The Multiverse[1] of Democracy
Choices for Nepal

Tone Bleie, Head, Centre for Peace Studies, University of Tromsø, Norway
Dev Raj Dahal, Head, Friedrich- Ebert-Stiftung (FES), Nepal

Introduction

Democracy is the synthesis of ideals of many societies, Nepal included. This has been proved in numerous instances in both the Western world and in the regions of the Global South. The struggle for democracy in Nepal has entered a new phase from April 2006 mass movement and the unprecedented changes that followed. Now, some years later, it is necessary for all actors in Nepalese society to do soul searching exercises of why the state and society even today is so deeply steeped in attitudes that make political institutions and political practice undemocratic. The ideals of democracy might seem like twinkling stars that appear so distant from the wrangling of the parties in the current coalition government, rumors of planned coup and the lawlessness in the Tarai, the southern flatland. Before we engage you in a discussion of the contradictions, shortcomings and progress in this critical phase of democratic transition, we would like to characterize in brief the basics of any democracy.

Democracy is characterized by its ability to distribute political power and enforce accountability of leaders to their actions. Through its constitution, democracy creates government's rational authority, which must be modern and secular, sets limitation and nourishes the broader representative structures. A well-ordered democracy puts constitutional checks against any unreasonable rule – or tyranny of a majority. Also, it provides citizens with two kinds of rights.

Firstly, *negative rights* against the encroachment of government, non-interference and constraints to individual liberty. And secondly, *positive rights* related to their wellbeing, dignity, identity and capacity to exercise one's own legitimate interests. These two sets of rights are mutually related. A democratic outlook requires that human rights and basic needs are "available to all citizens equally under law, and that they be guaranteed even in the face of a contingent electoral or parliamentary majority" (Beetham, 2003:23).

We would like to stress that the establishment of "a culture of constitutionalism" is vital in several senses. Such a culture helps ensuring the principles of freedom of citizens, their dependence on a single common legislation, and laws that establishes their equality as citizens of a state (Guyer, 2008:281). It also helps ensuring the ability of citizens themselves to check the inclination of politicians to induce political change through extra-constitutional means.

How can such a culture of constitutionalism be nurtured in Nepal? Until very recently, many citizens of this country hardly knew the content of the constitution and its role in forming the overarching framework of the state and between themselves as citizens. We will below attempt to discuss if such a culture really exists, what is needed to strengthen it and what we can reasonably expect of this country's new constitution. In a span of sixty years of Nepal's constitutional history, six different constitutions were introduced in the country. Within two years of promulgation of the Interim Constitution following the success of April 2006 mass movement, it has been amended six times. Why this surge of amendments? This surge is an expression of constitutional instability and a very fragile peace in the country. On the positive side, never before in Nepal's history have so many changes been seen by its citizens, who now desire to have a real say in the public constitution making process.

---

[1] The term multi-verse is invented by psychologist William James in 1895 to denote the diversity of universe, their structures, relationships and interpenetrating spaces that together constitute entire reality.

Any government is fully legitimate only if it is representative of all citizens, allows public reasoned deliberations on all policy issues, executes the popular will and legitimizes its actions in acceptable ways. Popular sovereignty is measured by the existence of public policies that are fully decided by citizens through them and their representatives. This also brings coherency between public reason, public interest, politics and political system. So what is a theory of sovereignty?

By this we mean the possibility of a just use of political power in a society. Popular sovereignty and state sovereignty,[2] in this sense, are interwoven, forming a kind of virtuous *dharma.* Each one of us can only become sovereign citizens in a sovereign state having the ability to protect national borders, possess legitimate monopoly on power, and the ability to institutionalize citizenship rights in order to open a wide range of opportunities for them.

Otherwise, it cannot remake pre-existing and unequal ties of citizens, redistribute power among all social classes, become a real neutral mediator and create civic solidarity. The tradition of constitutional belief seeks to provide ways of relating and making compatible, balancing and checking the relationship between the state and society. Such a tradition of belief is protecting both public and private rights (Held, 2000:328) and negotiating trust in a social contract between the state and us as citizens. In a war-torn country like Nepal, the challenge is not simply one of rebuilding state institutions that treated people as unequal citizens or even treated many as subjects only. The greater challenge is to remake state institutions, making their decisions trustworthy and binding and fit to undertake service delivery, reconstruction, stabilization and peace building measures.

Popular sovereignty in Nepal can be constituted only if Nepalese citizens gradually see themselves as capable and indispensable in the process of law making for the new constitution. The Nepalese leaders can successfully organize democratic nation-building, if they are able to reconcile the mushrooming of ethnic and regional identities with a new sense of common nationality, in order to overcome the current crisis of national identity. What could this common nationality be made up of? This is a contested matter now in Nepal as current leadership has made Hindu Kingship, religion and Nepali as a national language a subject of controversy considering them oppressive and imposed upon the "other." What are the bases of rule-governed rational citizens, who are willing to live together in the shared rule of a national community of sovereign state? In ordinary language this means that peoples as citizens must share some basic reasonable rules in a shared sovereignty - that forms this virtuous *dharma*. General conformity to law of the land and a clear wish for collective life - are the main features of a national political community or the political system.

This begs the question of what this national community and wish for collective life can be. In such a state, is nationalism, i.e. the secular ideology of nation-state, the answer? Is the notion of unity in Nepal's cultural and religious diversity possible, at a time when radical differences (in terms of ethnic differences and plain versus hills) are much used as a means of political mobilization? This unity may be understood as civic and national affiliation of citizens - based on democratic values.

Even if the state has become secular in principle, many Nepalese remain deeply religious. Still the ancient religious state rituals are being performed, but now with an elected President instead of the King as the chief devotee, and the embodiment of the nation. The abolition of the Hindu monarchy, as the main state pillar of state sovereignty and the "body" of the nation is a historical decision. So is the new secular constitution. As the mindset of the mass of Nepalese people is still religious, and people's mode of worshipping contain distinct hierarchical elements and expresses helplessness and dependence on wishful filling and protecting deities, even the leaders of the new secular state might be tempted to make manipulative use of quasi-religious and religious state rituals and ceremonies, and cast themselves

---

[2] "Nation-states are the product of four clearly interrelated 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 welfare state linked to the control of the immigration of foreigners)" (Wimmer, 2002:9).

in roles that are empowering to them, by using royal and religious insignia and behavior, but utterly undemocratic.

The liberation of Nepalese citizens from feudal tutelage, from external domination and the matching internal mental domination - a sense of being critically subjected to the anger, protection and boons of unpredictable deities - is a precarious and complicated process, demanding democratizing statecraft, and a self-aware understanding of the interplay between folk psychology, folk religion and national integration, including the positive integrative role of Nepal's syncretistic temple worship and its negative exclusionary aspects - not the least the discriminatory effects of religious notions of pollution on women and lower castes. Even in the deeply conservative religious domain, time might be ripe for changing age-old norms and ritual practices that are exclusionary.

This historical ongoing process is liberating, since new sections of society now demand full participation in public worship and they are now represented in the Constituent Assembly (CA). But this emerging common bond of citizenship, constitutional solidarity and a shared future is delicate, and has yet to develop the needed national coherence. Still there is a cacophony of dissenting voices, making undiscriminatoric use of strikes, blockages, lethal violence and fabricated rumors, instead of genuinely listening to one another through democratic debates and negotiations. This needs to increasingly happen if one shall succeed in establishing "the right to development is of course, a right of all individuals in a country exercised collectively" (Bleie, 2005: 65).

In a democracy, government[3] derives its legitimacy not from divine or quasi-divine authority, but from the general consent of free and equal citizens. Democratic government is, therefore, often sensitive to rational consent of citizens and provides them public security, justice and service. The purpose of democratic politics has always been to accommodate the great plurality of human beings, so they can live in peaceful coexistence and share the earth in mutually guaranteed freedom (Arendt, 2006: 202). Such politics therefore, does not act in a partisan manner against opponents. It rather legitimizes its struggle to "protect the life-world."[4] National integration of Nepal requires the creation of an independent source of authority and genuine and equitable participation of all citizens, both women and men, all castes and ethnic nationalities, all religious communities, plains people and hill people in the material and symbolic production of the shared public domain of government, of the political domain of political parties, of a voluntary spirit of civil society and of a larger public sphere constituted by media and civic initiatives.

But, without building the capacity of security agencies to become politically neutral and serve a legitimate state and its laws (Rubin, 2009:37) it will be difficult to institutionalize democracy. This is why the debates on civilian rule, efforts to democratize the army, the row over the army's top leadership and which approach should be taken to the reintegration of Maoist soldiers, are important indeed. This also requires the demilitarization of militant youth groups and all rebel groups, so that politics provides equal level playing field for all.

Our study will in the following, after a brief note on the notion of the nation-state in Nepal, explain by use of political theory, the meaning of democracy, and what we have chosen to call democracy's main types. We will then debate Nepal's democratic choice, how principles and mechanisms of democracy actually work, and how a peaceful resolution of conflicts can be put into practice.

---

[3] "Government can be interpreted as the major agent of the state and exists to carry out the day-to-day business of the state. Governments are short-term mechanisms for administering the long-term purpose of the state. Hence every state is served by a continual succession of governments. But governments only represent the state, they cannot replace it. A government is not a sovereign body: opposition to the government is a vital activity at the very heart of liberal democracy: opposition to the state is treason" (Taylor, 1988:111).

[4] According to Habermas, the life-world "remains largely unthematized, but the theorist can differentiate its resources into three broad components: the stock of taken-for-granted certitudes and ideas (culture); the norms, loyalties, institutions, and so forth, that secure group cohesion or solidarity (society); and the competencies and skills that members have internalized (personality). A viable life-world is reproduced, then, through cultural transmission of ideas through forms of social integration and through the socialization of its members" (1996:518).

