cultural change and the dynamics of social norms in explaining demographic behavior.

The socio-cultural changes are mainly based on the theory or concepts based on the changes in socio-cultural stigma i.e. orientations of socio-cultural values and socio-cultural norms. The culture of society that focus on what types of values they have prevailing and which institutions and organizations that are acting for the reproduce of these value system through socialization, enculturation and assimilations of each new generation. These models contrast cultural differences at a given point in time, but do not account for cultural change (Morris et al. 2015). Cultural influences on behavior are dynamic and contingent, both in how individuals form and alter attitudes and how norms, practices, and institutions change over time.

But, there are other alternative models of culture which focus on social norms rather than values. Even though in cultural studies, norms are related to values, they are dynamically conceptualized by time and context. These cultural values and norms that are socially accepted patterns of behavior functions as mechanism to regulate the human behavior socially and individually. Social norms explain the regularities in social behavior, as well as behavioral variation across space and time (Elster 1989), and shape living together relationship, and cohabitation behavior (Settersten & Mayer 1997).

Similarly, the new discourse arises, is living together stands as the alternative to the marriage? The increase in the number of living together relationships, pre marital sex and culture of cohabitations has not devalued the concept of marriage, but counter-intuitively cohabitation has become a way to preserve and protect marriage as an ideal for long-term commitment and emotional closeness (Perelli-Harris et al. 2014). At the same time, however, the society and cultures of this world are unique in nature and culture diffuse, from one to another will get new and modified as per their context and content.

Socio-cultural norms regarding living together or pre marital sex may prescribe or proscribe a unique but definite pattern of union; for instance, prescribe direct marriage and proscribe living together. In western societies, social norms may be more specific and refer to the age at which living together, pre marital sex and cohabitation is practiced. The dynamic nature of social norms and their changing relevance over time suggest that during particular historical periods, social norms shift and behaviors become more or less regulated, emancipated, accepted, and performed. Norms are either substituted with other norms or they fade away and leave room for a plurality of alternative norms and behaviors (Bicchieri 2006).

It is obvious that females are biologically different from males in that only the female sex possesses the organs and functions of maternity. But it is not true that nature is responsible for the oppression of women; such degradation is exclusively the result of man-made institutions and laws in class-divided patriarchal society. Based on mentioned theories, at last, the main function of marriage in Nepal is starting the family, and who can have legal sexual relation with whom and after this connects two families or ethnicity or groups that have no relation with each other. This paper is mainly focus on the pre-marital sex relationships of couple, which is socially not accepted, cohabitation and impacts on socio-economic, psychological dimensions of individuals and multiple impacts on society and culture as many social problems.

3. METHODOLOGY

Since the research topic is anthropological, the method of this research is intensive and field study and the researcher considered the findings, gathering information and observing effects and phenomenon. In this research, method is adopted explorative,

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

descriptive and analytical so as to find out the facts about trends on living together, cause and effects of living together in individual level, family level and in society.

However, most of these studies are primarily the outcome of a structured process of data collection in which respondents fit their answers to predefined alternatives. While such a methodological approach is necessary for measuring the distribution and variation in living together relationship formation, as well as determinants such as socioeconomic background, it constrains the possibilities of research to predetermined categories and limits the understanding of variation in the meaning of living together relationship formation. This approach often concludes that differences across phenomenological studies on events of respondents, and case studies method helps to identify the events that had happened to them from how to establish living together relationship to separation of them in different contexts. In addition, such methodology is insufficient to provide substantive interpretations of social norms, attitudes, and meanings related to living together relationship. For this, observation, formal and informal interview were chosen as research methods to get reliable data form respondents, experts and others.

The field study was carried out in among respondents who go away from living together and those respondents were key respondents who filed the cases in Kathmandu District Court after separation most of the cases are filed under the clauses the female partner was raped by her male partner while they were in living together relationship.

This paper attempts to provide a clear picture of status of living together on the basis of empirical information gathered during the course of a short field study. The research study on which this paper is based on the exploratory cum descriptive research design, qualitative approach was followed to collect the data. Data collection techniques were ranged from key informants interview, interview schedule and case studies. Most of the required information was taken by interviewing with experts, sociologists, lawyers, psychologists, officers of Districts Court Kathmandu, member of National Women Commissions etc. as per the research title.

