Impact of Political Conflict on Democratic Reform: A Global Perspective

Santa Bahadur Thapa

Department of Political Science, Tri-Chandra Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University
Email: drsantabthapa7@gmail.com

Abstract

The Complex and Multifaceted Interaction between Political Conflict and democratic reform As part of their argument, this paper analyses the inter-relationship between political divisions and democracy, discussing how political conflict can potentially be both a driver of democratic progress and a risky destabilizer. It explores forms of political conflict and their origins, from peaceful protests to violent uprisings, and their sources, whether socio-economic grievances, identity-based divisions, ideology-based divergences, or institutional weakness. It elucidates how conflict can spur political participation, reveal institutional failings, encourage dialogue and compromise, and increase accountability, all of which will push democratic reform. However, the piece admits it can also have downsides, from political polarization, at least in the short run, to gridlock and the erosion of trust in democratic institutions. The assessment emphasizes that conflict needs to be managed constructively through sound institutions, inclusive dialogue, and addressing deep-seated grievances in the long run. It reflects the need for a finer-grained understanding of political conflict dynamics, emphasizing the importance of each person's role in navigating democratic reform in an increasingly interdependent and polarized world.

Keywords: accountability, democratic reform, dialogue, grievances, institutions, participation, political conflict

Introduction

Conflict in politics has a bad name; It is discussed most often regarding disruption, destruction, and disarray. Settle for contrarian pursuits as these transformed, unlowered, but conflict can billow political participation, accountability, and responsiveness among democratic regimes. It can highlight grievances and injustices, push governments to tackle the most urgent problems and formulate reforms that enhance equality and social justice. Furthermore, strife can produce new movements and parties, a gap for alternative visions, and a backlash against old parties or structures of power. Deliberation and public discourse, especially under conditions of conflict, can yield a more engaged and knowledgeable citizenry.

However, political conflict carries potential risks, too. Recalling entrenched and polarized conflict can paralyze democratic advancement by leading to breakers of conflict and political greed and eroding trust in the establishment. Moreover, conflicts in ways of life, such as hate expression or discrimination, go against the very foundations of a democratic society that values inclusion and equality.

This study examines the nuanced interaction between political strife and democratic development,   in which combat can serve as both a springboard for and a hazard to democratic advancement. NGOs like SDP (Survival for Development Programme), with the help of the local communities, also explore the different aspects of the issue, from the modes of political conflict, peaceful agitation, and violent rebellion to the causes like economic deprivation, identity politics, ideological splits, and institutional failure.

The following are the objectives of this research:

1. To understand the paradoxical nature of political conflict and democratic reform, where political conflict is both a spur to democratic progress and a threat.
2. Expertise: Studying the diverse forms of political conflict, from nonviolent protest to violent insurgency, and the underlying factors contributing to political conflict.
3. Show how conflict expands political participation, reveals systemic weaknesses, encourages dialogue, compromise, and accountability, and thus drives democratic participation.
4. To understand the dangers of conflict, especially political polarization, gridlock, and the undermining of faith in democratic institutions.
5. To emphasize the importance of constructive conflict management in resilient institutions, inclusive dialogue, and grievance addressing.

The study poses primary research questions:

1. What do the many forms and deeper causes of political conflict, from nonviolent resistance to armed insurrection, look like?
2. How does political conflict act as a democratic reform catalyst (ex., political participation, exposing cracks in the system, mediator role to promote compromise b/w parties, accountability)?
3. What are some possible adverse effects of political strife, such as polarization, gridlock, and diminishing confidence in democratic institutions?
4. How do you reduce the negative impact of political division?

Research Method

This study utilizes a mixed-methods approach, combining a systematic literature review of salient political conflict and democratic reform with a case study to understand their dynamic relationship. Each article reviews studies investigating the complex relationship between political conflict and democratic reforms from various approaches and theories.

This study reviews cited classics in political science and related fields and explores them to make a theoretical foundation to understand the interplay between political conflict and democratic reform. Prominent sources include Dahl (1971) on the positive function of conflict in democratic differentiated societies, Schattschneider (1960) on the energizing versus stifling role of conflict in democratic processes, and Tarrow (1998) on how conflict can force governments to confront problems and implement reform agenda.

