# State Building, Social Movement and Inclusive Citizenship in Nepal

Prof. Masayuki Tanigawa[1] Dev Raj Dahal[2]

## Introduction

The Nepalese citizens are now engaged in national envisioning processes for a new constitution, structural transformation of state power and durable peace based on the standards of human rights. The structural reforms seek to end the existing discrimination through the construction of a modern, constitutional state and resonate with aspirations of citizens for responsible governance. This is the basis of active, inclusive and law-abiding citizenship. The current political establishment of Nepal has, therefore, set an agenda of progressively restructuring Nepali state to address historically existing class, ethnic, regional and gender problems through economic, social and cultural transformation. The strategic means of this transformation, inter alia, are: abolition of feudalism, institutionalization of secularism, federalism and republican regime and giving more social rights to citizens through structural reforms. Ironically, the Weberian state's "legitimate monopoly of violence" has now been contested by domestic elites of political parties who want to destroy this state, militant youth wings of several political parties and non-state armed actors thereby disabling the state to perform core governance functions. The ideological, cultural and institutional resources to support the Nepali state are waning at a time when transnational forces are equally contesting its geopolitical writ for strategic and ideological reasons. Even leading exponents of social movements of Nepal are demanding the distribution of public goods from the state to organized groups rather than "creation of institutional public goods that benefit both elites and masses" (Snyder, 2010:288). Nepal is now also deprived of the three critical components of state consolidation defined by Charles Tilly, namely, "coercion, capital and charisma" used historically by state-builders (Call, 2009: 13). Lack of disposition of political will caught the leadership in perennial deadlock straining many national initiatives.

The state fragility in Nepal is mainly attributed to a lack of elite consensus for domestic peace, growth of competitive violence, insufficient tax base to finance self-governing state (tax contributes only 12 percent to Gross Domestic Product), increasing primacy of subsidiary identities over the national identity, loss of policy sovereignty, inability of politics to serve public interest and geopolitical struggle reducing national choice and self-determination. The capacity of state to secure national security and rule of law is weak as militarized political parties and groups are exerting pressure for "democratization" of Nepal Army while maintaining impunity for them. This is helping the perpetuation of state of nature and deterioration of human rights condition. The unresolved constitutional issues[3] have magnified incentives for armed groups to prevent the state's outreach in society and create authority and legitimacy to cohere diverse society. Law enforcement and service delivery agencies are largely partisan and a climate of perpetual fear between rival parties of each other's motive has returned social inertia, political immobility, the mood of nervous economic uncertainty and food shortages. This is driving Nepalese youth to unknown directions.

The Constituent Assembly (CA) election on April 10, 2008 has institutionalized the identity representation of five groups of people, allowed their institutional politics based on cultural segmentation and made negotiated compromise among various groups to develop

---

[1] Prof. Tanigawa teaches political science at Nagasaki University, Japan

[2] Dahal is Head of Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Nepal Office

[3] These issues are: nature and number of federalism, self-determination, prior use rights on land, water and forest, form of governance, judicial autonomy, election system, economy, integration of Maoist combatants, number of national commissions, etc.

proportional access of citizens to state resources to avoid vicious cycle of conflicts. Culture matters for politics of development as well as development of personal, social and national identity. Today, however, cultural boundaries are increasingly becoming fluid and their rules are broken every time. "People make changes in their lives—whether moving from one city to another across the globe, marrying someone form a different background, or just incorporating the literature or even the cuisine from an "other" tradition into their own repertoire" (Show, 2000:56). Pressure for consociational polity, rooted in the theory of group identity, is becoming stronger while individual identity couched in human rights and national identity based on citizenship are becoming weaker. It is challenging both participatory democracy where popular sovereignty is institutionalized in citizenship rights (Axtmann, 2003:3) and representative system as social groups of Nepal are demanding social representation not on the basis of ideology and party but on the basis of electoral strength of social classes. Critics of consociationalism, therefore, argue that "group autonomy can deepen uncompromising attitudes which in turn will make power-sharing arrangements unstable and short-lived" (Hueglin, 2003:69). This is already gripping Nepali politics as mainstream political parties treat negotiation more as competition for power than collaboration to achieve national goals. This article explains about the aspiration of Nepalese for statehood, democratic impulse of social movements, promise of order, building robust public institutions, democratic leadership, citizenship competence and conclusion.

