

Conflict Transformation and Peace in Nepal

Critique and Choices

Dev Raj Dahal, Head, FES

Introduction

The restoration of human responsibility is central to the mediation of disagreement and successful transformation of conflict in every society. This responsibility is based on a general commitment to human rights as it allows a shared understanding of the situation, common field of discourse, a common source of judgment and a common need for a caring society with other human beings. The emerging international order holds the state sovereignty accountable to human rights standard as a key to justice and peace. The essential characteristic of this order is the primacy of universal rights over domestic laws defined through political process and, by implication, gross violation of these rights is subject to humanitarian intervention. This is a marked departure of the traditional version of laws as a prerogative of sovereign state and civil rights of citizens as collectively exercised self-determination of national political community. In normal condition, protection of human rights of citizens is the obligation of state. It is also entitled to civilize the people through education, opportunities, discipline and punishment. Human rights standards seek the conformity of the authority of domestic laws to universal values. But, like laws which involve the ethics of rights and duties, it has yet to create a coherent order and manage the complexity of a multi-polar world.

Conflict transformation in a weak state is affected by the causes of human rights violation as victims of violence demand justice before peace. The example of Nuremberg reflects victors' justice. Peace settlements in Angola and Mozambique provide amnesty with structural reforms. The South Africa's post-apartheid transition has set another principle: agreement on the past for a shared future. Citizens forgave all the past lapses on human rights since they were publicly acknowledged wrongs. But, they did not forget to abolish the culture of impunity and enforce accountability of human rights abuses. Pursuit of transitional justice based on a culture of revenge can easily obstruct a search for post-conflict reconciliation in the same way as the pursuit of peace without addressing the root and proxy causes of conflict. Sometimes, humanitarian intervention often obscures the knotty politics of religion, territoriality and nationality and conflict is enmeshed in the geopolitics of great powers as well as post-modern politics of culture, identity and ethnicity (Shrestha and Dahal, 2008:1809). Effective redressal mechanism, reconciliation and re-socialization can help to organize diversity and prevent conflict (Johnson, 1983:24).

In Nepal, the state sovereignty is bifurcated between conflicting parties and citizens have more interest to the parties in conflict than the political system and state. Erosion of state capacity to organize the societal forces allowed the latter's anti-systemic orientation. Similarly, political system lacks checks and balance as it is controlled by the oligopoly of major political parties. It has fostered a culture of clientalism which continues to erode the base of national identity. This condition has offered an opportunity for the international peace building community to effectively engage in conflict prevention strategies and find "more accountability and proof of impact of peace building interventions" (Paffenholz and Reychler, 2007:29) in order to protect and promote human rights and rebuild the shattered state-society ties. A workable solution to conflict thus requires an understanding of all its internal and external causes in full sociological detail including the duty of state to protect human rights of its population and secure key governance functions. Nepal's policy experts and decision-makers have to acknowledge the missing gaps in systemic thinking about the contesting ideologies of "tribalism, nationalism and human rights" (Bleie, 2005: 48) while applying various methods to conflict transformation.

Party schools of Nepal's left forces continue to utilize the Hegelian dialectic, the transformation of social, economic and political contradictions through continuous development of oppositions and their reconciliation with complex whole, as a tool to open and resolve the contradictions of society and "shape the future as history" (Arendt, 2005:76). Karl Marx's revolutionary promise and action are added into it to initiate historical change. The non-left forces utilize other techniques-- dialogue, the mechanism of reducing contradiction and conflict through communication and negotiation, power balance between powerful actors and even muscular tools. But, none of these methods has provided rational device for lasting transformation of multi-polar and multi-layered conflicts and establish state-society coherence.