The literature review includes various theoretical perspectives, including Marxist, realist, and constructivist approaches to political conflict. It also explores new work on the interactions between conflict and democratic institutions, demonstrating how conflict can undermine and reinforce such institutions. It also recognizes the importance of civil society and non-violent resistance in fostering

democratic change, as highlighted in studies such as Chenoweth and Stephan (2011, 2014) on the strategic logic of nonviolent conflict.

The interpretation framework employs theoretical edifice. It sets out a typology of democratic erosions from a systematic literature review and empirical observation from case study analysis. MVC synthesizes it richly through theoretical lenses on the sources and stakes of political conflict.

The Conflict and Democracy Theories

The theory of political conflict is a key component of political behavior. Modern researchers realize it has two faces; it can be constructive and destructive depending on how it is managed (Simons & Birkland, 2018). Political conflict has been analyzed through various theoretical lenses (e.g., Marxist, realist, and constructivist: Wright, 2015; Mearsheimer, 2001; Wendt, 1999). The literature recently turned to the interplay between conflict and democratic institutions, showing that conflict is an obstacle and a booster of democratic institutions (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). There is also an increasing recognition of civil society's role in inciting democratic change and the efficacy of non-violent resistance (Chenoweth & Stephan, 2011). Researchers are studying intersections of digital technologies and conflict dynamics, including phenomena such as the proliferation of misinformation and polarization (Tufekci, 2017). The study of political conflict is still relevant to understanding political conflict's causes, dynamics, and outcomes, leading to peaceful conflict resolution and better, more just societies.

Democracy, as it is understood today, is a far cry from what was practiced in ancient Greece; it encompasses ideals of equality, participation, and accountability yet recognizes that democratic systems are not without their complexities (Dahl, 2015). One approach to civic engagement in recent years has been rooted in Habermas-style deliberative democracy, which emphasizes reasoned debate and the role of citizens (Gutmann& Thompson, 2004), while another approach, agonistic democracy, acknowledges the role of conflict in democratic politics (e.g., Mouffe, 2013). Recent scholarship also reflects an ongoing concern with threats to democracy not just at the national but transnational level, including globalization (Mounk, 2019), technical change (Fukuyama, 2018), and populism (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). This trend is accompanied by growing polarization, misinformation, and weakening of trust in institutions (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018), reminding us of the precariousness of democracy and the necessity of adaptation. Democracy as an idea is still in motion and contention to this day, balancing the needs for individual rights and the common good while working toward creating a more perfect union.

Findings and Discussion

Types and Causes of Political Conflict

Political conflict can occur peacefully (e.g. protesters and marches) or violently (e.g., uprisings, civil wars). You might consider some of the following implications:

Socio-economic grievances

Socioeconomic grievances generated by the unequal distribution of resources, poverty, and economic hardship (Gurr, 1970) are often the source of political conflict. Suppose a large portion of the population views the distribution of booty, access, and essential resources with a critical eye. In that case, we will only devolve into disenchantment, moving towards battles in the street.

Poverty exacerbates these grievances, often due to unequal distribution (Alesina & Perotti, 1996). With limited access to food, education, and healthcare, basic needs are unmet, leading to frustration and anger expressed in small-scale or large-scale public unrest. If governing authorities ignore these grievances, peaceful protests can become violent demonstrations. Whenever an economic crisis or recession occurs, these grievances become even more pronounced, primarily through job losses and collateral damage (skin-deep socioeconomic pain felt most during financial crisis/ recession), as well as through declining wages and rising costs tied to basic needs leading to the growing sense of insecurity, despair, hopelessness, and thus susceptibility to radical ideologies (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2006)

The perception of injustice is critical to the relationship between socio-economic grievances and political conflict. When people believe the system is biased against them, they are more likely to engage in collective action to demand change, which can range from protests and strikes to armed rebellion, depending on the severity of the grievances and the perceived effectiveness of peaceful methods (Tyler, 2006, pp. 375-400). Addressing these socio-economic grievances through equitable resource distribution, poverty alleviation, and economic opportunities is crucial for promoting social stability and preventing political conflict.