Before we start discussing the current state of globalization and how it is impacting Nepal's current political, social and economic life, and especially the crossroads Nepal finds itself in as it comes to choices for different modes of democracy or authoritarian rule, we would like to briefly outline some key features of the notion of nation-state in Nepal. This notion is currently politically contested due to the rise of ethnic movements in Nepal who have distinct demands for recognition in the constitution, and for an ethnic federalist model.

The emergence of the nation-state in Nepal
The basic defining features of the nation-state, as a people with certain unique features, whose territorial distribution defines the outer borders, is based on a European model, the so-called Westphalian state system (1648). This model established democracy, the nation (in singular) and economy within the nation-state. Citizenship, territory and sovereignty were as already noted, brought under a single political community. This helped to resolve religious conflicts between Europe's warring princely rulers and defined the duties of the state; the provision of security, opportunity and public goods to all citizens.

The first experience Nepal's early rulers had with a foreign power who held such a notion, was during the conflict from 1814-1816 onward with the East India Company. They forced upon the Nepalese the notion of a clear and exclusive border. Even before that at the turn of the nineteenth century the rulers of Gorkha, had a notion of sovereignty, based on proprietary authority (*muluk*) and ritual authority within their realm (*desa*). In addition, there was the recognition that subjects had certain rights to the land they lived on based on inherited ancestral authority. Other tenurial arrangements, were subject to annual renewals during the Dasain festival (Regmi 1984:128-34), allowing people to move and change their political affiliation. The nature and size of levies, fees, duties and rents expressed ones graded inferiority to those who received the payments. At the top of the hierarchy was the king whose position as recipient only, underpinned his political sovereignty towards other kings. The conquest of Nepal, was an intrusion into the sacred realms of the Malla kings, and demanded devotion to the tutelary deities of each realm, for political integration to take place (Acharya 1968: 503-505, Burghart 1996:233). The realms were also hierarchical, the capital with its tutelary deities - at the cosmological centre – versus the outer provinces. These occupied provinces were subject to asymmetrical treatment and state appropriations.

The newly formed state was a collection of countries of different peoples, who lived in their unique environments, spoke their own native languages and shared certain customs (including tenurial costumes) that were considered ancient and worshipped their own deities. Some deities like Manakamana of Gorkha, which initially was a divine protector of military prowess and source of authority of the expanding Shah Kings – became gradually an integral part of the nation-building project, a national wish-fulfilling and protective deity (Bleie and Bhattarai, 2002: 26-53). Countries were distinguished and classified both by their distinct natural environment and by their native peoples. The latter classification of country had an ethnic sense. The difference in the subjects' affiliation as tenants and native in his/her country is demonstrated in the migration patterns in the 18th and 19th century. People were ready to terminate their tenurial contracts and move to a new polity, but not to leave their country with its unique environment (akin to what we would call an ecological belt). Therefore, people preferred long-distance migration to lands presently into Kumau-Garhwal in the west to Assam, Bhutan and Sikkim in the east, rather than to the near-lying malaria infested Tarai plains.

We have already noted the fixed demarcation of an international southern border (this happened much later for the northern boundary to Tibet), as an early contribution to the formation of the nation-state in Nepal. Other (not necessarily exhaustive) events were the introduction of the legal code Muluki Ain with its Hindu interpretation of a hierarchical order of species (*jat*) as social "bodies"; of Nepali as the one official language in 1960; and in the same year the establishment of a unique polity (in a cultural sense)—Panchayat, without the legal existence of political parties. It can be argued that the redefinition of ethnic countries as species, served the interest of the Hindu state by invisibilising the

territorial basis of these countries. The erstwhile governments retained what we today may call "an eco-regional approach", through the separate administration of plain and hill countries.

This extremely brief array into the gradual formation of the nation-state, serves as a necessary backdrop for raising some questions about the underpinning notions of ethnic movements since the 1990 mass movement, the introduction of democracy and the latest phase of mobilization on ethnic grounds by the Maoists and the engagements of the ethnic movements in ongoing constitutional process. In this process, federalism has been proposed as a solution to the Nepalese state's ailments with a centre dominating the peripheries.

What is federalism all about? It is a power-sharing compact between the Centre and the Parts (which can be provinces, districts or federative regions or states). The goal of federalism is to divide a unitary state into parts that are so homogenous that people may be ruled by representatives they consider to be of their own kind". A federative state should contribute to a just, positive peace *within* Nepal, based on cooperation (within and between federations and federations and the Centre) that promotes freedom, identity and equity (and removes age-old structural class, caste and gender violence). The suggested ethnic federative regions, are building, partly explicitly - partly implicitly, on asserted historical references to notions of peoples and territories before the Gorkali conquest, during the early phase of modern Nepal prior to the establishment of an entrenched hierarchical Hindu order, and to the late phase post-1960 phase of Hindu nationalism, as the basis for the theocratic nation-state.

More so, the ethnic movements, engage in inter-cultural translation and accommodation between these distinctly Nepalese notions (though to some degree shared with the Gangetic region) of peoples and countries and the international notion of "ethnic groups" and "indigenous peoples", as laid down in international human rights law. The current debate on federalism therefore is "a hybrid" one, a particular mix of cultural globalization and of Nepalese ideas. But, it would be dangerous to overlook at the composition of peoples, castes and territories as they are very different from in the early modern period. If we consider any of the discussed territorial divisions, we end up with ethnic nationalities and castes living side by side in the same villages, valleys, district or proposed federative region. So in Nepal, any feasible federative solution has to address peaceful co-existence and democratic power-sharing with people who are not of your own kind. Ethnic identity politics' currently challenges to what constitute common national values and can also threaten the democratic and decentralizing and peace-building intentions of a federalist state, if explicit political counter measures are not taken. "Ethnic identity tends to peak in times of crisis, such as political uncertainties and economic down-turns, a scenario that typifies contemporary Nepal" (Shrestha and Dahal, 2008:1809).

The eventual federative solutions chosen have to consider the level of autonomy between Centre and Parts; non-territorial versus territorial ways to divide Nepal; symmetrical division (all units get same duties and rights) versus asymmetrical (more autonomy to some parts); eventual role of territorial chamber of representatives and chamber of nations versus having one-chamber parliament; horizontal (most contact between the federative Parts) versus vertical (most contact between the Centre and each Part) organogram; and finally, the regulation of internal and international borders.

Globalization of Nepal from Above and Below
We will in the following address several dimensions of globalization in the three sections below, we start out discussing the new imbalances between the territorial state and the society that is expanding beyond national borders. This will be followed by a brief discussion of the risks of the new political economy and of Nepal's aid dependency.

New Imbalances between State-Systems and Societies
The Westphalian state system established - as we have already pinpointed - democracy, the nation and economy within the nation-state. Citizenship, territory and sovereignty were under a single political community, religious conflict between rulers was resolved and the duties of the state to provide

security, opportunity and public goods to citizens were properly defined. Internal autonomy from the dominant interests of society defined its impersonality in rule-enforcement, while non-interference in the internal affairs of other states was based on a code of peaceful co-existence.

Democratic states are reasonable in their relations with other states and humane to their citizens. Now, the process of market-driven globalization of capital, technology, ideology, and communication and a transition of international relations into global relations have marked a radical shift from the welfare state-oriented constitutional version of democracy to the competitive market-driven state and the corresponding adherence to inter-state institutions, based on international norms, agreements and laws. This has made the state-centric definition of democracy increasingly problematic for reasons we will outline.

Modern democracy has moved beyond the nation-state because of the increasing imbalances (or incongruity) between social transactions of national society crossing state borders and the regulative capacity of territorial state. Instant electronic communications have in certain respects removed the distance between time and space. It is not a new thing that the Nepalese society too is pulling the state into its expanded territories. This has happened through the migration of Gorkha soldiers, traders, and artists to Singapore, Bhutan, Darjeeling, Assam, Sikkim, Burma, Malaysia, Lhasa etc. But, in new and old diasporas, the lifestyle of migrant workers and refugees of national origin changes. So does the establishment of and workload of national embassies and consulates. Also patterns of foreign investment and the nature of foreign policy issues are affected by the new virtual extension of time and place through electronic means of communication. The results are reshaping family life, migratory patterns, popular consent, representational patterns and state-society relations. The popular social movements mark the structural transformation of state power - questioning the subordination of the Nepali state to plural authority structures of international regimes, such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC), etc.

The separation of state and society also means the differentiation of a market economy institutionalized via the principles of individual private rights (Habermas, 2001:63). It has established that privatization of state-owned industries as an undisputable fact and that income distribution generated by markets is so-called normal and just. Increasingly, "resources and threats that matter, including money, information, pollution, and popular culture, circulate and shape lives and economies with little regards for political boundaries" (Mathews, 1999:534). To respond to this societal denationalization, different state organs of Nepal, such as executive, legislative, judiciary, police, army, etc have started networking across the borders for policy making, coordination and collective action. One can say that the rise of cross-border transactions and their scale, undermines the normative dignity of political borders and national identities (Zurn,1999:10).

The Vagaries of the New Political Economy
Currently, global imposition of conditionality as a precondition for development aid, often if not always, continues to distort national choice, authority and sovereignty. The global economic relations, however, lack the interdependence that is popularly constituted, and created "a condition of equilibrium at a low level of interdependence" (Waltz,1979:209). At the same time, the export-oriented value chains are creating new economic interdependence, and make commitments to human rights more difficult. We already see this now during the ongoing financial crisis. Autocratic governments' clamping down on people demonstrating against rising food prices and unemployment, is increasingly tolerated by the Western governments, who say we have to stick together to fend of the crisis.

Erosion of the Nepali state's capacity in the monopoly of financial resource (tax), leads to less capacity to sustain welfare programs and rule-enforcing ability. The erosion also results in declining recognition by other states of state authority and leadership in coping with internal and external challenges and realizing governance goals – security, rule of law, voice, civic participation, service delivery and resolution of political conflict within the national territory. Nepal is in this situation vulnerable to regional and global geopolitics.