Nine cases were taken the samples cases from the District Court Kathmandu where the cases were filed to establish justices for the women who were victimized in living together randomly from the case and data were collected and analyzed. All respondents were given nick name or pseudo name so as to maintain the secrecy and nobody will not know the person but know the cases which are happened in society.

Table: 1. Distributions of Sample Respondents with age and from birth place

S.N.	Name of the Respondent	Age	Birth Place
1	Ananta Rai	24	Dhankuta
2	Shova Sharma	25	Butwal
3	Bandana Tamang	25	Nuwakot
4	Armila Chitrakar	28	Birjung
5	Pushpa Poudel	23	Pokhara
6	Pramila K.C.	26	Taplejung
7	Pabitra Limbu	17	Panchthar
8	Ritu Acharya	23	Chitwan
9	Sunita Bam	26	Kailali

(Source; Field Survey, 2019)

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

What do girls think of guys who want to have a live-in relationship and not get married?

Since many Nepali couples staying in such relationship hesitate to come out in open, the exact number of couples living in such relation is unknown. However, the live-in relationship, a well-accepted norm in the western societies, is increasingly being witnessed in the cities of Nepal. It is a fact that people opt for this relationship to minimize the living cost and to enjoy sexual freedom, without having to bear legal and financial impediments caused by legal marriages, after which breaking up with partners would have been quite hard.

The main objective of these cases are to crystallize the situation of living together relationships in Kathmandu using cases, their stories and their experiences and anthropological observation on it so as to explore the real situations, problems faced by couples, their behaviors, its socio-cultural consequences and its impacts on society and culture. Here some characters are presented and it is the fact and the information and data presented here is real but considering ethical factors I used the Pseudo name of the characters.

Case- 1

Ananta came to Kathmandu from Dhankuta to attend college for masters' level in Tribhuvan University few years ago. Rupak met Ananta and she began dating her classmate Rupak. They convinced with each other to stay living together and they promised to

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

marry after completion of masters' degree and placement of their respective jobs. It was the good and convenient option to live Ananta with the man she loved, as well as the best way to cut down on living expenses and saving time in Kathmandu.

But Rupak, started becoming very possessive on eating, mobility, dressing, doing and everything without the permission of Rupak to Ananta, and he began keeping tabs on her accounts on social networking sites. "He won't even let me leave, threatening to tell my parents about our past and ruining my future," says Ananta, who is still living with Rupak because they did not complete education and their job placement is still dream.

The growing trend of living together relationships among young people in Kathmandu usually migrated from different districts, has brought with it a whole set of problems in a society that is still culturally conservative. It is usually women like Ananta who suffer sexually, socially and economically, when relationships break.

Case- 2

Shova is a graphics designer; works in a media house. She met Kamal reporter of the same media but different job. She was victimized domestically by his beloved boyfriend Kamal for almost two years. He drank alcohol, gave torched, beat her and also took money from her. After some times, Shova found out about his other affairs, she was sad, but she still asked him to marry her but after that the physical assaults got more severe and she decided to leave him despite his threats. She resigned the job in that media house and has started the new one job and she couldn't complain to anyone since her living together relationships are not legally recognized.

Here, women are victimized from such relationships and they take shelter at women's organizations in some cases and try to start a new life. In such cases, there are no any legal provisions in support of victims and living together relationship needs to be recognized by law so victims can seek legal recourse in case of domestic violence or disputes related to children who may be born out of marriage. According to, Menuka Thapa, chairperson of Raksha Nepal; works with trafficked women and shelters women from broken living together relationships, that it is very important that the legal issues related such relations should be addressed by government very soon. She further talked about this issue with reference of guidelines provided by India's Supreme Court about living together relationship last year while adjudicating dispute between living together relationships of couples where the woman had sought maintenance from the man after the relationship ended. Shared household expenses and pooling of resources are some of the guidelines the Court framed within the expression 'relationship in the nature of marriage' for protection of women under Domestic Violence Act. In Nepal, there is no such legal recourse.

Case- 3

Dhan Bahadur is a 53-year old who lives permanently in Pokhara under the condition of anonymity, shared that he and his partner were in cohabitation for the past 15 years and were in a blissful relationship. He was relationship with a lady of 25 years named Bandana. They met in Kathmandu 3 years before, when Dhan Bahadur, came Kathmandu in the course of his business. He has his wife and sons in Pokhara but he lives living together with Bandana in Kathmandu.