Now, the conflict energy generated by state-centric CPN (Maoist)'s People's War¹ for social transformation has spilled across diverse society opening and igniting many fault-line conflicts— ethnic, territorial, caste-based and geopolitical. Its entry into 12-point agreement with the then Seven-Party Alliance for mass movement, Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), interim constitution, interim government and CA subsequently to mark an end to hostilities and participate in a coalition government have not abated the conflict of judgment about the nature of the state, polity, government, army, economy and foreign policy. Similarly, lack of inclusive policy has caused ethno-territorial agitation of Madhesh and hills, social movement of Dalits, trade union, indigenous groups and sovereignty-free violent activities of 109 non-state armed actors. Owing to the deflection of central power of the state to enforce security and order, peace in Nepal's southern and eastern parts, is still fragile. This condition of fragility has offered an opportunity for various disgruntled actors to strike a new bargain. By engaging various groups in talks the government can reconcile the legitimate interest of moderate one and apply hardball tactics to criminals. This will help to compress the deviant actors, abolish the Hobbesian state of nature, achieve the real unity of the state capable of protecting human rights conditions and establishing rule-based governance.

The continuity of structural injustice and sustained resistance against it has set Nepal's democratic struggle in a cyclical pattern within a rough span of 10 years. The social and economic change corresponding to political aspirations, however, reflects only glacial pace and, consequently, failed to sustain the energy of political movement. As the style and outcome of negotiation in each political change was narrowly monopolized by few super individuals and groups the stake of those outside the state power remained very unstable. The cycle of political change in Nepal has been reinforced by a lack of rationalization of new order corresponding to social, economic, technological and institutional requirements of diverse people and its mal-adaptation to emancipatory needs of social movement actors. The fission and fusion of mainstream political parties such as Nepali Congress, Communist Party of Nepal-Unified Marxist Leninist, Rastriya Prajatantra Party, Nepal Sadbhavana Party birth of a number of regional parties such as Madhesi Jana Adhikar Forum (MJAF), MJAF (Democratic), Tarai-Madhesh Loktantrik Party (TMLP) and Sadbhavana Party (SP), etc and the growth of autonomous critical masses of change agents within each sub-system of society aspiring for restructuring of public institutions continue to unravel state-society ties, devitalize the requisite energy for consolidating the change process and delayed a transition from authoritarian politics to civic culture. Why did it happen? Beyond doubt, "Nepal's half-baked democratic experiments have only benefited the political parties and the elites" (Sharma, 2008:154) and therefore, political parties are facing intergenerational, social and gender-related tensions.

The structural rift in Nepalese politics now is so pervasive due to the proliferation of functional interest groups and their anti-institutional social movement that old formula of

¹ The CPN (Maoist) People's War began in April 1996 with the articulation of grievances of people and identification with basic needs fulfillment, national independence, abolition of unequal foreign relations and a new constitution made by an elected Constituent Assembly and motivated diverse groups of society for the creation of revolutionary condition, revolutionary action and revolutionary transformation. The taxing of the state's production, escalation of guerrilla force, adjudication of disputes through People's Courts and expansion of base areas provided it critical resources for conflict escalation and dialectics of political change.

establishing natural law tradition rooted in human nature, the reason of state and the power equation among dominant actors for the sanctification of new *status quo* seem no longer capable to overcome this cycle of change and reconcile human rights and constitutional considerations as National Human Rights Commission finds "protection of criminals by political parties" to maintain a culture of impunity. None of the options seems attuned to cope with the changing context, values, actors, structures, rules and processes underway in Nepal. This paper discusses various modes of conflict transformation in Nepal such as power equation, art of dialectic and social inclusion, articulates the necessity of democratic peace and draws a brief conclusion.

Power Equation

The prime source of conflict in a state of nature is conflicting judgment of actors about their own self-image, perception, character, capabilities and interest and about issues relevant to life, liberty, property and identity of citizens. Rana oligarchy (1846-1950) aligned with British-India utilized imperial method of conflict resolution and emasculated any semblance of dissent. The Panchayat regime (1960-1990) used a soft authoritarianism to co-opt, isolate and silence the opposition to the regime but allowed educational institution as a political barometer of oppositional politics. The successive Nepalese incumbent political classes practiced power equation method following the success of movements of 1950, 1980, 1990 and even 2006 to define the mode of conflict resolution, the last one triggered another set of counter mass mobilization of Madhesis, women, Dalits and ethnic groups for rights, power, resource and identity. The power equation method of conflict transformation reflects the tradition of natural law in which weaker actors are obliged to submit to the hegemony of stronger and dynamic ones for the sake of stability, balance and order. But, it perpetuated the condition of structural injustice on the ground for the weaker and left out actors. The unbound passion of incumbent classes for power and greed for possessions proved the futility of this method as it has distanced them from the legitimate needs of societal forces including those of conflict victims and delayed in establishing several institutional pillars of peace.²