Also globalization and regionalization of political economy is eroding the state's autonomous institutional capacity across its territory, historically evolved state-centric nationalism, state-defined citizenship and the universal recruitment of soldiers tied to citizenship.

In the chaotic context of vast inequalities of power, wealth and communication within the Nepalese society and between Nepalese and non-Nepalese party cadres, ethnic leaders and human rights activists, the state cannot muster the necessary consent of citizens for a legitimate political order. Multinational enterprises, key donors and private sectors all use their financial leverages and thereby continue to prevent state's capacity for the economic interventions necessary to realize social priorities of citizens through a process of collective choice.

Now, powerful global forces are bringing institutional changes in the Westphalian architecture through a novel redistribution of power among states, markets and civil society (Mathews, 1999:534) and weakening the political loyalties of citizens to the state. A bureaucratic and centralized state is ill-suited to deal with complex challenges and satisfy the aspiration of diverse public at home and international audience. Democracy beyond the state remains weak because of a certain anarchic tendency of international system. Denationalization of domestic forces has also made democracy internally weak as subsidiary identities of Nepal claim their rights, voices and stakes in the political system on the basis of universal discourse of human rights or of a classless society, rather than on national capacity. Insufficient national capacity to allocate resources and resolve disputes is weakening the writ of Nepali state. The neo-liberal economic policies and key donors' interest in private sector, further limited the state's capacity to perform welfare functions. Also it has undermined the leadership's ability to govern through coercion, capital and charisma (Tilly,1992).

The Nepali state seems too weak to de-radicalize high-bidding politics, control competitive violence, resolve the pressuring security dilemma arising out of the existence of two armed forces, increase its security outreach in society in order to control the activities of criminal groups and to implement rules and policies. The authority, effectiveness, accountability and responsiveness of any democratic regime rest on how it is financed[5] (Moore, 2009:38-39). The overall tax of the country contributes only 12 percent to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) while workers' remittance contributes 18 percent to GDP. This remittance, however, is hurtling into a downward spiral due to global economic meltdown, increasing protectionism and workers' layoff. The share of international financial assistance in Nepal's development is as high as 70 percent, but it is not sufficient to beef up the fiscal capacity of Nepali state to bridge the development gap between unequal citizens and to craft policies that actually work, preventing a race to the bottom.

Likewise, the Nepalese leadership has yet to demonstrate its competence to govern by properly balancing private interest with public responsibility in response to the serious crisis in global social production, which is altering the contemporary conception of work, labor and economy. This is a serious defect of Nepalese political culture, though the recent post-CA election governments have shown their willingness to start tackling this enormous challenge. Currently, Nepal does not need controlling father figures or pathological leader personalities, or even great charismatic persons mostly interested in personalization of power. Nepal needs those who articulate the hopes and dreams of the diverse citizenry, stimulate their confidence, inspire them for collective action and muster resources to fulfill the vision of a stable, peaceful, prosperous and independent Nepal, that also contributes to balanced regional cooperation and global democracy.

Nepal's critical Aid Dependency

---

[5] "The more a state depends for revenue on taxing its richer citizens, the more it is likely to pursue policies specifically beneficial to the rich- defined as stronger protection for property rights—in order to persuade them to continue to part with their money. Conversely, the more a state depends on revenue on taxing its poor citizens, the more it is likely to pursue policies specifically beneficial to them- defined as spending more money on the provision of public services" (Moore, 2008"38-39).

Nepal is worrisomely dependent on the international community for advice, resources, technical expertise, implementing agencies and even legitimacy. This is the back-drop against which we understand the post-conflict state's hectic constitutionalism, incorporating a flurry of international human rights laws, humanitarian principles, membership obligations in regional and international institutions and cross-border coordination of policies, all aimed at addressing transnational issues. The bi-annually held organization of Nepal Development Forum, largely debates and negotiates many of its policy issues including the choice of values, policies and political system. As human rights have become universal in scale, their arbitration is subject to an international regime, such as UN Committee on Human Rights, which offers recommendations to state action, even though their judgments have - to the disappointment of many claimants - no legally binding force. The core themes of Universal Declaration of Human Rights are indivisible, interdependent and mutually reinforcing. Global democracy, therefore, requires greater openness and effective cooperation among states to manage the issues of interdependence and to protect the natural foundation of life, in which all living species depend for survival and development. Adaptation to global norms, issues and institutions of transnational concerns is essential for global governance.

There is currently both a serious ecological and an economic crisis. They are not the outcome of shortage, but the success of global economic and technological efficiency, undermining human and animal habitats, commoditization of labor, land and money and colonizing our life-worlds. Scientists reveal that the Himalayan glaciers are shrinking faster than anywhere and could totally disappear by 2035 (Leahy, 2009:1).

The women, men and children of Nepal and the wider Himalayan region already experience the ecological crisis, as for example climate change is affecting glacier melting, river flows, food production, prevalence of tropical diseases, and loss of local biodiversity. It has rightly been said that "too much credit was packaged in too many ways by people who were too smart, too busy, and too greedy" (Schell, 2009:20).

Ensuring real financial stability requires new global agreements based on equity and mutual adjustment of the capital and the labor, and a break-away from the current inbuilt "roller-coaster" tendencies of the capitalist global economy. Only an ecologically balanced economic growth, based on intergenerational, gender and racial justice can save the fragile ecological system, including the mighty Himalayan highlands, green hills and foothills and gigantic river vallies. These natural and cultural landscapes are dear to all Nepalese, and form the basis for their common territorial understanding of what is unique to Nepal's natural and cultural heritage. Balanced growth and justice in Nepal and the wider Hindu-Kush Himalayan region, can also help to rectify the defects that are inherent in the economic system.

Like the Great Depression, the current credit crunch, the slowing economic growth and the falling stock market, mark a possibility for sweeping expansion of state's role in social justice (Barber, 2009:24) and a conscious retreat from the whole intellectual structure of the defective Washington Consensus.[6] A fundamental change in the attitude and behavior of powerful consumers in China, India, the US and the EU is urgently needed, focusing on the protection of environment, use of alternative energy, infrastructure, job-creation, social equity and justice for the survival of democracy and for future generations. Confronting deep structural inequality, exclusions and discrimination requires equal opportunity, satisfaction of basic needs of the poor and dispossessed, and decent working and living standards for them all. The resolution of the crisis of global proportion in food, energy, finance and ecology requires global democratic accountability, a sound partnership between states, markets, civil society groups and international regimes. The partnerships and binding international obligations and treaties need much fairer representational rules than we have today. These partnerships must forge

---

[6] The chairman of the US Federal Reserve Alan Greenspan, recently conceded in testimony before Congress that his ideological viewpoint was flawed and that the whole intellectual edifice of modern risk management had collapsed (Rudd, 2004).

institution-building for a cosmopolitan democracy, a common culture of human rights, and stronger cooperation for ecological management, preservation and durable peace-building and disarmament.

Democracy and Political Ideologies

In this section we will outline certain basic assumptions of influential political ideologies, and the degree to which they differ in their understanding of democracy. National leaders pursue diverse ideological ends to justify their actions. Conservative political ideology, for example, holds the predominance of tradition, order, authority, religion, institutions, hierarchy, strong defense, national unity, patriotism and an ingenious limit of the welfare state.[7] Liberal ideology represents the so-called enlightenment tradition of the supremacy of rational thought, liberty, property rights, freedom of choice, due process of law and a tendency to favor change. Social democratic ideology prefers the reformist programs and direct taxation to support equality, redistribution of wealth and social justice. Marxist ideology prefers a policy advocating state restructuring, cooperative ownership and administration of the means of production and distribution of goods and the creation of a society characterized by equal opportunities and the full employment of the workers.

Since liberalism has been the dominant ideology for the last 30 years internationally and globally, we like to expand a bit more on the basic assumptions of this ideology. It perceives individuals as sensible (rational) agents engaged in maximizing their benefits and minimizing losses. Liberal democracy espouses constitution, representation and citizenship. It is mostly concerned with civil and political rights, and considers that social, economic and cultural rights are private rights of individuals that can be guaranteed by the free market and by free ownership of the means of production, exchange and distribution[8].

Feminist theorists have criticized this ideology for seeing the public sphere as a place citizens should express their rational and universal ideas, detached from their particular situations and feelings. This should not be taken to imply that feminist theorists do not make a distinction between the public and the private. The private should not be defined as being excluded from public scrutiny and not interfered with.

For women in Nepal or elsewhere - whether poor or affluent – and for other discriminated and economically deprived groups - the principle of non-intervention in the private sphere is bad news, since their discrimination and oppression occurs within the household, the family, the clan, or the community. Instead privacy should be understood as active decision of withdrawal of the individual woman or man. The private sphere should be associated with intimacy, caring and gender equity - instead of one gender (men) being seen as heads of household and guardians and women as dependent, vulnerable and irrational.

The public sphere should also be open to affective, civilized action, expressing the diversity of the Nepalese life-world. In Nepal until recently the public domain has been one of a particular kind of homogeneity, with the King, Rana Oligarchy, and authoritarian and even democratic leaders mirrored the embodiment of public will. Public dissent used to be equated with disloyalty or treason and therefore, banned. Currently, the public sphere is very diverse, and one may say chaotic, as many sections of the public are claiming their own space in the public realm. This new heterogeneity of diverse citizenships, aesthetic and bodily expressions, are a sign of democratization and may be a lasting feature of public democratic life. But the current cacophony of voices risks stifling public life and costs the economy far too much, if the demands behind agitation, demonstrations and blockages can not be negotiated politically without paralyzing economic life in large parts of the country.