**Aspiration for Statehood**
A modern state holds the potential to contain violence in society and introduce civilization process. Culture is the basic nutrients of civilization as it generates overlapping norms and sociability and controls the expression of selfish human instinct rooted in social Darwinism. If the rights to equality is missing then multiculturalism may lead to the acceptance of cultures with gender, caste and class divisions that deny disadvantage women, low caste groups and workers access to social mobility. In Nepal, demand for inclusive democracy is contesting the boundaries of representation through political parties as various organized groups increasingly demand social representation in political power and economic transformation for internal peace (Bhatta, 2008: 113). They are building solidarity across party lines for collective action. Based on shared tradition and historical experience the state establishes basic rights of its citizens including the rights of minorities to maintain their cultural, linguistic and religious distinctiveness and constitutional governance. Identity politics, the politics of difference, has to be coterminous with secular polity and should not deviate from parties and the state as they are supposed to equality of rights and serve larger public action. "The state is constituted, both in the guise of an apparatuses and in the guise of an agent, by the set of legislative, executive and judicial power rights which put some individuals, the agent of the state, in position of authority over others" (Hamlin and Pettit, 1991:3).

The state's legitimate monopoly on force, taxation and loyalty of people is essential for its legitimacy in the eyes of public, security of its territory, autonomy from the dominant interest groups of society and sovereign in foreign relations. "State and nation have fused into the nation-state since the revolutions of the late eighteenth century" (Habermas, 2001:109) when democracy became its national ideology, nationalism and provided a basis for collective self-identification of citizens. In this sense, modern nation-states are the "product of four closely interconnected processes of institutional closure: a political one (democracy tied to national self-determination), a legal one (citizenship tied to nationality), a military one (universal conscription tied to national citizenship) and a social one (the institutions of the welfare state linked to the control of immigration of foreigners)" (Wimmer, 2002:9).

Nation building, that is, "creating a political community and promoting citizens transfer of loyalty from smaller groups, like tribes and local communities, to the larger political system" (Martinussen, 1997:171) is a long-term process of converting one's faith of personal identity into collective faith of tolerance in shared nationality and adequate representation of minority cultures

in national life. It contributes to the formation of shared national character. The state is also treated as order-creating institutions, rules and norms. But, in Nepal, due to thinning of state-bearing institutions, enforcement of rules and norms has become hard and, as a consequence, citizens increasingly feel the alienation of state from society and resorting to post-modern inclination based on post-modern citizenship. Maintaining autonomy of the state from the dominant interest group of society and building its capacity are two crucial issues to make it an impersonal institution.

## Historical development of Society

| Pre-Modern | Modern | Post-modern |
|---|---|---|
| *feudalism<br>*no sovereignty<br>*feudalistic plurality of political power (ex. kingdom of lords)<br>*feudalistic local self-rule, or communal self-rule<br>*no nation-state, no state-nation<br>*people belong to each communities; never free from their own castes, religions, ethnicities, etc.<br>*group (communal) rights | *sovereign state<br>*legitimate monopoly of violence by a sovereign state<br>* rule by law (not rule of law)<br>*rational bureaucracy<br>*free, equal and independent individuals<br>*modern citizens can be free from culture, ethnicity, religion, etc.<br>*human rights or natural rights of individuals<br>*modern citizenship | *"Empire"(A. Negri)<br>*plurality of power (ex.EU)<br>*power-sharing, inclusion<br>*no nation-state, no state-nation<br>*globalism, regionalism, localism<br>*group rights of castes, ethnicities, religions, languages, etc.<br>*people cannot be free from their own attributes<br>*post-modern citizenship. plurality of citizenship; multiple-citizenship (ex. EU) |