In a power equation method, the role of an internal and external balancer becomes crucial to regulate and control conflict and enforce the rule of law. The power of a balancer rests on its ability to either take the side of weaker actors, or inflict damage to the deviant one if it does not comply or even an incentive of peace dividend for its compliance and restores the balance of power. In Nepal's case, international community legitimately played this role and formulated a compromise formula assuming that internal causes of conflict have geopolitical consequences. As the People's War mushroomed into a major conflict, the diplomatic missions of the UN, the UK, India, Switzerland and Norway applied preemptive diplomacy through back channel communication: by persuading the King, Seven-Party Alliance (SPA) and CPN (Maoist) to stop the escalation of conflict before it becomes irreversible.

As these resources were underutilized by Nepali actors, India owing to its high leverage in major political parties played a role to mediate 12-point agreement between the SPA and CPN (Maoist) in New Delhi to dislodge the King's rule through the mass movement of April 2006. The US, China, Russia, Japan and South Korea reconciled the state sovereignty with democracy but accepted the outcome of change. The success of the movement transformed triangular conflict into bipolar one, suspended the monarchy, brought the army under civilian control and latter declared the country secular, federal democratic republic. The United Mission to Nepal (UNMIN) facilitated the monitoring of human rights, arms and armies and CA election. The new power equation established subsequently, however, demonstrated the neglect of the advise of civil society for peace monitoring and systemic ties of potential and left out actors especially Madhesis, ethnic groups and indigenous

² 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.

peoples in the political system. An underestimation of their ability to disrupt the legitimacy of newly-established political order through distributional struggle and hyper political activism made the constitutional system unstable.

Nepal is a country of minority and there is no institutional mechanism to prevent minority becoming a majority through new constellation in the medium run. Lack of any constitutional mechanism to protect and nourish the interest of minorities increased their antipathy to the hegemony of ruling classes and fuelled the source of conflict. Ethnic and indigenous peoples' struggle in Nepal can be cited as an example as they felt that political authority constituted through elections could not stop the injustice inflicted on them. The redistributive struggle of Dalits, Madhesi, workers and women to rectify this condition also weakened the authority and strength of old parties built on patronage, hierarchy and lineage network and evaporated the CPN (Maoist)'s revolutionary fervor following its assumption of coalition government of six parties. It has also faced a tension between its promise of revolutionary transformation and necessity to form a coalition government whose coalition partners opposed many of its policies, such as land reforms, integration of Maoist combatants in the NA and structural reforms of judiciary, public administration and security agencies. Their withdrawal of support to Maoist-led government on the ground of its sacking of chief of army forced the Prime Minister Puspa Kamal Dahal resign thus allowing the scope for a new coalition government of 22-party alliance. Social learning by habit-driven, rationalistic and revolutionary actors of Nepal about this fact is essential to understand the changing narrative of discourse, issues, rules, actors and context transformation, recognize each other's perspectives and pursue violence-reducing inclusive policies and action.

The tenacity of Nepalese leadership for a personalized and partisan, rather than institutional and national interest, dictated most of the power negotiation processes. The motive is not to create a stable system for the fulfillment of people's aspiration for freedom, basic needs and identity but to cling on to power by changing the rules of the game and delaying the transformation of vital issues. This tendency has incubated anti-legalistic and extra-constitutional mode of conflict transformation every time and prompted the new actors to repeat historical patterns of conflict. It eroded the stability of the government, political system and the state and challenged the legitimacy of constitutional system. A durable peace entails the constant search for some common ground guaranteeing open dialogue, identification of common points and settlement of differences among the actors for the relative satisfaction of all sides. The scope for common ground narrows the tendency of alienation, exclusion and domination of weaker actors and increases their commitment to system creation, its survival and maintenance. The methodological disagreement between imperial, muscular, power equation, dialectic, dialogical and inclusive methods can be sorted out if the condition of discourse makes human rights, democracy, social justice and peace common reference points for all actors. Mutual interest of adversaries in these values reduces the intensity of conflict and makes it amenable for peaceful transformation.