---

[7] Hayak (1960:397) has said "Conservatism proper is a legitimate, probably necessary, and certainly widespread attitude of opposition to drastic change".
[8] The private domain "remains beyond the reach of political intervention and structuring" and, therefore, "individual citizens are themselves responsible for their own social and economic well-being" (Meyer, 2005:8).

There are also a few remaining public taboos, such as no open discussion around sexuality, including forced sex and sexualized violence. In the later case the victimized body is seen as the symbol of the enemy. One can argue that both Western liberal ideology, and the ideology in Nepal both during the Panchayat era and after the first mass movement, have been used by the state to legitimize rather than to challenge men's dominance over women (the patriarchal paradigm) and have confined the definition of women's interests within "a male" definition of the state (Ueno, 2004: 94 and Squires, 2004:128).

Similarly, such liberal ideology has an instrumental view of the value of nature. It serves exclusive human profit-making interest, which in a narrow sense may represent a rational choice of individuals, but results at the societal level in overexploitation of the nature (Hardin, 1968:1244).[9] Liberal ideology sees the institution of private property as the root of society. Private ownership of property is assumed to foster incentives, efficiency, innovation and competition which, in turn, contribute to wealth-creation in society. Private wealth, therefore, becomes a condition for admission to public life and full-fledged citizenship (Arendt, 1998:61). This theory sacrifices social justice for economic growth. The recent manifestation of this liberal vision of democracy is reflected in the Washington Consensus, which has also guided the international community's approach to aid in Nepal.[10] The predominant belief of this ideology has been that state action should be limited, and eventually substituted, by the free play of market forces.

Its critics, however, are many and they have good arguments. Some points a dialectical relationship between the equalization tendency of democracy and un-equalization propensity of the forces of market.[11] Democracy, they would say, requires a healthy, sound and competitive market regulated by the state. Other critics argue liberalism makes it difficult for the poor to create a national identity, (Cooper, 1999:11) because social, economic and cultural rights of citizens remain unaddressed. The leadership of the Unified Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) and Communist Party of Nepal-Unified Marxist Leninist (CPN-UML) prefer substantive democracy that combines freedom with social justice.

The current financial crises which erupted in late 2008, has lead to a fundamental criticism of the basic assumptions of the neo-liberal consensus and its governing institutions. Again the famous economist Keynes economic theory, which dominated post-war economic planning, has become relevant to address the questions of poverty, inequality and unemployment. The current recession has also led to a renewed interest in the legitimacy of welfare state as it represents "organized solidarity between strong and weak, young and old, sick and healthy, workers and unemployed" (Thierse, 2009:11).

The continued condition of scarcity and economic insecurity in Nepal after the 1990 mass movement has been a hindrance for any guarantee for individual freedom and autonomy. Nor has it been promotive of a democracy, as a healthy community of citizens (polity). In a developing country like Nepal, citizens' common good should have primacy over rational, but narrow profit making choices or the private interest of consumers. The resistance against any comprehensive land reform, minimizing caste, ethnic and gender inequalities, against reversing the privatization of water resources and giving more attention to women and former untouchable castes in community forestry and in public

---

[9] The liberal democracies, such as the USA and Canada are defying their obligation of Kyoto regime while the United Kingdom is meeting its obligations only by outsourcing its pollution to other developing countries. Liberal democracies are, therefore, simply ignoring the principle to manage global commons. It is already clear that much more ambitious targets have to be agreed upon in the next post-Kyoto treaty.

[10] The famous Washington Consensus of market-friendly reforms subsumes the following objectives: fiscal discipline, redirection of public expenditure toward education, health and infrastructure investment, tax reform – broadening the tax base and cutting managerial tax rates, market-determined interest rates, trade liberalization – replacement of quantitative restrictions with low and uniform tariffs, openness to foreign direct investment, privatization of state enterprise, deregulation – abolishment of regulations that impede entry or restrict competition, except for those justified on safety, environmental, and consumer protection grounds, and prudential oversight of financial institutions, and legal security for property rights.

[11] "Economics is concerned with individuals maximizing their self-interest; politics is concerned with sets of individuals maximizing their common interests" (Held, 1987:188)

service, have not only violated economic and social rights, but also hindered an inclusive democratization in Nepal (Acharya, 2009: 20-129) The liberative spirit of the new social movements of women, Dalits, youths, indigenous people and workers articulate both profound socialist and social-democratic values of distributive justice.

Expanding the Meaning of Democracy
One kind of democracy we like to propose as being relevant for Nepal in addition to social-democracy is "a post-liberal democracy," based on the expansion of individual rights, including a more informed understanding of the limits of free will. But this post-liberal democracy must balance individual rights with a proportionate recognition of group rights. Any expansion of property rights, and expanded state power to curb pollution and other environmentally destructive practices that are threatening to destroy our collective future, has to be democratically accountable to the public.
Our vision of a post-liberal democracy is unmistakably building on aspirations of the liberal era itself, yet it breaks sharply with the liberal tradition in two important respects.

We understand this vision as representing the individual as an intrinsically social and moral being, actively engaged in the continual transformation of one's own and others' capacities, sentiments and attachments; and who sees oneself as part of the animal world instead as of as standing above the animal world. Our position also builds upon recent recognition in political theory and in cognitive science of the very conditions of being "a free human being." These insights include the republican tradition's understanding of that no one is free if one is subject to somebody else's arbitrary power, be it ones employer, landlord or husband.
These relationships are not free even if your boss treats you decently, even if your landlord pays you as agreed in kind for your labor and your husband does not threaten with violence or with throwing you out of the home. The point is that there is no safety in neither of these relationships. One can never fully predict how those in power will exercise their will over you. Such inequalities in the conditions of exercising freedom, has to be addressed by any republican state, also Nepal. This means republican theory more demands of the state, than a liberal standpoint, which expects the state to simply ensure noninterference, so we can exercise our free will.
In other words, people can often be un-free without knowing it. A factory worker does not think of unionizing as a possibility, or a woman does not think she has equal right to parental property or to have a business of her own. These insights are to some degree compatible with Marxist theories of labor, but have a more balanced and inclusive theory of the non-reductive relationship between material conditions, social relations and self-consciousness. One can for example explain how come there are also many un-free citizens in Western democracies, such as women with full political and civil rights, whom nevertheless either subconsciously or consciously are dominated by fear for domestic or arbitrary violence to such a degree that their freedom of movement and sense of wellbeing are seriously curtailed. Recent second generation cognitive science (Lakoff and Johnson, 1997) has some very important insights about the limits of freedom which democracy theorists now have to take aboard. This science has documented in new detail how our brains and thinking operates, and concluded that we as human beings share some propensities toward how we perceive and order the world meaningfully, including a tendency to hierarchical and stereotypical thinking and use of horde instincts, that can be mobilized and manipulated so as to make us act aggressively and dehumanize "enemies." These are not only important new insights for understanding authoritarian regimes and leadership (such Pol Pot Cambodia) or even elected democratic leadership face in using and manipulating our inborn tendencies and the challenge even democracies face continuous civilizing projects.
This post-liberal materialistic (in our extended sense) vision of democracy sees private control over productive property not as a salutary barrier to the pretensions of the state, but as a bedrock of economic dependency and an obstacle to popular sovereignty
(Bowels and Gintis, 1987:179).

Social democracy considers that the universal ideals of democracy and human rights in no way be achieved for all citizens under the conditions of social and economic inequality and poverty. It, therefore, stresses that the state has to fulfill not only civil and political rights but also social, economic and cultural rights. In order to enable democratic conditions for active citizenship, the Nepalese citizens of various positions require different policies for equitable and just distribution of resources through a thriving public sector, full employment and a support to the welfare state. In this context, the helpless and oppressed in Nepal and elsewhere require not only protection, but also additional opportunities so that democracy creates level playing field for all for life chances and equal participation in public life rather than creating winners and losers.

Also losers do need to have any stake in the political system, otherwise democracy becomes a game of power-specializing elites and political and constitutional stability cannot be guaranteed. Sustainable economic growth requires ecological and social support, political stability and good governance. Social justice requires substantial democratization of political power, investment in job-creation, ways to address violence against women, children and other vulnerable groups, good health and educational services, disability support, critical development infrastructures and redistribution of vital resources – in order to fulfill basic livelihoods of all Nepalese. Some interests are non-negotiable such as basic needs while others rest on matters of individual choice—like professional job preference. The creation of a system of collective decision-making by extensive citizen engagement requires certain preconditions: equal votes, effective participation in decision-making, enlightened understanding, and final control of the agenda by citizens and inclusiveness of all adult members (Dahl, 1985:59-60) in public affairs.

There are three different modes of achieving public goods: "through the market, when it is a question of procuring goods and services to be procured against payment; through the states, when it is a question of public goods which will benefit all and must if necessary be procured through instruments of power; and through the civil society when it is a question of collective goods whose procurement is to be facilitated through a voluntary act of solidarity on the part of society" (Meyer, 2005:16). The World Summit for Social Development that took place in 1995 was an important milestone conference. The Summit participants found a convergence of postliberal and social democracy on poverty alleviation, productive employment, social protection, social dialogue and right to work - as mutually supporting strategies for democracy and civilized life. This recognition should be remembered. Coping with structural change requires support for the lifelong learning, including the learning of public policy by all citizens, young and old, women and men, urbanites and rural dwellers.

Nepal's Democratic Choice: Combining Post-Liberal and Social?
Nepal's hobbled transformation from civil war to peace presupposes transformation of the organization of the state, of the political parties and of civil society. Such a transformation would enable control of the fragmented means of violence, its regulation and the building up mechanisms of national and popular sovereignty and effective democratic oversight. Nepal's stratified society was integrated through a civil code that occupational groups and the terms for exchange of services based on notions of the pure and impure. This functional, but hierarchical system continues to collapse since the 1950s, and is giving way to a highly segmented society with 103 ethnic and caste groups, over 90 languages and several religious groups.