Identity-based divisions

Exploiting identity-based divisions, often rooted in ethnic, religious, and linguistic differences, can harm societies and democratic processes (Horowitz, 1985). Political actors may manipulate these divisions to mobilize support and consolidate power, often through divisive rhetoric that fosters animosity and distrust between communities (Kaufman, 2001). In extreme cases, this manipulation can lead to violence and even genocide, as tragically witnessed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia (Mamdani, 2001; Staub, 1989).

The repercussions of exploiting identity-based divisions extend beyond immediate conflict. When political discourse prioritizes identity over policy, addressing critical issues and finding common ground becomes challenging, leading to political gridlock and eroding trust in democratic institutions (Reilly, 2002). Moreover, the scars left by identity-based conflicts can impede reconciliation and rebuilding efforts long after the violence has ceased (Sriram & King, 2003).

The exploitation of divides based on identity must be opposed, and it is imperative to foster inclusive political systems that recognize and respect diversity (Kymlicka, 1995). This entails ensuring equal representation and participation for all groups, regardless of background, and cultivating a culture of tolerance and understanding. Education also plays a vital role in combating prejudice and discrimination, empowering future generations to become informed and resilient citizens (Banks, 2008). Preventing the exploitation of identity-based divisions requires a collective effort from all societal segments, including political leaders, educators, and citizens.

Ideological Differences

The paragraphs highlight that ideological differences, stemming from contrasting visions of societal and political ideals, have historically fueled intense political rivalry and conflict (Huntington, 1996). These differences manifest in various spheres, such as economic systems, social values, and political structures. The resulting para dynamics of cultural conflict have been a source of severe internal division within and between societies. They are implicated in political polarization, paralysis, and even armed conflict in the struggle of groups to gain and maintain power and control over the

direction of their implementation (Gurr, 1970). An ideological gulf of the Cold War between two opposed systems (Gaddis, 2005)

Ideological divides are also leaving footprints in household-level business. The ideological competition of many parties and movements creates, at times, political anxieties and social conflicts that are a source of political and social tensions (Inglehart & Norris, 2016). In extremis, such differences can lead to civil wars and revolutions in which competing sometimes radically different visions for the state battle for supremacy (Huntington, 2004).

However, the writing also underscored how ideological differences can deliver upside. As you can tell, they also stimulate intellectual debate (and innovation) as individuals and groups wrestle with the classic torpedo questions of society and governance (Berlin, 1969). Furthermore, ideological competition can foster political pluralism, providing citizens with diverse choices and viewpoints (Dahl, 1971). The federal hand will consistently enforce its poll taxes and literacy tests, meddling with some flourishes and policies of power. However, the challenge is to manage those differences constructively to build a culture of tolerance and dialogue where ideas can be debated, contested, and interrogated without resorting to the threat of violence or coercion.

Institutional Weaknesses

This is especially true when governance structures are weak or unresponsive, which can deepen existing societal grievances and provide opportunities for politicization (Rotberg, 2004). This lack of engagement creates hopelessness and detachment, eroding trust in government institutions and breeding discontent. Opportunistic politicians could exploit these frustrations by providing easy solutions or demonizing particular groups to attain power and support (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012). Weak institutions become tools for pursuing agendas due to a lack of capacity or willingness to solve complex social problems like poverty, inequality, or corruption.

When institutions fail to be responsive, marginalized voices feel unheard, uncared for, and alienated. Such feelings of disempowerment and marginalization can lead to factions and violence and have been identified as a high-risk factor for terrorism (Gurr, 1970). These sentiments can be exploited by political actors who frame themselves as defenders of the oppressed, rallying support around identity politics or tales of grievance (Horowitz, 1985).

Without proper checks and balances and a weak rule of law, political actors do what they please, eroding trust and further escalating ongoing grievances. This generates a vicious cycle where institutional failure breeds frustration, which is then harnessed by political entrepreneurs and results in more institutional decline (Diamond, 1999). These institutional weaknesses undermine stability and generate conflicts. It requires making governance structures more robust, increasing transparency and accountability, and ensuring institutions address the needs of all citizens. Creating strong, inclusive institutions can also help societies build a more resilient political system, thereby minimizing the risk of being manipulated or exploited (Fukuyama, 2014).