Art of Dialectic

Nepal's political system now is maladjusted to both internal tension and external environment. This is partly caused by conflicting ideologies and partly by conflicting vision of a political system, such as democratic republic versus People's Republic and conflicting means such as "democratic alliance" of 22-party led by NC and CPN-UML versus "republic-patriotic alliance" of CPN (Maoist). In a theory-infused dialectic, for example, leaders of the left political classes perceive themselves people-oriented, progressive and superior and treat their actual or perceived competitor classes as an arch political enemy (such as feudalism, reactionary, capitalism and imperialism) to define their own course through a systemic pathology—"contradiction, destruction of rival and recreation" (Smelser,1973:xxvi) based on redistribution of power and resources in society.

The image of self-superiority inclined many left parties to inject structural distortion in the system, defeat the opponent through conscious political choice of class mobilization and apply

strategies and tactics to "create revolutionary situation, revolutionary action and revolutionary change" (Johnson, 1983:viii). This tendency prevented long-term strategic cooperation on national issues and the possibility of learning from others. In this method, emancipation of oppressed classes rather than realization of human rights of all citizen, steers the gyration of politics. To Karl Marx, only the state arising out of the need of society and liberation of the oppressed for the achievement of humanity can moderate class conflict and bring peace. According to him, abolition of private property reflects the equalization of power, the level playing field for all, the desire to live in peace and restore the common law of humanity (Marx, 1963:66).

In Nepal, most of the left parties have used dialectic to train their party cadres, demolish the myth of cyclical nature of fatalism, expose the contradictions of society, expand their constituencies, disequilibrate the system and enable qualitative transformation of class politics. But, the dialectic has provided a binary code of politics where "the rival" is considered incapable of civility and, therefore, negatively valued, abused and dehumanized in their political socialization. In this method, adversary—the bourgeoisie class-- is to be either abolished, controlled or forcefully cowed for structural change. In no way "the rival" is considered a rational agent (citizen) potentially valuable for mutually advantageous exchange, peaceful cooperative action and adjustment. Conflict between uncompromising ideology, interest and position often grows from a false perception and stereotype commonly held by the actors. The application of dialectic without any time limit can viciously subvert property rights, social stability and peace beyond the capacity of the political system to compensate.

Dialectic has, however, codified a political mode of conflict transformation which transcends rational laws, traditionally accepted public morality and non-violent means. But, the infusion of militant ideology into politics weakens the foundation of a civic attachment of citizens to the state (Schwab, 1996: 11). This is the reason for Carl Schmitt to argue that "the dialectical change of quantity into quality is comprehensible in political through only" (1996: 59). Unlike dialogue which does not denounce the continuity of tradition but works for its rationalization and modernization, dialectic provides a zero-sum solution, creates a systemic antagonism and aims historical ruptures, breakdown and collapse of the rival. If one tries to maximize a single class instead of optimizing it, this will inevitably lead to destruction of the system as a whole (Capra, 1997:294).

The art of dialectic is less reconciliatory in nature as it does not recognize the legitimacy of the excluded middle, peaceful dissent and pluralistic worldviews in society. The use of universal ideology embedded in a single entity, the class, over multiple identities of people undermines the necessity of the principles of negotiation and compromise, the cardinal tenets of modern democracy. The growing factionalism within the left forces of Nepal caused by the economic empowerment of their key policy making and leadership classes, cohabitation with any kind of political alliance, contamination of ideology, multiple formation of left forces such as conservative, moderate, revisionist and orthodox, integration of class with gender, ethnicity and territoriality and a gap between revolutionary rhetoric (in contrast to the art of dialectic) and adoption of neo-liberal policies have defied the possibility of ideological unity among them for cooperative action. Neither revolutionary rhetoric nor dialectic amounts to science (Tilly, 2006:73).