They were living in this manner because they didn't want to be in a legally binding relationship. For Dhan Bahadur the relationship is for sexual pleasure and for Bandana for financial management to survive in Kathmandu without any physical work. Like, Dhan Bahadur and Bandana, many couples of different age group, different caste ethnicity, different economic status and different religions of different places in major cities are living together without socio-legally getting married. But not all are fortunate enough to give continuity to their relationship and lead a happy life. Couples made arrangements for living together on a mutual consent. But most often than not, the male partners desire to escape from the relation once his sole interest get addressed, or after his partner gives birth.

Recently, the National Women Commission (NWC), a government agency responsible to deal with violence against woman, dealt with a bluest story of a woman, who was unable to cope up with breakup from the live-in relationship.

Case -4

Armila a teacher of botany from Birgunj fell in love with Dipesh, one of her colleagues in campus in Kathmandu. When they got close and decided that they live together without arrange any legal and social procedures of getting married in behaves of their treasured and ideal love. After some time they spent together they were realized that their ideal love won't go long and Dipesh went to Korea leaving his girlfriend Armila following the sudden breakup of their informal relationship. It was she who bore the brunt of accusation for her condition and was left without any physical, social and emotional support from here family and friends. This led her to severe depression that drove her towards attempted suicide. She reached National Women Commission (NWC) thinking that she could get justice, but in the absence of a law, her complaint ended up in reconciliation.

The growing trend of living together relationship has continuously been drawing severe criticism, because in Nepal relationship between a man and a woman is considered valid only when both partners start their conjugal life by getting married as per the socio-cultural traditions or following the customs and existing marriage laws and social mores.

Case- 5

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

Pushpa had come to Kathmandu from Pokhara for her higher studies in Microbiology and she met Madan and started falling love with her classmate Madan. It was not so easy to marry when fall in love and they mutually decided to live together as husband and wife in the same apartment. Life was rocking for 8 years by when the couple had a son and a daughter. Sometimes, such a rash decision is enough to make victims mostly female partner cry in their whole life'. That is the deeper understanding of life by thirty years old Pushpa, who realized that life is not always as beautiful as in the movies when her own love of 10 years ultimately refused to marry her in spite of having two kids.

Madan went Australia in search of a job. He used to call and visit Pushpa and kids from time to time in Nepal. However, things began to sour soon, as Pushpa could gradually feel that he had changed and he has been living together in Australia with a girlfriend. Gradually, he is ignoring Pushpa and started mistreating her and like thousands of other women in Nepal she became a victim of domestic violence. But she had no shoulder to lean on and cry as she was staying with a man who was not her husband. In 2018, helpless Pushpa finally knocked at the court doors. She filed a case at the Kathmandu District Court against Madan, seeking to establish their marital relationship and demanding birth registration of her children under the Children's Act 1992. Although the court tried to reconcile their issue but Madan denied the accusations and gave a silly reason that he could not marry her as he has no time.

Case- 6

In Kathmandu, Living together relationships in Nepal are rising day by day. Mostly people from low family backgrounds, who come from the rural areas for seeking opportunities in different fields. Lacks of development of physical facilities, lack of opportunities including various reasons makes people migrate towards Kathmandu. Similarly, for the seeking of higher studies, are found living together with their partners which also cuts down their living expenses.

Pramila has been living together with her partner who is heavy drinker who keeps beating and torturing her for money as he doesn't have a job for the past three years. She holds a job of Clark in private office and earns her mere subsistence, but she can't spend a penny on herself. Pramila lamented and she has expressed her sorrow as she was trapped in his so-called love which actually never existed and now she I has been a commodity to satisfy his sexual and financial needs, she cries with eyes full of tears, she says she even caught him with other women in the past but still agreed to stay after his apologies hoping that he will change but he didn't. She wanted to go back to her family but they discarded her blaming her for spoiling their 'social standing'. "My life has become like hell and people look down upon me for my relationship."

It is found from the field study that young girls, who choose to live with their boyfriends, lack the legal protections and rights of married women in Nepal. Although living together is not socially accepted, more urban couples are choosing to do so to minimize living costs and enjoy sexual freedom.