North, Wallis and Weingast formulate three kind of states: "natural state builds on the personal relationships of the foraging order and is able to expand beyond the scale of simpler societies," "limited access orders provide a solution to violence by embedding powerful members of society in a coalition of military, political, religious and economic elites," and rule-governed "open access order allows individuals to pursue their own interests through organizations" (2009:254-5). Nepal is now facing a tension between its traditional political order based on patronage to a modern state that ensures impersonal rights to citizens, protects property and proscribes the use of violence so as to set up open access order. "The nation-state finds itself challenged from within by the explosive potential of multiculturalism and without by the pressure of globalization, the question arises of whether there exists a functional equivalent for the fusion of the nation of citizens with the ethnic nation" (Habermas, 2001: 117). The ongoing crisis of political authority in Nepal has created an opportune time for the suppressed voices to rise and appropriate their own spaces in the national arena (Shrestha and Dahal, 2008: 1809) for discourse and articulation.

State-building in Nepal is mainly associated with enabling public institutions to integrate diverse society through various incentives and opportunities for citizens' participation in the institutional resources of the state and muster their loyalty in governance. Multicultural societies of Nepal require not just federalization of territory but also democratization of its political culture guaranteeing the equality for individual citizens within various sub-cultures. Political process in multicultural societies is "characterized by negotiated consensus and compromise" (Hugelin, 2003:63). The mixed mosaic of ethnicities, castes, languages and tribes as well as center-periphery divides in Nepal has complicated the process of demarking federal states. The government at the center still needs the capacity to nurture ethical neutrality of law and politics, inclusion and implementation of social and cultural rights committed by the Nepalese leadership

in its constitution, human rights and public international laws and peacefully persuade diverse citizens to be their own agents of change in public life. Hannah Arendt argues: "Public life, obviously, was possible only after the much more urgent needs of life itself had been taken care of" (1998:65).

Are Nepalese social movements emancipatory in nature or operating under the bounded rationality of group-specific interest? Is there a possibility to integrate all social movements into a democratic framework of citizenship-building by fostering a common national identity of Nepaliness out of multi-structural and multi-cultural mosaic? What are the common values that unite Nepal's spectacular social and economic diversity visible in its over 103 ethnic and caste groups, over 90 languages and 7 religions and bind them into Nepalese? Do Nepalese social movements communicate the ideals of modernity or based on traditional instinct of social hierarchy, patriarchy and institutional closure? Is it possible to construct the equality of citizenship and develop their loyalty to the Nepali state when the operation of globalized form of market economy is widening inequality within the country and narrowing the writ of the state in decision-making? Can citizenship be meaningful when power struggle between political parties is weakening the democracy's internal checks and self-correcting character and post-national constellation of the state, market and civil society forces is dissolving the rule of law into politics and disconnecting leadership from the problems of periphery? How can the agents of socialization, such as family, media, civil society, political parties and educational institutions incubate free societies where majority and minority can share space in common and mediate ecological, social and generational interests? Does civic education have the potential to bring connectors of society for social cohesion and system integration and rebuild post-conflict Nepali state-society coherence on the basis of political pluralism?

**Democratic Aspiration**
Inspired by the emancipatory aspirations, popular social movements of Nepal have shaken the Nepalese citizens from snooze and created shared space, outside the sphere of both the state and family, for critical thinking and action. Aside from democratic ideals, the primary goals of social movements are liberation, entitlements, identity, power and social opportunities. Civic competence of citizenship is essential to build the state from bottom-up which is also responsive to the needs of the people (Wimmer, 2002:9). Passive citizens, by contrast, believe that their duty is over in the ritual of casting ballot in every five-year. Passivity not only weakens their civic competence but also enfeebles the accountability of polity to electorates. Passive, apathetic, alienated and even radicalized citizens offend democratic sensibilities and easily trample the basic structure of democratic system which is deeply embedded in the shell of state sovereignty. Reinvigoration of citizenship in Nepal, therefore, requires freedom from fear and basic needs deficit, provisions of welfare and renewal of civic infrastructures of democracy as they are the just means to remove the irrationalities of Nepalese society, accelerate economic and technological change and foster the collective good life of citizens.