The organizational transformation from armed rebels to peaceful politicians depends on three preconditions: "the rebel group's degree of internal cohesion during the peace process (*factions*), its level of popular support among the population at large at the time of the transition (*followers*), and the amount of legitimacy that the international community is willing to grant the rebels through the transition period (*friends*)" (Kovacs,2007:8). The latter two preconditions exist in CPN (Maoist)'s case but due to lack of proper management of inter and intra-party differences (two lines of struggle) on positional issues peace process has been stalled in Nepal. The main agenda of CPN (Maoist) for structural transformation, such as civilian control of army, integration of combatants, land reforms, etc can be resolved within the democratic dialogue, negotiation and mutual adjustment to changing realities. Civilization tolerates plural human existence and fosters cooperative action through the

unity of opposite forces. A civilized society tolerates the Lockean version of popular consent and Rousseau's spirit of social movement of civil society to abolish the state of nature, establish mutually-acceptable social contract and outlaw violence from politics. A good social contract emerges out of the goodwill of all citizens. It reduces the conflict between the state, society and classes.

Inclusion of the Other

In a constructive dialogue, each actor treats its competitor as equal citizens, ensures its representation in decision making and seeks negotiated solution of conflict of values, interest, issues and identities. Both learn from each other and pursue mutually beneficial goals through communication, understanding and compromise and coherence of individual, group and human rights. The civilized life would be impossible without "public use of reason for reconciliation" (Habermas, 2001:49). In Nepal, post-movement regimes have increased the representation of five categories of people—women, Dalits, Madhesis, ethnic and indigenous communities and people of backward region—in the constituent assembly and expanded the social base of political power. But, a shift from consensus to competitive politics among the main actors has produced Rousseau's metaphor of stag-hunt where in a competition for power, the separate interest of each actor held primacy over the common interest. This poses a threat to the promulgation of new constitution in time, initiation of post-conflict peace building measures and socio-economic transformation for justice.

The constitutional provision to pass every article of the future constitution either by consensus or two-thirds will likely to sustain the culture of deadlock if common grounds are not discovered among the 22-party coalition and UCPN (Maoist) and MJAF for post-conflict stabilization measures. The dialogical process has also exposed a gap between leaders' irrational inclination to stay in power throughout life by any political combination and people's aspirations for freedom, basic needs fulfillment and public good. It has also widened a cognitive gap as each powerful actor, locked up in its own historical memory and ideology, perceived its rivals a threat to democracy, instrumentalized its adherents against opponents, created a fundamentalist gap that the rise of opposition political party is a threat to democracy and dominated democracy through the power of leader-oriented political parties controlled by few super individuals.

Different traditions of perceiving the nation's problems have created a disharmony about the rationality of ends and means of politics³ and generated little prospect for the win-win solution of multi-polar and multi-structural societal conflicts. Since reason is linked with interest and ideology, dialogue under a condition of structural injustice cannot help seek mutual understanding at all levels of society. The inequality of participants in negotiation and uneven priorities left the distribution of benefits highly skewed. The practical interest of all in conflict transformation requires the involvement of all in a wider freed-up space after the peaceful departure of monarchy and mediation of diverse interest in the common benefits of all. Nepal's political system can only survive if political actors maintain a balance between give and take, assess the cause of the legitimacy of every initiative, such as constitution drafting, federalism, integration of Maoist combatants in productive life, nature of governance, judicial reforms, moderation of radicalized identity politics, management of conflict residues, peace-building process, etc and do not threaten the rivals' vital interests.

The Nepalese social and political system provides a number of home-grown, indigenous measures such as mediation, reconciliation, arbitration, use of local elders, Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanism and the court system to settle various conflicts. But, these means are insufficient to settle the structural contradictions of society emerging from poverty, inequality and exclusion. Similarly, there was neither reflective learning process through the monitoring of peace indicators nor balanced the post-constitution assembly election power-sharing process. Resolutionary

³ Hannah Arendt argues that ..."in the modern world, both theoretically and practically, politics has been seen as a means for protecting both society's life sustaining resources and the productivity of its open and free development" (2005:110).

change requires capacity building of permanent support structures for negotiations and dialogues, peace secretariat, peace funds, all-party mechanism, interim administration and Local Peace Committees to implement peace agreements at various tracks (Dahal and Bhatt, 2008), engage in "bridge-building functions" (Ropers, 2008:92) and the structural transformation of public sphere. The promise of democratic politics is the never-ending endeavor of the great plurality of human beings to live together and share the public space in mutually guaranteed freedom (Arendt, 2005:202).