Case- 7

Pabitra came to Kathmandu in search of work 10 years ago when she was 17 years old after, she had just failed her exam. Her parents barely made a living farming a small plot and running a liquor shop in their house in Panchthar district, a rural area in eastern Nepal. While working in a guesthouse in Kathmandu, Pabitra met a young man who suggested they move in together to minimize their living costs; they did after one year of their first meet. Because of the social stigma of living with a man before marriage, she kept her living arrangement secret and gradually cut ties with her family.

Despite being estranged from family, she was happy in the relationship, she says. For the first few months of living with him, she felt like she found unlimited physical and sexual pleasure and she was very excited and happy at that moment. But her happiness did not last long, within one year of living together she got pregnant and she hoped her boyfriend would marry her, but he pressured her to have an abortion. After two years, she got pregnant again. This time, Pabitra decided to have the baby and her partner supported the family for more than two years her boyfriend left her for work and never returned. Now Pabitra is one of many young women in Nepal who have entered living together relationships in the failed hope that they will lead to marriage, now Pabitra .makes her living washing dishes for families in Kathmandu. Pabitra longs to hear from her former boyfriend, the father of her child, even a year after he left her.

Case- 8

Rohan is a 25 years old a final year University student ding thesis in management stream, has been in a living together relationship since he was the first year student in Tribhuvan University. Living together fulfills his sexual needs and helps him reduce his living expenses. He is going to marry once he is secured financially, they will not betray each other. His girlfriend, Ritu is 23 years old and also studying in same stream confirms that they plan to get married someday. They feel for them living together is fruitful for their studies, their career, to reduce the financial expenses and for their future. In the meantime, Ritu keeps the arrangement a secret, and she said, if he changes his mind, she will not be able to show her face to society and if people find out about my relationship, no one will get married to her, she became serious thinking about her future. According to Rohan, several of their friends are in similar relationships and they all hide their living arrangements from their parents.

Case- 9

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

Sunita is a 26 year old lady living in Kathmandu and she is medical person as a doctor. She prefers a living together relationship compared to a marriage mainly because she feels it makes the couple involved love each other for their respective qualities and not because they are bound to law to stay put with each other. According to Sunita, most of the society members of my society, my friends and my family members think living together relationship is blatantly stupid and marriage is a must as it ensures that the couple wouldn't leave each other due to trivial issues. And people who think this way try to stay away from living together relationship and prefer a secure married life in fear of being alone once one of the partner gets over his/her feelings for the other. Most of these girls would prefer a guy who is willing to get married and later divorce if things don't go well. Since divorces are pretty messy (mostly), most people feel their spouses would put up with them for the rest of their lives. Also, earlier there weren't laws to protect the partner and kids borne out of a live-in relationship. However, as of late in India, laws have come up that makes sure the above-mentioned people are taken care of even if one of the partners calls it a day.

As long as there is love, marriage, living together, long distance, short-distance etc would work if the people involved are committed enough. If one of the partners wants to leave the other he or she can do it even in marriage!

One of the Sex psychologists Karuna Kuwar shared her knowledge in curiosity about why living together is growing in our society. She shared her idea that Nepalese society is so conservative in sexual life and the customs and traditions make them enforce not to be open, liberal and share in sex. The main purpose of the living together for young couple is for sexual pleasure first and then for their love. Every night will end with the two of them naked, sticky, and sweaty. "When they live apart, they make time for sex-any minute they can get their hands on each other, they do," says Karuna Kunwar a sex psychologist "But when they're around one another all the time, the frequency of sexual activity may taper off".

Karuna Kuwar, suggests in such cases that if you continuously and constantly making time for intimacy but changing your expectations. Realize that you can be intimate without having intercourse then it turns your relations more trustworthy, understandable and meaningful. This means you'll need to accept the transition from hardware to software: less bonking, more spooning. Similarly, in an every moment if couple always talks about equality in work and responsibility then quarrel starts, the division of domestic chores is one of the first things a cohabiting couple needs to discuss "If one of you works more hours a week and the other less, there's nothing wrong with the less busy person taking on more of the housework."

Anita Shrestha working as advocate Forum for Women, Law and Development, a nongovernmental organization working for women's rights in Nepal, explains the Nepalese law does not recognize de facto partnerships; The Domestic Violence (Crime and Punishment) Act of 2009 protects only women who are legally married. Likewise, new constitution 2015 A.D. grants only in case of rape and sexual violence while women the right to claim a deceased partner's property, applies only to married women. But new constitutions somehow protect women's violence and crime related relationships as sexual abuse, rape and other violence against women. Similarly, Domestic violence is rising in de facto partnerships, says Birendra K.C., legal officer at the National Women Commission, a government agency established to pursue gender justice. In most cases, the person who contacts the commission simply inquires about legal provisions and in the absence of legal protections other than those that apply to assault victims generally, they are unlikely to see their abusers brought to justice.