Each social and political movement of 1950, 1980, 1990, 2006 and many other ancillary agitations not only demonstrated the power of crowd but also expanded the rights of citizens. These movements have brought the condition of Nepalese citizens to global audience and contributed to the democratization of society and the state. Both sort of movements acted in a tandem but upon the ascension to power, political leadership have left the social movements in a lurch often bordering on despair and desolation. This has created a huge gap between social integration and system integration of citizens. Genuinely broad-based, non-violent social movements have an integrative potential as they embrace the capacity of society to articulate the "grievances of citizens," "communicate the unfavorable condition of society" through media, form "public opinion for social change" and "emancipate the citizens through the realization of rights." Hamlin and Pettit argue that where there are systems of rules there are also system of rights: rule-based rights, claim rights, power rights and immunity rights (1991:2). Growth of

critical mass of thinking classes and change agents in every sub-stratum of Nepalese society, availability of volunteers for social mobilization, scope for external resource and legitimacy of struggles motivated them to remove the unjust conditions of public life. These factors have also made the movements sustainable. The changes in election laws, party laws and the Constituent Assembly election have further expanded the political base of social movements in Nepal, deconstructed the insular, Kathmandu-centric view of the dominant elites and exposed the state to multi-cultural demands of society. Citizens' right to information embedded in the Interim Constitution of Nepal 2006 has made transparency a core of the governing process.

Most of social movements of Nepal have the multi-versal and multi-thematic framework of freedom, social justice, identity, solidarity, peace and eco-balance. Their struggle to enlarge the domain of citizenship across functional differentiation of society inspired them to join interacting public spheres across many cultures. In Nepal, the sustained drive of social movements has altered the nature of politics, defined new rules of conduct and claimed a negotiated social contract to distribute power between the state and citizens. Their populist instinct continues to renew many mediating institutions of society and transcend parochial differences. The Interim Constitution of Nepal has expanded more social rights including right to work, education, health, food sovereignty, citizenship in the name of father and mother, etc espousing the concept of social welfare state so that these rights can be reconciled with the modern principles of constitutionalism. Each political movement expanded citizens' more rights but the capacity of state to implement them is feeble. This paradox has exposed a terrible gap between the ideal of constitutional politics and sordid reality of political performance. The denouement is: fragile state incapable of holding together "the elite consensus for civil peace" (Snyder, 2010:278), creating a gender- and class-neutral political world and fulfilling the constitutional rights of social security for poor, elderly and disabled through internal tax support. Sadly, the energy of Nepali state now is paralyzed by a series of deadlock as political life is founded more on conflict than cooperation thus jeopardizing the nation's future. The abdication of consensus politics imposes risks for open access order, peace, progress and reforms.

The social movements of Nepal continue to pluralize the concept of legitimacy and standardize a new form of collective action aiming to alter the code of knowledge, communication and structure of social, economic and political power intending to equalize welfare across all members of society including minorities. The movements of women, Dalits, Madhesis, indigenous people, ethnic groups and workers have emerged as a critical response to the negative aspects of social hegemony of elites capturing the state and globalization process because both have confiscated the power of the state to maintain public order and distribute public goods. Additionally, globalization has individualized citizens, in-formalized political economy, undermined their loyalty to the state and created huge mass of losers. It is, therefore, reasonable to presume that these social movements have been provoked by the domination of society by the capital, the political classes and undemocratic application of technological, political, economic and social institutions. They have constrained the citizens' freedom of action in the direction of participatory, democratic change.

The Interim Constitution has recognized "popular sovereignty" establishing thereby irreducible, indivisible and inalienable rights of Nepalese citizens. But, the precondition for this is: only sovereign state can guarantee popular sovereignty and offer policy choices to citizens. Educational institutions, political parties, civil society and media of Nepal have to familiarize the rights and duties of citizens and remove hereditary privileges from public life and public policy. Ironically, they have failed to end new social stratifications created by digital divides of information revolution which are no less different from the old ones based on social hierarchy and patriarchy. There are two main challenges: first, democratic institutions in Nepal are too weak to prevent the unraveling of the bottom of Nepalese society as militant culture has encroached its political sphere; and second, upper classes of society are emotionally breaking their bond with under classes and retreating into private sphere of education, health,

communication, travel and life-styles thus polarizing a class gap in citizenship and, consequently, re-feudalizing its public sphere in opinion, democratic will-formation and social opportunities. This polarization is putting a powerful brake on the transformation of unequal Nepali people into equal citizens as their unequal positions affect their civic competence to exercise power and influence.