Democratic Peace

Democratic peace⁴ rests on a negotiated, fair, just and inclusive social contract where its principles agreed by parties have ethically and legally-binding character as it reflects the unity of the particular and general will of all citizens and based on justice. Such a contract can only be founded on an inter-subjective framework that includes "the other all" in the political equilibrium by giving them legitimate space, utilizes non-violent politics and crafts a shared community. In no way does it establish hierarchical relationship between empathy of victors and sufferers. Democratic peace thus combines various elements of modern political system, such as human rights, rule of law, good governance, political reform, economic well-being and cultural diversity as well as takes up the values of orderly social change. "Pursuing such change promotes developing structures that meet basic human needs (substantive justice) while maximizing the involvement of people in decisions that affect them (procedural justice)" (Lederach, 2003: 26).

The CPA espouses many of these elements for conflict transformation but suffers from its own contradictions due to a lack of conceptual consensus on a number of contending thematic and methodological issues and inability to foster a culture of compassion, the will to identify with the suffering of others, as well as spread relief works built on moral, spiritual and emotional foundations. Inter-subjective framework will not be a cure for all the national ills, but it is a crucial step Nepalese leadership must take to liberate themselves from their self-inflicting rhetoric and engage sovereign public in the constitutional talks. Transformation of conflict requires finding optimal space for all the actors of conflict system—actual, potential and left out—and establishing a dynamic balance of their interests in the political system. In such a balance, all horizontal and vertical actors become fully aware of their systemic ties and take each other's legitimate interest and perspective into account in socialization, decision-making and action. This helps to resolve the internal security dilemma that hampered the democratization and de-radicalization of politics.

Inclusion of the other's perspective bridges the difference, improves trust and enables the performance of the political system as a whole. Relative satisfaction of each guarantees the commitment of all in social contract and increases their stake in its maintenance. The absolutization of particular interest such as ethnic, class, caste, race, region or religion, in contrast, generates continual state of tension and makes the search for engagement, confidence building and conflict transformation difficult. Only the collective awareness of the overlapping interests and needs can open the multiple actors to reflection, learning, communication and transformation based on the golden mean of Gautam Buddha and facilitate the attainment of a state of dynamic balance of opposed parts by treating all actors equally by virtue of belonging to the same Nepali identity.

Transformation of unequal mini-identities of people into a meta-identity of equal citizens (Habermas, 1997:572) and human beings is a durable mode of settling the question of loyalty and transformation of identity-based conflict. Reconciliation of conflicts among various doctrinal methods, value-based discourse and demolition of their arrogance requires civic education, critical discourse, mutual learning and rational adjustment to new reality. Conflict of dogmatism is to be

⁴ John Rawls argues that precise formulation of a democratic peace needs to satisfy the five features by the reasonably just and constitutional democratic societies—basic rights, liberties, opportunities, sufficient means to enable all citizens to make intelligent and effective use of their freedoms and reciprocity so that institutions prevent social and economic inequalities from becoming excessive (1999: 49).

resolved through critical debates and identifying the conditions of what Immanuel Kant calls "perpetual peace" through prohibitory prescriptions, realization of moral aspirations of human beings, creation of public order based on cosmopolitan values, the mode of government adopted in conformity with the spirit of a representative system (Haste, 1891:92) and the abolition of war as a physical necessity. To him, perpetual peace is the "highest public good" (Caygill, 1994:314) which can grow with the interest of democratically virtuous citizens and leaders about a shared sense of justice.