Usually, women in living together relationships complain about sexual exploitation, domestic violence, abandonment after childbirth, and multiple abortions, but the lack of proper law has denied them justice because of improper law provisions about living together relationships. According to the gazette officer of district court of Kathmandu, sometimes women themselves are responsible for their situations, as out of empathy, they keep doing everything that their partners demand even after knowing their ill intents. Some women are so vulnerable and fragile that they cannot imagine their life beyond their partners and keep staying in the abusive relationships. Such situations are the responsible for exploitation of women in the name of love established by the living together relationship. There are many cases presented here, who are being physically, mentally and sexually exploited by their partners. One of the official person under secretary at the National Women Commission mentioned that, pre-marital sex is a crime in our society and one who does it will have to live like a criminal, hidden, and according to her, very few women dare to come out of their shells and demand action against their partners but most keep suffering silently due to the social stigma.

The relationship of living together of couple once break may cause the serious problems on individuals who are in such relations and their family, but it brings more severe and chronic problem when they have children A woman living in such relationship or a child born out of such relationship is always vulnerable because the relationship is illegitimate in the country, said one of the officer who has been involved in managing such cases from National Women Commissions. According to her, there has been gross misuse of such relationship by the male partners because in this relationship they don't have any legal obligations and responsibilities to serve.

While asking to office of registration section officer of District Court Kathmandu about the number of cases filed 2019, he said there is no exact number, but many cases are registered at District Court (DC) Kathmandu by women seeking recognition of such the relationship, said nodal officer at DC. But all these complaints reported to the police and the commission end up in reconciliation. In a lack of laws, the cases are dealt under the Domestic and Women Violence Act, said Khadka. There is no law mentioning the rights and commitments of partners in such relationship and for the status of children born to such couples.

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

In such case new constitutional provision is far in the favor of women, however it has a provision that if a woman becomes pregnant and gives birth as a result of a physical relationship prior to marriage, then their relation will automatically get legal marital status. According to advocates and lawyer, it is hard to provide justice to the victimized women because they have no evidence that they were living together, such as witnesses and other documents to prove their relationship. In most cases of the living together relation, men do not plan to marry their female partners, and in most cases, they are clever enough to remove all the evidences, lawyer and advocates said. It is found from the lawyers and advocates that found when they need legal and psycho-social counseling, we have found that many women in living together relationship complain about sexual exploitation, domestic violence, multiple abortions mostly more than 3 times and abandonment after childbirth. If the female partner refuses to have sex when they demanded they would further victimize these women, as a result, they end up with depression very often. Many have claimed that they have suffered repeatedly from suicidal thoughts and some have even attempted to kill themselves.

I have asked one of the sociologist who did Ph.D. in subject entitled "changing patterns of marriage in Nepal," argued that the rapid urbanization has been driving rural youths to the cities. The high living cost have led many young couples to live together prior to marriage by hiding their relationship with family and society, and Women are choosing such relationship for financial and social security, while men opting it for sexual gratification and to ease their daily life. It is found that most of men who enter in such relation have no intention of marrying their partners because many of them were already married and the majority of couples who entered in such relation were from the indigenous communities. Many such couples are staying together calming that they were close family members like brother-sister, cousins and uncle-niece and sometime it is easier to end relationships for partners than like in marriage they don't have to go through long legal procedures to end their relationship.

The views from expert of culture found that institution of marriage is socially and ritually accepted union that institutes duties, responsibilities, rights and legal obligations to both men and women while people choose to be in living together relation to exempts themselves from such legal and cultural obligations of marriage, however, in a conventional society like ours, where the institution of marriage is considered to be sacred, living together relationship has been emerging as a challenge.

The situation in the western society and in ours is completely different. They have broader understanding of the idea and have the rights to follow legal treatment; however, it is not practical in case of Nepal. It is found from the concern authority of state and law, such practices should not be promoted, but the fact is that the concept is already exists and it cannot be controlled. So it's a high time to manage the issue legally and changing mindset of the society is equally important.