This diversity offers a highly plural system of beliefs and practices and exceedingly varied nature of political parties, public spheres, Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), NGOs and a civil society. Nepal's uneven social macrocosm does not offer any reasonably just order for the enjoyment of equal liberty as underlined in the constitution. The political accommodation of these societies in the state is a crucial strategy for the formation of a national community and for the safeguard of constitutional stability. The other coin of this social diversity is caste, class and gender asymmetry that pervades all 74 political parties and their multiple channels of political communication. Nearly half of Nepal's population lives below poverty line having less than $1 a day. This condition of structural injustice reflects unequal control over both economic and political resources and, consequently, offering

a favorable climate for exaggerated political promises, escalating violence and different conflicts that feed one another. Without a strong base of ecological, social, economic, educational and material prosperity, which only comes from broadening asset ownership, productive participation, business energy, enterprise development, ethics and accountability, it would be difficult to create a real stake in democracy of the numerical majority, who belongs to the powerless sections of society.

In Nepal, each political party defines democracy in its own way. The Unified Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) has adopted competitive federal people's democratic republic. The CPN-UML has defined *janatako bahudaliya janabad* (people's multi-party democracy), Nepali Congress (NC), Madhesi Jana Adhikar Forum (MJAF) and Tarai-Madhesh Loktantrik Party (TMLP) favor multi-verse of social democracy. Rastriya Prajatantra Party and Rastriya Janashakti Party (RJP) prefer liberal democracy and Rastriya Prajatantra Party-Nepal is demanding liberal democracy with constitutional monarchy and a referendum on federalism, secularism and monarchy.

A group of left intellectuals associated with various parties is debating on deliberative and even participatory democracy. The means used to achieve these laudable goals also vary. There is poor coordination of goals and means, accountability and feedback. The UCPN (Maoist) led coalition government who resigned in April 2009, became fragile due to mutually fighting between the political parties in the coalition, who are caught in the differences between individual personalities who harbor fear of each other. Some of the UCPN (Maoist)'s radical and necessary policy initiatives also faced staunch, open and hidden opposition among old and new elites. The UCPN (Maoist) is therefore, for strategic reasons, parading revolutionary fusion of three fronts—government, parliament and street for a desirable synergy in making new constitution, state restructuring, peace and social transformation. The "old" mainstream parties who are part of this power equation are worried, and their fears are sought aggravated by powerful geopolitical and conservative players. The parties have to coach their resistance in an acceptable language, and react by demanding the Maoists to abide by the spirit of Comprehensive Peace Agreement, human rights and democratic norms.

Generating a legitimate compromise on interest, ideology and identity for a new social contract requires a rational strategy as democratic politics is about negotiation, compromise and non-violent resolution of conflict. For such a rational strategy to emerge, the political culture has to be changed from patronage-based system to modern civic ones. The Nepalese politicians, therefore, must reach a consensus on whether they want parliamentary form of government or presidential so that rules of the game can be easily defined through new constitution for the forms of political system and government.

Nepal's endorsement of civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights, core labor standards, social charter of South Asia, Beijing Declaration on Women and the Kyoto Protocol, etc reflects its non-negotiable commitment to social justice, the lynchpin of social democracy. The Interim Constitution of Nepal has further expanded the concept of social rights by including right to work, education, health, basic needs, etc. During the UN World Summit in 2005 Nepal along with the heads of states and governments of the world promised to "make the goals of full and productive employment and decent work for all, including for women and young people, a central objective of their relevant national and international policies as well as national development strategies" (Somavia:2008:2).

To manage its segmented political culture, Nepal has steadily moved to a mix of inclusive and con-sociational mode of power-sharing[12] through the Grand Alliance of Seven-Party plus CPN (Maoist) in April 2006 mass movement for democracy, Six-party Alliance led by Unified CPN (Maoist) following the election of CA in April 2008 and 22-party Alliance led by CPN-UML. The mixed system

---

[12] The new political dispensation of Nepal bears many mixed elements of inclusive and con-sociational democracy. They are: group identity and autonomy, multi-party polity, grand coalition government, proportional sharing of executive and legislative powers, interest in strong bi-cameral legislature, federalism, proportional election system and a culture of compromise. The theory of ideal-type con-sociational democracy is articulated by Arndt Lijphart as a means to accommodate segmented societies. But, its critics argue that "group autonomy can deepen uncompromising attitudes which in turn will make power-sharing arrangements unstable and short-lived" (Hueglin, 2003:69).

of electoral representation has, however, produced a very unstable politics as Nepalese politics moved from consensus to concertation, competition and confrontation now. Difficulty in the negotiation of multi-party interest continues to affect constitution drafting, bring the peace process to a logical end and resolve the contesting issues of federalism, form of government, integration of Maoist combatants and peace and justice building measures.

The post-CA election environment expressed these various visions of democracy in Nepal. It mirrors the diverse identity of political parties as they are rooted in the politics of social difference rather than national cohesion and national identity. The consensus of current political establishment on the cancellation of the National Day strongly reflects this mood of segmentation and reactive "re-tribalization." Identity politics, the demand of the people for group rights, however, reflects a mix of ideas, both ancient notions of liberty, the Gorkhali proto-modern notion of *jat* and more recent modern ideas of culture and territory as the basis for a collective right. Liberty of the modern[13] age is elaborated mostly in terms of individual autonomy, equality of opportunity, the rule of law and conscious human action. The process of human development is fostering cultural changes toward greater individual autonomy, erosion of traditional basic religious values and beliefs, opening the possibility of gender equality, racial equality and a democratic political culture.

The assertion of group rights in Nepal springs from three modern conditions: inability of the state to represent all citizens due to its growing internationalization; weakness of the intellectual classes to confront the challenges of modernity; and opportunity provided by the international community to foster post-modern segmented human rights that are group-based. Exclusive claims are proving effective vehicles for ethnic and communal organization and mobilization, but the total ethnification of politics becomes "a liability for quick consolidation of democracy" (Dieckhoff, 2003:273) in a culturally plural society like Nepal. Ethnic movement and ethno-nationalists have become a sub-regional political "epidemic", forming an axis from the Myanmar and Chittagong Hill Tracts, through India's North East, and Nepal, and southwards through the Central Indian Tribal Belt (Bleie, 2005: 93-139). As long as Nepalese leaders continue to indulge in state restructuring (through mainly ethnic mobilization) than in building state sovereignty, they cannot construct a national political community and switch the loyalties of citizens from family, clan, lineage, tribe, religion and region to the state, overcoming current security failures and repairing the rule of law deficit and de-linking criminal activities from politics. The continuing culture of impunity and recent proliferation of non-state armed groups indicates this fact.

The state-society congruence is essential for nation-building, and it establishes inclusive means and guarantees the rights of also the twenty left-out small minorities in the CA. But singularity of identify is making Nepal more inflammable.

And quite a number of political movements and power relationships are entangled in sub-regional flows of political ideologies, arms and people. The society is also increasingly defined by powerful extra-territorial forces. Nepal cannot escape from a consideration of post-state constitutionalism. As we have already underlined, ecological, economic, technological and ideological spheres are not coterminous to Nepal's territorially-defined state. This situation has posed difficulties for the Nepalese political system in maintaining internal cohesion and external adaptation. The latter reflects that powerful external forces indulge in system change and create an artificial power equation through persuasion, the sheer use of leverage and manipulation of sub-systemic actors of society.

In multi-ethnic states, external actors find in ambitious local elites a leeway to intrumentalize cultural differences of the nation, to expand their political constituency and tear apart state-society ties.

---

[13] "Modern politics rested on a notion of individual autonomy and treated political and social relationships as the self-interested constructions of autonomous agent: their individuality was expressed in the language of rights and the most characteristic modern regime (though not the only possible one) would be a broadly liberal arrangement, permitting the continued exercise of an extensive a set of individual rights as possible. Ancient politics lacked the idea of rights, insisting on the power of the citizen body, acting collectively to determine all aspects of people's lives" (Tuck, 1999:1).

This is not an argument for repression of new and reconstituted ethnic or regional diversity, and for a re-imposition of the homogenous Hindu-based nationalism that has already been contested now. Nepal has not been able to maintain governmental and political stability and address the collective and justified struggle of various groups of society. A judicious balance of geopolitical interest is crucial to prevent serious security dilemmas, centrifugal elements and impending anarchy.

Key Principles and Mechanisms of Democracy
Only a democratic state that is not as Gandhi said – the dictatorship of a majority of 51 per cent - can defend the human rights of its citizens because it retains certain degree of power independent of the dominant classes of any society and allow citizens' voice against external encroachment. The state capacity is closely related to its autonomy and embeddedness in the general interest of the society. But, the means of democracy must be compatible for its ends of human struggle for a wider freedom, genuine participation and a dignified life. This requires timely positive change. Ironically, change does not come easily. Nepal's political culture still transmits a general distrust of authority, citizens' general lack of confidence in the leadership and harbors a culture of confrontation rather than compromise.