A large section of Nepalese citizens is poor. Politically, it marked a situation of their powerlessness, embittered competition for scarce resources and impeded the impersonal functioning of public institutions based on rule by law as required by "open access order." If under-classes are largely cut off from productive life or forced to migrate abroad to eke out their living, their stake and ownership in democracy become fragile. It will disconnect citizens from nationality. Nepalese guest workers working abroad have certain rights but they are without citizenship there. In contrast, non-resident Nepalese are demanding dual citizenship more for the safety of their capital investment than real commitment to build this nation. Similarly, open and porous borders have created fluid boundaries for the citizenship of refugees, guest workers and anti-social groups. Unless citizenship is tied to nationality and sound population policy, it would be hard to make Nepal a cohesive nation-state. The cultivation of national consciousness is, therefore, essential to strengthen the forces of society to self-organize, modernize and rationalize, provide avenue for democratic citizenship and foster non-violent resolution of conflict.

**Promise of Order**
Culture matters for political order. As culture grows and human beings gradually "move towards greater agreement over their principles, they lead to mutual understanding and peace" (Kant, 1970:114). Political justice demands collective good life of virtuous citizens. It considers the modern aspiration for civic autonomy of individual citizens only to the extent of democracy's capacity to stay resilient. The advent of constitutionalism has limited the "dominant faction's ability to use the machinery of government for oppression of minorities" (Hirshleifer, 2001:63) and fostered the idea of two kinds of constitutional rights for citizens. *Positive rights* basically foster citizens' capacity to act, participate in their political system through voting, forming and joining associations and right to factual and accurate information, etc. *Negative rights* are the rights citizens enjoy without interference from the state but which protect the individuals from each other, such as rights to sue in the court, rights to property, right to religion, privacy, political pluralism, especially regarding minority rights etc. Both these rights are mutually related.

In Nepal, the implementation of negative rights has become highly contested as the state is facing a tension between its institutional closure to group rights characteristic of post-modernity and institutional opening to cosmological and human rights and between "limited access order" akin to elite control and "open-access order," characterizing participatory democracy. The major problem of modern social science knowledge is the odious function of rationality which is not sensitive to the interest and needs of marginalized social, economic and cultural classes. System of law rooted in individual rationality and logic rooted in "doctrine of necessity" fail to create stakeholders democracy based on the "doctrine of democratic alternative." Law and rights have come into conflict with the reality of powerlessness and inequality of Nepalese citizens as leadership continues to ignore the rights of citizens to self-governance, subsidiarity and self-actualization by evacuating themselves from local reflection and action. In contrast, rights-oriented reasoning of civil society and international community has only institutionalized the power of organized part of Nepalese society thus leaving the marginalized disaffected lurching in the margin of adequate policy response.

Social movements in Nepal mainly spring from the unrealized rights of Nepalese, resource opportunity to engage the affected population in advocacy and activism and possibility to effect inclusive social transformation. Many of these social movements are, however, group enclosed and ascriptive and, therefore, socialize their members into group rights rather than advance the cause of equal rights intrinsic to citizenship and human rights to realize their

common humanity. "Ancient politics lacked the idea of rights, insisting instead on the power of the citizen body, acting collectively, to determine all aspects of people's lives" (Tuck, 1999:2). Modern politics is based on individual rights. Human feeling, emotion, empathy and affection to native citizens enrich the social bond of solidarity within the nation-state. Heightened awareness about democratic principles and rational understanding of national issues can increase the edge of civic spirit and minimize the cost of collective action. The tri-lemma Nepal faces now is: how to balance citizens' aspiration of universalistic concept of human rights with constitutional rights and rights of subsidiary identities located in difference spaces? This tri-lemma is rooted in the authoritarian political culture of Nepal and the struggle is located at three levels. Irrespective of political stripes, Nepalese leadership did not develop a sense of "constitutional patriotism," steer the constitutional process as per the spirit of Directive Principles and Policies of the State and often sought political transformation through extra-constitutional and extra-parliamentary means. This has exacerbated political stability. The post-state issues such as Himalayan climate change, migration, refugees, diseases, labor, trade and peace require informed negotiations beyond national society which so far remained within the territorial and constitutional bound of state and constructive international collective action.