One of the officers of the National Forensic Science Laboratory has focused the rise in living together relationships are also an imitation of the western world. He states that he has witnessed cases of living together relationships where the male partners abandon the child giving various reasons to escape. As a result women come for DNA testing of their child to prove their partners that it's their child.

5. ANTHROPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Marriage is not "just a piece of paper." Love and commitment can exist between people, whatever their legal obligations to each other are, but marriage provides a framework to sustain that relationship and to (at least in theory) ensure that both partners and their children are protected when things aren't going well. It's very romantic to declare that love will find a way, but when there are unexpected conditions or situations arises and suddenly when one of a partner dies or go away, vanished unexpectedly at early or middle age and leaves you with children, what will be the situations? That's why marriage is the only one option to satisfy biological needs and secure social security.

It depends on the relationship, everyone is different. However most people, women especially seem to like to work towards having a serious, committed, exclusive relationship with another person, particularly as they get older and know what they want in life, and if they do find that person. Many people are afraid of the idea of marriage, whether or not they have experienced it and everyone has their own definition of marriage. Eventually most people do want a serious, committed, exclusive relationship with the right person. Every one can call it anything to anyone whom he or she wants, but it's very difficult to spend years and get very close and intimate with a person knowing that they could call it quits and leave at anytime. So even long term relationships which aren't marriages generally have a lot of permanent elements to them; people usually live in the same house, often have both names on property, bills, etc. So it's not so easy to leave these long term relationships even if there is no marriage.

Some women don't ever want to marry or never want to again or don't see the point and some woman really want to be marriage or at least some day. The thing is that few smart women are going to commit themselves to spending yrs with a man without some kind of serious, committed, exclusive relationship, even if you don't call it marriage. After all she is committing to one man, he should do the same and she is committing for usually an unknown length of time ('forever'), so he should as well. Finally she is probably spending her best reproductive years with this man, whether or not she has children. So they don't care what you call it, most smart woman aren't going to spend years living with a man, unless there is some implied serious, committed, exclusive relationship. Again they may never marry, but frequently it's not an easier to get out of these; with joint property, shared bills, being possibly "common law married", with possible children and other responsibilities from sharing a life together for a long time.

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

Marriage is important for all - it shows commitment and conviction to be there through thick and thin. One should make own's intentions known from the start as he or she will feel deceived afterwards. According to the social structure and the construction of the Nepalese society, based on this study I am suggesting that men are more likely than women to be not "completely committed" to their partners cohabiting young adults have significantly lower levels of commitment than their married peers. This aversion to commitment is particularly prevalent among young men who live with their partners. Men and women have very different ideas about what living together means. Women typically see it as an almost inevitable step toward marriage, while men see it as a no-obligation "test drive."

Living together results in regular, no-strings sex for a man, thus removing the sexual motivation that is part of a marriage proposal. And don't worry about his proposing just to bed you -- there are too many sexually available women out there for a man to propose marriage just for sexual release. Similarly, it is found that, living together means that a man doesn't have to pursue his girlfriend any longer. And if something is too easily acquired, it just doesn't hold the same value as something that is more challenging to get. It has found that male who are apathetic about their partner with whom they are either co-habiting or who lived together before "sliding" into marriage. During the field work, most of the male respondent or living partner expressed their opinion as "we're not married so it doesn't really matter," or "I just married her because she wouldn't shut up about it," or "I only proposed because everyone expected me to." It was found that the lack of enthusiasm and passion toward their partner is as depressing as it is discouraging in male rather than in female partner.

Why male partner of living together were found less committed? Because it removes much of a male's motivation to make the formal commitment of marriage within a reasonable time, living together often causes female to feel frustrated and get stuck in a cycle of hope and disappointment. Usually, female wants to marriage as soon as possible and she hopes for a marriage commitments like ring or court marriage to legalize the relations mostly, to be disappointed. In many festivals like Dashain, Tihar, Teej etc. likewise, her birthday comes and she hopes for a ring, only to be disappointed. So many social pressures arises to accept female as formal and legal wife but he always ignore then, this cycle often leads to ultimatums -- Marry me or it's over! -- which, in turn, can lead to a reluctant and passionless groom or, just as bad, a female who tries to fool herself into believing that "marriage is just a piece of paper" so that she doesn't have to break up with a male who calls her bluff.