Similarly, its political sphere is marked by phenomenal rise of protest that keeps public confidence in the country's investment climate very low, and government's authority corroding. The high participation of citizens and the low institutionalization of political parties (including inner-party democracy) and of civil society - has increasingly made civic engagement anomic and extra-constitutional. The radicalization of public sphere is eroding the social base of the traditional parliamentarian political parties and giving birth to partial associations, lineage groups, regional associations and several revolutionary groups. These are the reflections of pre-democratic politics rather than civic culture. Nepali politics also lacks a boundary between the private and the public. Nepalese leaders' power-monopolizing tendencies, also devoid of democratic values - has helped to maintain a culture of impunity for powerful interest groups in the country and postponed justice to the powerless sections of society. The militarization of the youth wings of parties has caused a decline of human rights standards and eroded the concept of public security. This concept of public security is so vital for ordinary citizens to liberate themselves from primordial fears and basic needs deficit. Modern democracy espouses the following principles and institutions that are also crucial for Nepal:

Horizontal Separation of Power
Security and rule of law are intimately connected to the management of a government with different centers (poly-centric) and different levels (multi-level) of governance. Democracy requires a constitutional state, having division of power among various branches of government within the system such as legislature, executive and judiciary and the state, market and civil society at the horizontal level, in order to control the abuse of power. The representative branch helps to coordinate the acquisition, use and transfer of power. Tolerance to dissent and a legitimate opposition in the parliament are essential preconditions for control of government's power and for maintaining public oversight and transparency. Lack of any respect for opposition in Nepal has, however, inspired parliamentary, extra-parliamentary, extra-constitutional and anti-systemic opposition and has seriously weakened the ability of the political system to maintain democratic balance.
The legitimacy of modern laws springs from the reasoned participation or deliberations of citizens, from consensus and humanitarian spirit. Deliberation is based on reasoning and justification, the legal profession being a classical example of a deliberative tradition.

There are two ways of achieving consent-- dialogue and consensus or debate and voting democracy. Such consensus-based democracy, through talking things through, has a long tradition in Asia and Africa. Autonomy and impartiality of judiciary offers a guarantee against the abuses of government authority, the infringement on human rights of citizens and ensure balanced representation of the relevant interests of society. Maintaining the autonomy of the judiciary and its power of judicial

review are crucial test of the constitutionality of executive or legislative action. Nepal also needs a marked improvement in civil-military relations for long-term security and stability of the nation.

Full civilian control over the army, an army representative of the population (in terms of caste, ethnicity and region) and at least - some level of integration of those Maoist soldiers into the Nepalese Army who fit the standards- are all crucial elements for such an improvement to really take place. Likewise, the state institutions, including the bureaucracy, police and army and the economy are permeated by clientalist and semi-feudal relations, further weakening the Nepali state by yielding its autonomy to interest groups (Wimmer, 2002:93). These challenges have to be addressed immediately in order to make the polity a public good cherished by all citizens.

Vertical Devolution of Power

The constitutional state is a guardian of society, and must create several vertical structures for the exercise of power and valid legal regulation of society. In a democracy, affected people have the right to participate in the decision-making. Verticality applies the principle of so-called subsidiarity. This term means, that decisions are made as close to the citizens as possible, based on local deliberation where options for collective action are discovered. This way, democracy is built from the bottom up, that is from the villages, urban neighborhoods and locally elected village officials and up. The aim of verticality lies in fostering local responsibilities at the base and to allow citizens to exercise decentralized self-governance.

The Interim Constitution spells out provisions for state restructuring in order to address the caste, ethnic, gender and regional disparity. But there is a contest among the parties as to how to go about restructuring and redistribution of central, federal and local power, resources, authority and responsibility and how set sound mechanisms for conflict resolution. Citizens have both the right and duty to participate in national, federal and local governments through various civic agencies and maintain unity among social and cultural diversity.

The right of citizens to decide their own destiny is a criterion for ensuring responsibility for governing themselves. Lower tiers of self-governance not only provide effective check on power. These tiers also deepen democracy at grassroots level. Nepal has, however, yet to seriously debate on the sharing of power by the vertical institutions of society, on how to formulate consensual laws about it and to institutionalize peace and development through local democratic bodies, be it within a framework of a federative or unitary state model.

Circulation of Elites and Renewal of Authority

Elections constitute a vital link between all citizens and those who at any time are in political power. Public financing of periodic free and fair election is justified on the ground that it circulates new elites into the political system and gives democracy new leadership, dynamism and also some degree of continuity. It also renews the legitimacy of political system and provides opportunities for critical reflection on campaigns and new policies. Sovereignty belongs to Nepali citizens. Therefore, the National Election Commission periodically organizes elections to realize this principle and legitimize public power. Nepal's new mixed election system has brought its social diversity into political power. In the 601-member CA, 240 members are directly elected, 335 through proportional election system and 26 are nominated by the cabinet on the basis of recommendation of political parties. The multiple ways of leadership selection has, however, freed the nominated leaders from electoral control, and provided opportunity to the popularly rejected ones to capture the governmental power. It has weakened the autonomy of politics from powerful interest groups.

Most of Nepalese politicians have often demonstrated a sheer lack of interest in public policy. They are more interested in development project that can help them to expand their political constituencies, through patronage and prevent the opportunity for the rise of non-elites. The politicians are also nurturing close clientelistic relations with the top-rung of bureaucrats, who are reportedly quite corrupted (Transparency International-Nepal, 2008). These cross-cutting clientelistic ties have blurred

the boundary between the executive responsibility of leadership for development and the legislative branches of the government, in formulating policies that are appropriate in the Nepalese context.

The erosion of political ideology has created an enlightenment deficit and increased the cost of cooperation at the intra-party level. Similarly, deterministic thinking rooted in class, ethnic and market fundamentalism and territoriality, rather than in nationality, has prevented the possibility of national cooperative action among the political classes other than crude, power-sharing ones. Modern democratic processes - participatory and deliberative, are rooted into citizenship rights. As we have highlighted earlier, the governed people are not only subject to the laws, but also authors of laws. Therefore, procedures of making decisions depend on voluntary and reasoned consent of women and men, young and old, hills people and plains people in order to ensure the justness of those decisions (Lafont, 2006:5).

Political Expression
Political parties are the central organization of political decision-making in a democracy having pluralist responsibility. Out of 74 political parties in Nepal, 54 of them contested the CA elections while 25 have been represented in the CA. These parties reflect various sizes, ideologies, interests and identities. Parties act as "transmitters" of people's interest between society to "the political circuit" of parliament-government-state axis. They also provide feedback on official policies, mobilize and socialize diverse peoples into citizens, collect and articulate their demands and elect leadership. Parties formulate alternative programs and transform pre-political forces into a vibrant and varied political culture of the whole country. These functions are essential to build national identity. Open and democratic parties are the very backbone of peaceful political life. But, Nepal's partisan politics has fragmented the political sphere and integrated vertically subsidiary groups and sister organizations with dominant institutions of society rather than providing them "relative autonomy." Such autonomy is quite necessary, in order to work as "a communication belt" between the social and political organizations and represent the collective intellectual life of society.

Nepal's condition, as it comes to ecological, social and inter-generational justice, is less than satisfactory. Gender justice is slowly increasing, through political representation and improvement in various spheres of life. But still much oppression and suffering are not articulated in public life, sexual violence both during the conflict and after remains a taboo, leaving many women and their children to suffer silently. Similarly, most of Nepal's political parties do not have programmes that express the interests of the country's social diversity, rather than just ideological expressions of particular class. Also, as we have already underlined, they have yet to overcome the burden of past political culture of personalization of leadership, factionalism, clientelism and weak to resolve the problem of collective action. As a result, they have yet to enter into the double process of politicization of people into citizens and socialization of the state so that it stands for public transparency and accountability. The transformation of authoritarian leaders to mass membership-based parties (Meyer, 2007) is essential to enhance their democratic credentials. The social movements of *Dalits*, *Janajatis*, *Aadibasis*, women, students, workers and professional groups are politicizing new welfare and discriminatory issues and demanding equity, inclusion and distributive justice. These movements show diversity in collective forms of expression, also incorporating semi-traditional modes and are likely to foster a listening culture - across various levels of party committees. They will be instrumental in democratizing party structures and link the social sphere to political system.

Mediation of Power
The establishment of democracy in Nepal has contributed to the proliferation of freedom of expression and association. Citizens have begun to organize themselves into civic groups for the articulation of their collective interests. But, they must foster a balance between order and freedom, law and politics and rights and duties. At a time when family has become less effective in political socialization and

transmission of norms (Almond, 2002:203), peer group socialization lacks a sense of history. At the same time, religious values are contested by media, and patriotism is replaced by radicalism.

Only greater emphasis on a duty-based civil society and public sphere - can ignite hope of civic renewal for democratic character. Civil society groups, situated between the family and state, are expected to perform a number of critical functions. They should project and protect the rights of those citizens who are left out by political and economic institutions of society. Also they should educate citizens to carry out their roles in democracy, respect authority and decolonize the life-world (Habermas, 1987) through public communication and rational formation of collective will. Finally, they should exert a democratizing influence on representative institutions.

The arbitrary use of power by interest groups, political parties, economic institutions and the government must be checked and democracy deepened through networks, trusts, and other initiatives. In a conflict-torn complex society like Nepal, civil society has additional responsibilities: mediate the social interests of a series of mini-publics and generate more democratic impulses for cooperative social action.

Bulk of civil society groups and NGOs in Nepal are subsidized by the donors, and hence subjected to international policies. Therefore, they have failed to become autonomous bodies capable of self-accountability. As a result, execution of development policy through partisan NGOs and civil society groups has fostered a clientelistic culture and has served the interest of organized groups of society than the needy citizens. In the context of group-enclosed civil society, the collective struggle of dispossessed represents major forms of efforts to protect the life-world and to achieve social transformation. Social democratization of intermediary associations including civil society is essential to renew the power of society to self-organize and articulate and redefine ecological, social, economic, education and health policies. An improvement of human capacities in the transition from school education to work, social inclusion and integration (especially for disadvantaged groups) are essential in order to remove inequities and injustices in the system and increase the resiliency of democratic polity.

Political Communication

The society, the public sphere and the interest groups create a "fourth estate," that should try to check the abuse of government power and educate the public about the importance of their participation in constitutional and political debates and generate politics that is relevant for public opinion. Young people of both sexes need constitutional education to engage in public discussion about whether laws work badly, or whether they are unjust and how they can be changed (Crick, 2004:79). Free, fair and plural media is a lynchpin of democracy as it helps citizens to critically reflect about their conditions, enable them to understand responsibility about how to organize responsible actions. Such media provide them with regular opportunities to help setting the public agenda, making informed choices on public affairs, discovering common interests, reaching society-wide consensus on common good and also actually protecting the activities of the opposition parties (Kyogoku,1987:200).