**Public Institutions**

The ability of citizens for political judgment about the national affairs can bring them into public sphere. Nepal continues to harbor a political culture where powerful leaders, not citizens, arbitrate the application of rules so that inter-personal relations can flow smoothly, unconstrained by constitutional and cosmological laws. In such a cultural setting, it is difficult to develop strong impersonal institutions of the state and equality of citizenship. Nepal is particularly plagued by this political culture. Therefore, in the face they seem to be modern institutions, under the thin layer there is an intricate life-fixers, power brokers and patrons who decide everything without consulting Nepalese citizens. This is a sign of authoritarian political culture and a mark of democratic deficit. Nepal's Constituent Assembly became particularly victim of this culture. From political parties to government and civil society all have deeply internalized these cultural practices thereby reducing citizens to subordinated role of a sort of *praja*, the subject, and denied a place for citizens' enlightenment. The meaning of *praja* in Sanskrit language is demos, an equivalent of citizens. Whatever the term implies, civic culture requires conscious engagement of citizens in everyday life of public affairs and contribute to national constellation.

Passive citizens mark the weakness of state. In Nepal, there are obvious reasons to explain the behavior of those who occupy state offices and served by the state remain quite comfortable with weak institutions and fear impersonal laws processes and institutions that a modern constitutional state requires. Obviously, institutional transformation in the country is essential to alter the political culture of citizens and leaders to make them law-abiding and cohesive and abolish the culture of impunity by rescinding the tendency of leaders to free-ride in national space without accountability. Nepalese historians argue that Nepal is not an invented concept. It had existed in the spiritual and social consciousness of Nepalese long before it is conceptualized by Ne Muni and concretized in a geographic, cultural and linguistic space by Prithvi Narayan Shaha. But, if Nepaliness continues to be overwhelmed with huge structural divides in terms of gender, caste, class, age, language, religion and territoriality, creation of a national identity out of the chrysalis of mini identities becomes difficult. With the cancellation of National Day by the current establishment, older loyalties are revisiting to challenge national unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The establishment is seeking to create a state without culture and history. Out of three props of Nepali identity—Hindu state, monarchy and Nepali language—the first two suffered collapse while the last one is allowed to be contested without any limits. By deconstructing the syncretic culture through the instrumental use of class, ethnicity, religion, region, gender and age, the post-2006 leadership have forced the people to define themselves by Madhesis, Janajatis, Aadibasis, Mahila, religion, third gender and

weakening both national sovereignty and national identity. Citizens are increasingly feeling collective national stress of who are we? In this context, it is necessary to optimize the mini-identities of Nepalese for nation-building and help the diverse society nurse sound democratic citizenship as focal point of social ties and mutual accountability. Without the meta identity of Nepali citizens where all mini identities are subsumed Nepalese citizens can neither confront the challenges of geopolitics nor those arising from market-led globalization.