In a way I like to explore the idea about why couples who live together are less likely to get married. In response to it, it is found that both couples do not want to marry after sometimes and they do not have any motivation to marry. Co-habiting couples also tend to have a more lax attitude toward commitment and don't work as hard to stay together. When their relationship goes through a rough spot -- as all relationships do -- it is all too easy to just walk away. The legal and public commitment of marriage motivates couples to work through conflict, strengthen the relationship and stay together.

From the field work, it is found that, living together is not a reliable way to predict long-term compatibility or marital success. In fact, couples who live together before marriage separate at higher rates. Serious dating allows two people to get to know each other as loving friends and determine whether they have a reasonable chance of being a faithful, respectful and cooperative couple with shared values and vision. Spending time at a boyfriend or girlfriend's house will reveal many personal habits and quirks, while a practical pre-marital class that teaches communication, interpersonal and life skills can give couples the tools they need to help avoid common problems and resolve those conflicts that will invariably arise.

In this research, the terms "push" factors refer to lacks of unemployment, natural disaster, lack of physical development, lack of opportunities etc. are the main factor which help to promote migration from rural area to urban especially in Kathmandu. Rural to urban migration is one of the key problems facing developing countries like ours. The push factors are motivators that prod people out of the rural areas, while pull factors are those ideals in the urban areas that attract people to them. Well, relationships too are a form of migration, and I believe these factors apply here.

Rapid urbanization, which draws rural youths into the cities, and the high cost of urban living have led more young couples to live together before – or instead of – marrying. Women in these relationships have become vulnerable to violence and abuse. The men often abandon these women, sometimes leaving them with children.

Due to the lack of economic opportunities in the rural areas to motivate youth towards the urban and urban simultaneously attracts the youth from rural. Busy life, individual freedom, however people facing loneliness, high disparity in income level, huge gap between income and expenditure, heavy work load, heavy rent, expensive life, increasing cost of basic utilities, as well as a high cost of living, some unmarried young couples choose to live together.

The number of living together has gradually been increasing over the past decade in Kathmandu, but the Hindu faith and Nepalese moral standards prohibit sex before marriage, so couples who live together are compelled to hide their living arrangements, that's why the cases and issues related to it is underground and it comes up in surface when the crime, victimizations, exploitations and betray associated with it happens.

6. CONCLUSION

It is found from the analysis of data from field work that social norms are to understanding how cultures operate and how social change occurs and prominent explanations of family change. Theories that stress the importance of ideational change and

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

increasing individualization imply that different contexts have different social norms and that these norms change differentially over time. People generally think that living together is ideal for young adults, while marriage is for later in the life course. Social prestige and tradition were most important for maintaining the prominence of marriage and living together is antisocial in Nepalese society not necessarily Hindu dogma. Although here we emphasize the role of culture and context, individuals are not always aware of macro-level influences on their own lives: thus it is the researchers' task to extract the normative discourses that emerge during the field studies. Living together relationships and marriage are not either-or statuses, but can change, both within a relationship and across the life course and according to the influence of other life domains. But it is found that people who are in living together relationships they are in same relations, positions, status and even same rights and responsibilities only lacks the societal acceptance. Living together relationship is still illegal, antisocial relations and it brings many legal and social problems in individual level, family level and social level.

Why such illegal and antisocial relationships are in practiced? It is found that young adults wants to establish living together relationships because employment options for women are limited, their alternatives to stay single without job and any earning for their securing future are likely to involve securing support from another person to ensure their livelihood while migrated to Kathmandu from rural settings. One possibility is that a both male and female may find romantic partner in their work place, college, or by any means in anywhere and they may stay together after their affairs, love and trusts. Another possibility is that a when male and female became close, they were willing to stay together for their sex desire, for saving economic resources, and for saving their time. A third possibility is that male and female may stay together for their professional career i.e. university students of same subject migrated from different parts of country. Despite this businessman, politicians, bureaucrats, etc keep partner for their pleasure, but the age gap between them is quite measurable.