The government has promulgated Right to Information Act to allow Nepalese citizens' free access to competing information. The Act is meant to establish the transparency and accountability of policy and decision-making bodies including the access of public in matters of their shared commonwealth. But, the structural condition of Nepal, especially the existence of poverty, illiteracy and geographical remoteness has made media distribution highly skewed and has delayed peoples' transformation from passive subjects into active citizen. At a time when the importance of family, school and religious institutions in political socialization of youth[14] is declining, Nepalese media has to play active role in framing the public agenda and informing and engaging the public in decisions that affect their lives, liberty, property and identity.

---

[14] "The emotional youth of today probably derive their feeling of grievance from an awareness of the threat looming over the whole world, in which sense of feeling of victimization might well be called the spirit of the modern age" (Doi, 1973:26).

In a free public sphere, media, the key agencies of socialization and cultural industries, are critical aspect of knowledge building, policy mediation and social change. Democratization and decentralization of media from urban concentration to remote rural areas help increase citizens' access to decision-making on public affairs, integrate the excluded into the public sphere and awaken in people a "we feeling" of a national community.

Journalists and media, as a part of an enlightened public, must have the willingness to learn and hold the capacity of criticism of the working of power in society (Habermas, 1996:378). In other words, in building civic competence of citizens media has to assume a number of functions. The media must nurture political interest of citizens to participate in politics and to perform their civic duties of volunteerism during elections and societal engagement. And more so, the media should instill in citizens a sense of capacity to influence public policies and provide exposure to what we have chosen to call the multi-verse of democracy. Through this exposure, they can choose the best one on the basis of real public preference. Critical information and news emanating from reading habits, debates, discussions and reflections help the formation of informed choice on public issues.

Democracy and Conflict Resolution

Political violence undermines currently hard-won democratic principles and institutions. Peaceful resolution of conflicts over more narrowly-defined interests, ideologies and identities - are essential aspects of democracy building - as it fosters political dialogue among groups for common ground, negotiation, compromise and social change. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed in November 2006 has underlined measures for the normalization of situation, integration of CPN (Maoist) combatants, justice, social and economic reforms and reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction measures. But, many institutional pillars of peace[15] have yet to be set up to expedite the processes of reconciliation, reconstruction, rehabilitation and rebuilding of a shared future. Three main types of conflict in Nepal are:

Interest-Based conflict: Interest based conflict is amenable to unproblematic resolution through certain compromise, a mutually advantageous bargain and sharing of scarce resources. Actors in a conflict recognize the commonality of interests and devise a mutually acceptable formula for a negotiated outcome. In the process of bargaining, a sharable collective good is produced. The social conflicts that engulf women and men, young and old, Dalits and higher-castes, workers and employers, landless and landowners - can be termed as interest based - as their struggles are seeking distributional justice and ending discrimination. Only by moving from lofty and un-committing problem-solving debates to concrete, committing debates that are decisive for "changing the rules of the game" of state and non-state institutions - can we generate relevant public policies that can resolve the issue of distributional justice (Habermas, 1996:367).

Ideological Conflict: Ideological conflict is based on opposing conceptions of public goods, rights claims, values and worldviews. Due recognition of each other's views can offer scope for reciprocal perspective taking and entering into a common understanding of the situation for conflict resolution. Negotiated constitution can offer a solution to the diversity of ideological identities of Nepalese parties. Their conflict over certain social, economic and political policies can be termed as ideological ones. Mutual perspective taking can moderate the behavior of ideological groups and enable them to enter into a situation of win-win outcome.

---

[15] Establishment of Disappearance Commission, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, State Restructuring Commission, Monitoring Committee for the Effective Implementation of the Peace Accord and other Agreements and a High Level Peace Commission.

Identity-based conflict: Identity-based conflict is intractable as actors in conflict deny the legitimate interest and position of others and maximize its won. Common identity within the same group fosters internal unity and external hostility and conflict. The inter-ethnic politics in Nepal is increasingly becoming a vicious contest in extremes. Identity affects the level of civic participation and capacity to make choice about politics. Ethnic, indigenous Tharus and Madhesi peoples' conflict can be labeled as identity-based. Nepal Federation of Ethnic Groups and Nationalities (NEFIN), an umbrella organization of various ethnic groups of Nepal, has openly declared itself to disengage from Hindu culture, Nepali language and Sanskritic worldview and struggling for a culture of difference. Indigenous Tharus wants a separate identity away from Madhesis and opposed the concept of single Madhesh. Madeshi parties of all hues—Madhesi Jana Adhikar Forum (MJAF), Tarai-Madhesh Loktantrik Party (TMLP) and Sadbhavana Party-- prefer a separate identity for whole Tarai. All the left parties of Nepal have unanimously opposed this in favor of multi-federal schemes for power sharing for Tarai, the southern flatland.

Recognition of group identities and group rights and overlapping consensus in the framework of a democratic state is expected to resolve identity conflicts. "Bridges across social or political cleavages may facilitate the development of tolerance, trust, reciprocity, accommodation and cooperation" (Malony and Stevension, 2003:189). Conflict resolution at the identity levels equally requires moderating and bridging social capital across identity groups. Similarly, optimization of actors of conflict in Nepal requires a multi-party mechanism to implement the peace accord, peace monitoring, all-party mechanism, justice to victims, de-radicalization of politics and general commitment to the fundamentals of human rights, democracy, rule of law, press freedom, autonomy of judiciary and good governance. Nepal has to overcome five defects of its political life for the institutionalization of democracy: the lacking of access of all citizens to the institutional resources of the state; extra-constitutional claims to power, the erosion on legitimate monopoly on power of state; non-representative power structures and defects on the mode of governance (Meyer, 2004:34-35) so as to be able to strengthen the very institutional base of democracy.

Conclusion

We started this essay by stating that democracy is the synthesis of ideals of many societies. Nepal is still in a transition phase of democratization. It has to stake out its own path, in a social landscape that is as diverse and composite as Nepal's unique ecology. Many Nepalese over the last 60-years have given their best years and scarified their lives for the ideals of democracy or for a classless society. The struggle for substantive democracy in Nepal has entered a new phase from April 2006 mass movement and the unprecedented historical changes that followed. Now, years later, it is necessary for all actors in Nepalese society and supportive of Nepalese society to come to terms why the state and society even today is so deeply steeped in attitudes that make institutions and political practice undemocratic, and peace-building piece-meal at best.

In the preceding pages we have discussed the contradictions, shortcomings and some golden rays of progress in this critical phase of democratic transition; we characterized the basics of any democracy. We made an initial remark about the critical importance of building a new virtuous *dharma* of popular sovereignty and state sovereignty, if Nepal is to remain a territorial state with an intact polity. Without this double-sided "finely woven fabric" of sovereignty of both "horizontal and vertical threads", the state can not remake pre-existing and unequal ties of citizens, redistribute power among all social classes and become an effective mediator that also nourish civil solidarity. The specific configuration of geopolitics, regional and global social movements and interstate organizations that we have outlined in some detail, "tear and wear this fabric" and create destabilizing strains between "threads" of popular sovereignty and of state sovereignty.

A major current challenge for both state and non-state actors it to engage in an open, reasoned debate of what should be the foundational values of the national community and stimulate a real wish for a collective life as Nepalese. The current political mood is rather to claim a singular ethnic or regional identity. For Nepal to remain not only intact, but regain stability and become an important

reference point for its citizens, people must attach greater importance on many cross-cutting ties - or threads to use our fabric symbolism - in order to strengthen sovereignty in a balanced manner. So people if asked and for example will answer: "I am a Mager and a Nepalese" or "I am a Nepalese from Mahadesh", we should be cautious not to conclude that in the first case a communitarian identify is dominant over national community, unlike in the second case. People need a real choice about which belongingness they will give primacy to, when deciding their solidarity and support in concrete matters, be it a matter of support for an important constitutional reform or support for a proposed hydropower project.

Politicians, civil society and media have to shoulder the responsibility so people's perceived choices as it comes to political alternatives are not narrowed down to singular identities, be the membership based on ethnic or religious grounds or on gender or region etc. Any political demands have to become part of "a political culture of listening", through democratic debates and negotiations, rather than through un-discriminatory use of strikes, lethal violence, rumor mongering or authoritarian leadership styles.

Being in a dire situation, Nepal need to steer its course to a wanted collective future, guided by a balanced view of its own political history as a state and as a conglomerate of *jats* (whose stakes in the Hindu state has differed) and a self-reflective understanding of how the past with its caste, ethnic and gender hierarchies, patronage forms and semi-feudal practices continue to pervade parties across the political spectrum and also the organizational culture of all state institutions. A society can not smash its past or radically breakaway from it, through means of oversimplified black and white political rhetoric and ideology, exaggerated political promises, or through escalating violence. In a semi-feudal, war-torn country like Nepal, the challenge is not simply one of rebuilding state institutions that treated people as unequal citizens or even treated many as subjects only. The greater challenge is to painstakingly remake state institutions, making their decisions trustworthy and binding and fit to even out unequal property relations, and to undertake service delivery reconstruction, stabilization and peace building measures.

We have also in this essay undertaken a critical examination of the on the negative consequences of the so-called Washington Consensus. The crisis of legitimacy of this neo-liberal compact, might be good news to Nepal in the longer run, as there is a glimmer of hope for a new global agreement based on greater equity, and mutual adjustment between capital and labor, and a break-away from the current capitalist economy with its inbuilt "roller-coaster" tendencies. It is the neo-liberal macro-economic policies that has informed international assistance to Nepal and contributed to the continued condition of scarcity and economic insecurity in Nepal after the 1990 mass movement. This condition has been a hindrance for any guarantee for increasing individual freedom and autonomy. Nor has it promoted democracy, as a healthy community of citizens (polity). In a developing country like Nepal, citizens' common good should have primacy over narrow profit making choices or the private interest of consumers.