**Democratic Leadership**
Democratic leaders assume politics as a public responsibility and become the representative of national culture. They, therefore, do not instrumentalize the tribal, linguistic, ethnic, class and caste differences of the society for the expansion of political constituency and erode public unity based on "we" feeling of a sense of national identity. Under democratic constitutional state, "the concept of us and them are not based on hierarchy but on equality between us and them and among us" (Bhattachan, 2009:16). The leadership challenge in Nepal as a post-conflict state is to move beyond the classical concept of "command and control" style politics to capture transformational imperatives thereby reaffirming the rights of citizens to freedom, sovereignty, social justice and peace-building. Recycling of the same leaders undermines the possibility for intergenerational justice and destroys a more democratic vision of social life. Many Nepalese citizens still prefer strong leadership capable of fulfilling their personal needs and demands than democratic leadership interested in fulfilling the general interest of society. The bond between them is defined by transaction—voting, loyalty and submissiveness by citizens and command, control, service and protection from leadership. Both do not exercise the concept of citizen equality as they are acculturated in the traditional Nepal's practices of *jamindar* (landlord) and *mohi* (tenant) relationship which is basically vertical in nature. The authority of leadership largely depends on the legitimacy citizens grant through uncritical obedience and compliance and justify their deeds—right or wrong. This is a symptom of parochial political culture, not the civic one which requires critical inquiry and self-reflection.

When political system deflates, Nepalese citizens pin hope on extraordinary persons assuming that they will protect them from the breakdown of the system. When the leaders fail to deliver their expectation, they are interested in changing the public institutions and institutional processes rather than leaders. In this context, strong leadership has the temptation to shift citizenship into clientalism and strengthen the attachment of citizens to individual leadership than institutions. Politics of negation and factionalism practiced by Nepalese political parties mainly arise from this tendency. This has fostered a culture of dependency and destroyed citizens' ability to act in the pursuit of rational self-interest. The critical question that emerges is: How can Nepalese leadership link national identities out of the fusion of global space in the grid of communication and connect the citizens of periphery in productive national space? Public perception of leadership vacuum in Nepal is based on two factors: institutional incapacity for decision making and inability to establish the fundamentals of good governance. As a result, Nepalese leadership is more survival-oriented than pro-active focusing on long-term future planning of the nation.

**Citizenship Competence**
The real empowerment of citizens require multiple capacities in several realms such as *cognitive* (knowledge and life-experience) *social and emotive* (intimate sphere of family, neighborhood, religion, culture, etc), *economic* (production and exchange) and *political and normative* (voice, visibility and representation in public political sphere) and a connection with the national self-determination and self-governance.

Citizenship implies the membership of political community called the state. This membership stands above individual's membership with the family, civil society, political parties, market institutions and interest-based associations. The ideological orientation of political parties

to democracy and their politics of interest, identity and value-based compromise are essential prerequisites for democracy consolidation. Strong civic competence lies not only in early childhood socialization and experience about practical life but also in controlling one's own present and future and avoiding the risk of total assimilation in subsidiary identity through re-tribalized politics. In this context, Nepalese citizens must feel that their role affects the policy of political system and they have the capacity to initiate a new order of things. Modern citizenship involves not just the constitutional and human rights of citizens but also their duties towards the state, including involvement in voluntary services for justice and reconciliation—*melmilap* of post-conflict society. Proper accounting to past injustices through Justice and Reconciliation Commission can moderate the ruffled emotion of disaffected 20 minorities of Nepal who were denied any representation to Constituent Assembly. There is a need to remove institutional impediments to the empowerment of minority sub-culture.

The Interim Constitution has tossed huge responsibilities to citizens without thinking first about how to equip them and their organizations with the tools that make for good citizenship. Obviously, good citizenship requires knowledge and feeling about the national goals, transcend the idea of primordial considerations, such as tribal relation, ancestry, ethnicity, caste, etc and develop civic virtues, skills, networks, trusts and a culture of affinity to *Nepal mandala*, the universe of Nepal, nourished by the social thought, poems, essays, arts, plays and cultures of diverse groups of Nepalese. Civic competence enables citizens to enter into daily issue socialization about national affairs, peace education and civil peace works and revive the capacity of society to effect collective action. The Hindu-Buddhist worldview links individual citizens to the system as a while. Unraveling from this system fosters exclusion and disorder, *adharma* and risk of losing identity. Inclusive social transformation involves a wholesale democratization of public and private life of citizens and reshaping future by strong political will and fresh reasons for hope.