Conclusion

To manage multiple transitions within a law-governed political order, it is essential for the leadership to link the drivers, actors and stakeholders of the conflict system into a rational framework and muster necessary resources for joint development projects for nation-building. Sustainable transformation of conflict in Nepal requires moral imagination about new relational spaces (Lederach,2005:7), a sense of ethical duty to help the helpless, sound representational base, accountability patterns, virtuous conduct of leadership and multi-sectoral and multi-track initiatives for transitional justice. Institutional reforms for this justice are a precondition to abolish impunity and enforce accountability of leadership for their action. Leadership virtue is defined as "the willpower necessary to fulfill one's duty, and as the moral strength human need to resist those defects that prevent or hinder the accomplishment of duty" (Bobbio, 2000:19). It also requires methodological agreement on conflict resolution and the transformation of the existing political culture of unprincipled rivalry, where all political actors are engaged only on a rationalistic conception of politics where power is pitted against power for primacy devoid of value considerations for human rights, democracy, social justice and peace, into a civic culture.

In Nepal, there is a need to promote mutual adjustment between transitional justice and peace and mediation of change in the distribution of values in society. Aspiration-fuelled politics generates huge demands and inputs for the system beyond its capacity to process them for fulfillment, permit the system to break deadlock and support its maintenance through the genuine accountability to *pacta sunt servanda*. But, agreements are not implemented in a state of nature when rights to liberty and property are often encroached, social mobility is restricted and self-preservation becomes a major stake. Sustainable transformation of conflict enables a balance between the optimization of actors on conflict for a system equilibrium where mutual reward is guaranteed to all the members of society.

References

- Arendt, Hannah. 2005. *The Promise of Politics*, New York: Schocken Books.
- Bleie, Tone. 2005. *Tribal Peoples, Nationalism and the Human Rights Challenge*, Dhaka: The University Press Ltd.
- Bobbio, Norberto. 2000. *In Praise of Meekness: Essays on Ethics and Politics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dahal, Dev Raj and Chandra Dev Bhatta. 2008. *The Relevance of Local Conflict Transformation Mechanisms for Systemic Conflict Transformation in Nepal*, A Report Prepared for Berghof Foundation for Peace Support, August.
- Capra, Fritjof. 1997. *The Web of Life: A New Synthesis of Mind and Matter*, London: Flamingo.
- Caygill, Howard. 1994. *A Kant Dictionary*, Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 2001. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*, Cambridge: MIT.
- Habermas, 1997. *Between Facts and Norms*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Hastie, W. 1891. *Kant's Principles of Politics*, Edinburgh: T. Clarck.
- Johnson, Chalmers. 1983. *Revolutionary Change*, London: Longman.
- Kovacs, Mimmi Soderberg. 2007. *From Rebellion to Politics*, Sweden: Uppsala University.
- Lederach, John Paul. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1966. "Political Rights versus Human Emancipation," ed. Frederic L. Bender, *Karl Marx: The Essential Writings*, New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Paffenholz, Thania and Luc Reyhler. 2007. *Aid for Peace: A Guide to Planning and Evaluation for Conflict Zones*, Germany: Nomos.
- Rawls, John. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ropers, Norbert. 2008. "Perspectives for the Further Development of Systemic Conflict Transformation: A Concluding Reflection", eds. Daniela Korppen, Beatrix Schmelzle and Oliver Wils, *A Systemic Approach to Conflict Transformation: Exploring Strengths and Limitations*, Berghof Handbook Dialogue Series, No. 6.
- Schwab, George. 1996. "Introduction," in Carl Schmitt. *The Concept of the Political*, Chicago: The University Press of Chicago.
- Shrestha, Nanda R. and Dev Raj Dahal 2008. "Nepal," eds. Guntram H. Herb and David H. Kaplan, *Nations and Nationalism: A Global Historical Overview*, Vol. 4, Oxford: ABC-CLIO.
- Sharma, Prayag Raj. 2008. "Restructuring the State in South Asia: Some Impressions and Ideas," ed. Lok Raj Baral, *New Frontiers of Restructuring of State*, New Delhi: Adroit.
- Smelser, Neil J. 1973. *Karl Marx: On Society and Social Change*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schmitt, Carl. 1996. *The Concept of the Political*, Chicago: The University Press of Chicago.
- Tilly, Charles. 2006. *Why?*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Note: Readings on Governance and Development, Vol. X11, April 2010.