It is found from the study that due to various reasons young adults are in living together relations as alternate to marriage relations for saving financial resources, satisfying sex desire and for sexual pleasure, for personal freedom and for independence. Using sample case studies of case filed 9 couples in Kathmandu District Court of different nature; this paper investigates the effects and consequences of living together relationship in individual life, familial life and in social life. Results reveal that (a) if there is harmonized relations among partners, life will be easy to satisfy their basic biological needs and too easy for further progress. (b) If both live-in couples are of same status, same profession, same educational background and economic background and commitment for future marriage they may have satisfactory life and it may less harm by living together. (c) Most of the misunderstanding between living together arises when they live-in together for one and two years. Most of the living together relationships will not continue for their married life. If there is no children, partner may separate easily with minimum conflicts while if they have child or children they male partner usually went away without knowing to his partner. Overall, these findings suggest that both for betterment marriage relationship is far better than living together relationships that were found during this study.

7. REFERENCES

- 1) Hiekel, N. and Castro-Martín, T.(2014), Grasping the diversity of cohabitation: Fertility intentions among cohabiters across Europe, *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76(3): 489–505.
- 2) Perelli-Harris, B. & Gassen, N.S. (2012), How Similar are Cohabitation and Marriage? Legal Approaches to Cohabitation across Western Europe, *Population and Development Review* 38(3): 435–467.
- 3) Sánchez Gassen, N. and Perelli-Harris, B. (2015), the increase in cohabitation and the role of marital status in family policies: A comparison of 12 European countries, *Journal of European Social Policy*.
- 4) Rhoades, G.K., Stanley, S.M., Markman, H.J. (2012), a longitudinal investigation of commitment dynamics in cohabiting relationships, *Journal of Family Issues*, 33(3): 369–390.
- 5) Brown, S.L. & Booth, A. (1996), Cohabitation versus marriage: A comparison of relationship quality, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 58 (3): 668–678. .
- 6) Rhoades, G.K., Stanley, S.M., & Markman, H.J. (2009), Couples' reasons for cohabitation: Associations with individual well being and relationship quality, *Journal of Family Issues*, 30, 233-258
- 7) Murrow, C. & Lin S. (2010), The Influence of Cohabitation Purposes on Relationship Quality: An Examination in Dimensions, *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 38: 397–412.
- 8) Bert, P. (1998), *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century*, Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, U.K.
- 9) Craib I. (1997), *Classical Social Theory*, London: Oxford University Press.
- 10) Cuff E.C., Sharrock W.W., Francis D.W. (1990). *Perspectives in Sociology*, Third Edition, Unwin Hyman Ltd. London.
- 11) Ritzer, G. (1996), *Modern Sociological Theory*, Fourth Edition, McGraw Hill Inc.,
- 12) Mauss, M. (1967) *the Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange In Archaic Societies*, New York: Norton.
- 13) Engels, F. (1988), *Origin and Evolution of the Family*, *Population and Development Review*, 14(4), 705-729.
- 14) Levi-Strauss, C. (1963), *the Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Beacon Press: Boston.

Living Together Relationships; Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu

- 15) Perelli-Harris, B., Sigle-Rushton, W., Lappegard, T., Keizer, R., Kreyenfeld, M., Berghammer, C. (2010) the educational gradient of childbearing within cohabitation in Europe, *Population and Development Review*. 36(4). [doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457).
- 16) Van de Kaa, D.J. (1987) Europe's second demographic transition, *Population bulletin* 42: 1–59.
- 17) Lesthaeghe, R. (2010), the Unfolding Story of the Second Demographic Transition, *Population and Development Review* 36(2): 211–251.
- 18) Perelli-Harris, B. & Gassen, N.S. (2012), How Similar are Cohabitation and Marriage? Legal Approaches to Cohabitation across Western Europe, *Population and Development Review* 38(3): 435–467.
- 19) Morris, M.W., Hong, Y., Chiud, C., and Liu, Z. (2015), Normology: Integrating insights about social norms to understand cultural dynamics, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 129, 1–13.
- 20) Elster, J. (1989), *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 21) Settersten, Jr., R.A. and Mayer, K.U. (1997), the measurement of age, agestructuring, and the life course, *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 233–261. .
- 22) Perelli-Harris, B., Mynarska, M., Berrington, A., Berghammer, C., Evans, A., Isupova, O., Keizer, R., Klärner, A., Lappegård, T., and Vignoli, D. (2014), towards a new understanding of cohabitation: Insights from focus group research across Europe and Australia. *Demographic Research* 31(34): 1043–1078...
- 23) Bicchieri, C. (2006). *The Grammar of Society: the Nature and Dynamics of Social Norms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.