**Conclusion**

Genuine social movements foster the concept of inclusive citizenship educating them about rights and responsibilities and mobilizing them for the attainment of collective interest. Citizenship is the product of modernity. It, therefore, tries to liberate citizens from pre-political (biological orientation), non-political (bureaucratization) and anti-political identities (commoditization or indulgence in violent politics) and enfranchises them to understand about the rules of their life in common and encourages their voluntary participation in the public spheres. Democracy establishes the sovereignty of citizens to engage with government agencies and policy makers, exercise power according to the established norms and constitutions and negotiate all the differences on the basis of social equality. The democratization of civic infrastructures improves the possibility of empowerment of citizens in participation, decision making and collective action and brings the state closer to what Hannah Arendt calls, "human condition," a condition of plural human existence (1998:9).

The welfare state is a necessary precondition for a successful democracy because it is a virtuous state capable of mediating social conflict and the negative effects of multi-layered globalization processes that have disconnected the state from citizens and disabled power elites to think beyond their immediate desires. If basic needs of majority of citizens remain unmet and they have to migrate for livelihood guarantee they will be deprived of the capacity of social learning and feeling of membership of the state. Opportunity for role occupation in the national system beefs up their ownership and affinity with national values, institutions and laws and increases citizens' choice in public affairs. Social movements rooted into civic education broaden the horizon of citizens beyond partisan consideration and exposes them to the ethos of enlightenment--*nirwan*. It is far from the process of political indoctrination and false promises for political ends. Rather it aims to transform peoples into citizens and makes them conscious of their civic rights and responsibilities. It broadens their horizons and enables to exercise meaningful

political choices. But, Nepalese citizens need to be re-acculturated against the political disease of party politics—inflated expectation provoked by leaders. Elections and political movements have only changed the governments in Nepal, not the basic conditions of life because of election results. Obviously, Nepalese leaders emerged out of the legacy of feudalism no longer have power to inspire affection beyond their clients. Only democracy rooted in the heritage of tolerance can ignite a hope for multicultural existence. Democratization is an inclusive process as it includes previously excluded groups and contributes to the formation of rational and autonomous citizenship suitable for civic culture.

## References

Arendt, Hannah. 1998. *The Human Condition*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Axtmann, Roland. 2003 "Sovereignty," ed. Roland Axtmann. *Understanding Democratic Politics*, London: Sage Publications.

Bhatta, Chandra Dev.2008. *Challenges of State Building in Nepal*, Kathmandu: FES.

Bhattachan, Krishna B. 2008. *Minorities and Indigenous Peoples of Nepal*, Kathmandu: National Coalition Against Racial Discrimination.

Call, Charles C. 2009. "Ending Wars, Building States," eds. Charles T. Call with Vanessa Wyeth. *Building States to Build Peace*, New Delhi: Viva Books.

Habermas, Jurgen. 2001. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hamlin, Alan and Philip Pettit. 1991. "The Normative Analysis of the State: Some Preliminaries," eds. Alan Hamlin and Philip Pettit. *The Good Polity*, Oxford: Basil and Blackwell.

Hirshleifer, Jack. 2001. *The Dark Side of the Force: Economic Foundations of Conflict Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hueglin, Thomas O. 2003. "Majoritarianism—Consociationalism," Roland Axtmann. *Understanding Democratic Politics*, London: Sage Publication.

Kant, Immanuel. 1970. *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. H. B. Nisbet, trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Martinussen, John. 1997. *Society, State and Market: A Guide to Competing Theories of Development*, London: Zed Books Ltd.

North, Douglas C., John J. Wallis and Barry R. Weingast. 2009. *Violence and Social Order: A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shaw, Martin. 2000. *Theory of the Global State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shrestha, Nanda R and Dev Raj Dahal. 2008. "Nepal," eds. Guntram H. Herb and David H.

Kaplan, *Nations and Nationalism: A Global Historical Overview*, Vol. 4, California: ABC-CLIO.

Snyder, Jack. 2010. "The State and Violence," *Review Symposium*, Vol. 8, No. 1, March.

Tuck, Richard. 1999. *The Rights of War and Peace*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2002. *Nationalist Exclusion and Ethnic Conflict: Shadows of Modernity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Source**: editor. Mukti Rijal, *Readings on Indigenous Culture and Knowledge*, Kathmandu: IGD, 2011.