We have in this essay made an effort to highlight the synthesis of democratic models that to our best understanding are relevant for Nepal's current cross-roads and the path onward for building a democratic and just and peaceful society and state institutions. In what we have called the multiverse of democracy - or in literary language – if we imagine all the different kinds of democratic models with their underpinning ideologies as twinkling stars on the sky – then two stars shine brighter than the others. These are post-liberal democracy and social democracy.

Post-liberal democracy must balance individual rights with a proportionate recognition of group rights. Any expansion of property rights, and expanded state power to curb pollution and other environmentally destructive practices that are threatening to destroy our collective future, has to be democratically accountable to the public. Our vision of a post-liberal democracy is unmistakably building on aspirations of the liberal era itself, yet it breaks sharply with the liberal tradition in two important respects.

We understand this vision as representing the individual as an intrinsically social and moral being, actively engaged in the continual transformation of one's own and others' capacities, sentiments

and attachments; and who sees oneself as part of the animal world instead as of as standing above the animal world. Our position also builds upon recent recognition in political theory and in cognitive science of the very conditions of being a free human being. In this republican understanding, no one is free if she or he is subject to somebody else's arbitrary power. This position demands of the state active removal of structural injustice, so we can all exercise our relatively free will. So this republican theory, demands much more of the state than simply noninterference.

Social democracy considers that the universal ideals of democracy and human rights in no way be achieved for all citizens under the conditions of social and economic inequality and poverty. It therefore, stresses that the state has to fulfill not only civil and political rights but also social, economic and cultural rights. In order to enable democratic conditions for active citizenship, the Nepalese citizens of various positions require different policies for equitable and just distribution of resources through a thriving public sector, full employment and a support to the welfare state. In this context, the helpless and oppressed in Nepal and elsewhere require not only protection, but also additional opportunities so that democracy creates level playing field for all for life chances and equal participation in public life rather than creating winners and losers.

The central challenges to Nepalese democracy today are to find a common commitment to a negotiated constitutionalism, to bind citizens and leaders by common authority of laws, and develop a set of institutions and rules which can effectively protect rights of citizens, elicit their active participation in public spheres and peacefully manage conflicts arising our of diversity. A constitution can only be a living document if it can adapt to national needs of the present and future generations and captures the spirit of the age by taking into account post-state constitutional imperatives of human security. As we have underlined, informed civic participation of citizens in the public life of society is the heart of democracy. Active citizens' engagement has consequence for the exercise of power by leadership and shape policy decisions and political culture.

Bureaucratic mode of top-down, elite-controlled and non-voluntary participation in policy formulation and implementation does not foster civic competence of citizens. Enlightenment of society through civic education is expected to expand the concept of rights from civil and political spheres to ecological, social, economic and cultural dimensions, and to transform multiple identities of Nepalese peoples into citizens. This will also contribute to greater social justice. As a duty-bearer, the state must have the legitimate monopoly on power to establish checks in the system, perform key governance functions and realize the rights of citizens. In Nepal, social inclusion has become a major theme of discourse in state institutions, political parties and civil society. This demands inner and intra-party democracy. We hope our outline of political ideologies and of the expanded meaning of democracy, based on the complementarity of the post-liberal republican model and of social democracy can give some pointers to Nepal's political actors. The Nepalese political parties have to come to terms with the importance of a viable common vision of democratic future, in order to liberate the future political order from systemic conflicts we have outlined and to build civic virtues in Nepal's diverse citizens and leadership.

References

Acharya, Meena, et al. 2009. *Caste, Ethnic and Gender Dimensions of Nepal's Population: A Statistical Analysis, 1991-2001*, Kathmandu: TPAMF.

Almond, Gabriel, A. 2002. *Ventures in Political Science: Narratives and Reflections*, Boulder: Lynne
        Rienner Publishers.

Arendt, Hannah. 2005. *The Promise of Politics*, New York: Shocken Books.

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

Barber, Benjamin. 2009. "A Revolution in Spirit," *The Nation*, February 9.

Bleie, Tone and Lok Bhattarai. 2002. "Sovereignty and Honours as a Redistribute Process: An
    Ethnohistory of the Temple Trust of Manakamana in Nepal", *European Bulletin of Himalayan Research*,
    No. 23,

Bleie, Tone. 2005. *Tribal Peoples, Nationalism and the Human Rights Challenge: The Adivasis of
    Bangladesh*, Dhaka: The University Press Ltd.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1987. *Democracy and Capitalism*, London: Routledge and Kegan
    Paul.

Burghart, Richard. 1996. *The Conditions of Listening*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, Robert. 1999. "Integration and Disintegration," *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 10, No. 1, January.

Crick, Bernard. 2004. "Politics as a Form of Rule: Politics, Citizenship and Democracy, " ed. Adrian
    Leftwich, *What is Politics?* Cambirdge: Polity Press.

Dahl, Robert A. 1985. *A Preface to Economic Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dieckhoff, Alain. 2003. "Nationalism," ed. Roland Axtmann, *Understanding Democratic
    Politics: An Introduction*, London: Sage Publications.

Doi, Takeo. 1973. *The Anatomy of Dependence*, Tokyo: Kodansa International.

Guyer, Paul. 2008. *Kant*, London: Routledge.

Habermas, Jurgen. 2006. *The Divided West*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 2001. *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*, Cambridge: The MIT
    Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1987. *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol II*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and
    Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hardin, Garrett. 1968. "The Tragedy of the Commons," *Science*, 162.

Hastie, W. 1891. *Kant's Principles of Politics*, Edinburgh: T. Clark.

Hayek, F. A. 1960. *The Constitution of Liberty*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Held, David. 1987. *Models of Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Held, David. 2000. "Democracy and the Global System," Kate Nash ed., *Readings in
    Contemporary Political Sociology*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hueglin, Thomas O. 2003. "Majoritarianism-Consociationalism," ed. Roland Axtmann,
    Understanding Democratic Politics: An Introduction, London: Sage Publications.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Political Order in Changing Societies*, Bombay: Vakils and
    Feffer and Simons Ltd.

Kyogoku, Jun-ichi, 1987. *The Political Dynamics of Japan*, (translated by Nobutaka Ike), Tokyo:
    University of Tokyo Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to
    Western Thought*. Nye York: Basic Books.

Lafont, Cristina.2006. "Is the Ideal of a Deliberative Democracy Coherent?" eds. Samantha
        Bession and Jose Luis Marti, *Deliberative Democracy and Its Discontents*, UK: Ashgate,
        October.
Leahy, Stephen, 2009. "Global Geopolitics Net Sites," *IPS*, May 7.

Maloney, William A. and Linda Stevenson. 2003. "Social Capital," ed. Roland Axtmann,
        Understanding Democratic Politics: An Introduction, London: Sage Publications.

Mathnews, Jessica. T. 1999. "Power Shift," Robert J Art and Robert Jervis eds. *International Politics*,
        New York: Longman.

Meyer, Thomas. 2004. *Military and Democracy*, Jakarta: FES.

Meyer, Thomas. 2005. *Social and Libertarian Democracy*, Jakarta: FES.

Meyer, Thomas. 2007. *From Authoritarian Leader Party to Mass-Membership Party*, Kathmandu: FES.

Moore, Mike, 2008. "Between Coercion and Contract: Competing Narratives on
        Taxation and Governance,"eds. Deborah Brautigam, Odd-Helge Fjeldstand and Mike Moore,
        Taxation and State-Building in Developing Countries: Capacity and Consent, Cambridge: Cambridge University
        Press.
Myrdal, Gunnar. 1971. *The Challenge of World Poverty*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
        Books Ltd.

Parekh, Bhikhu. 1996. "The Nature of the Modern State," eds. D. L Seth and Ashis
        Nandy, *The Multiverse of Democracy*, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Rawls, John. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Regmi, Mahesh C. 1984. *The State and Economic Surplus,* Varanasi: Nath Publishing House.

Rubin, Barnett R. 2009. "The Politics of Security in Postconflict Statebuilding," eds. Charles T
        Call and Vanessa Wyeth*, Building States to Build Peace*, New Delhi: Viva books.

Rudd, Kevin. 2009. "The Global Financial Crisis," *The Monthly*, October.

Schell, Jonathan. 2009. "Obama and the Return of the Real," *The Nation*, February 9.

Shaw, Martin. 2000. *Theory of the Global State: Globality as an Unfinished Revolution*,
        Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Somavia, Juan. 2008. "ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization,"
        adopted by ILO Conference, Geneva, June 10.

Shrestha, Nanda R. and Dev Raj Dahal. 2008. "Nepal," eds. Guntram H. Herb and David H. Kaplan,
        Nations and Nationalism: A Global Historical Overview, California: ABC-CLIO, INC.

Squires, Judith. 2004. "Politics Beyond Boundaries: A Feminist Perspective," ed.
        Adrian Leftwich, *What is Politics?*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Taylor, Peter J. 1988. *Political Geography: World Economy, Nation-State and Locality*,
        England: Longman Scientific and Technical.

Thierse, Wolfgang. 2009. "What Future Role for the State*," International Policy
        Analysis*, Berlin: FES

Tilly, Charles. 1992. *Coercion, Capital and European States*, AD 990-1990
    Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

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

Ueno, Chizuko. 2004. *Nationalism and Gender*, Melbourne: Transpacific Press.

Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*, California: Addison-Wesley
    Publishing Company.
Wimmer, Andreas. 2002. *Nationalist Exclusion and Ethnic Conflict*, Cambridge:
    Cambridge University Press.

Zurn, Michael. 1999. *The State in the Post-National Constellation-Societal
    Denationalization and Multi-Level Governance*, Arena Working Papers, 99/35.