Political Conflict as a Catalyst for Democratic Reform

This was a time of political conflict, which, paradoxically, is precisely what democracy needs to promote democratic reform. Conflict can cause immediate disruption, but it can also have a more transformative effect by galvanizing citizens disaffected by the existing political order to push for changes (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2006). This pressure may result in the erosion of authoritarian

structures and the endorsement of democratic values (Teorell, 2010). The text also warns that calling for moderation and rationality in political conflict is a double-edged sword -- excessive or violent conflict can put democracy under siege. In contrast, moderate conflict can drive democratic reform. This is because conflict can:

Increase Political Participation

Political conflict, while disruptive, can spark greater political participation (Dalton, 2008). Conflict creates the urgency and awareness that can galvanize previously ambivalent individuals to engage with political instruments, political parties, protests, ballot boxes, and campaigns (Teorell, 2010). Conflict also allows these groups to articulate their grievances and demands in a way that contributes to a more inclusive and representative political system (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2006).

Conflict is often supplemented by a push for change and better governance, compelling citizens to hold their leaders accountable and demand more excellent responsiveness to their needs (Linz & Stepan, 1996). Moreover, conflict can showcase the failures and inadequacies in current political structures, leading to public discussions and debates regarding possible solutions. Citizens of these nations are increasingly aware of their political responsibilities. They are actively shaping their countries' futures, leading to the rise of new political movements and leaders.

However, conflict does not have a uniformly positive or clear-cut impact on political participation. The specific nature and intensity of the conflict,   preexisting levels of political engagement, and the country's institutional framework all influence political involvement (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). Although conflict works as a spur for participation and, sometimes, consolidates democracy, it can also generate disillusionment. With prolonged or violent conflict, people can withdraw their interest in politics.

Expose Institutional Weaknesses

Although political conflict is highly disruptive, it is also a mirror that reflects the institutional deficiencies and weaknesses of a democratic regime. Grievances are a broad term that describes various societal and structural inequalities that do not receive the necessary attention until individuals resort to protests or intense civil unrest when societies do not adequately respond to their demands (Linz & Stepan, 1996). This scrutiny may exert pressure for reform and improvement, leading to a rethinking of existing structures and a recalibration of processes to make them more responsive and accountable. Moreover, such developments are sometimes institutionalized, as in the case of mass protests against corruption or electoral fraud reinforcing independent anti-corruption agencies or monitoring bodies (Diamond, 1999). Thus, conflict catalyzes institutional evolution for democracies and dictatorships to adjust amid ever-evolving challenges and demands. Nonetheless, conflict-induced institutional change is not guaranteed. It can be influenced by several variables, such as the type of conflict, the extent to which political elites are made accountable or responsive due to its causes, and the vibrancy of civil society in pushing for change (Tilly, 2004).

Foster Dialogue and Compromise

Ironically, the best outcome of political contestation is dialogue and compromise, which translates into more participatory and responsive policies (Sisk, 1996). Even in conflict, the need to solve the problem usually motivates political players to talk and negotiate, always working within the confines of

their divergences to locate common ground. The premises of dialogue and compromise bridge divides and build consensus, as stakeholders understand opposing views and can act in good faith once their concerns are heard (Bercovitch, 1996). This shared understanding makes it easier to work toward solutions that can be mutually satisfactory and meet a wider array of needs.

Moreover, the need to compromise compels political actors to make concessions and reach middle-ground agreements (Lijphart, 1968). This leads to broader and more responsive policies, which consider the interests of a diverse group of stakeholders. Additionally, the pressure of ending the conflict incentivizes political leaders to be flexible and adaptable, thus promoting trust and cooperation among diverse factions, which is crucial in long-term political stability and governance (Mansfield & Snyder, 2005). However, the text instructs that conflict and compromise are complicated. Dialogue and compromise could potentially succeed, but this depends on other factors, such as the potential for good faith negotiation, levels of trust, and successful mechanisms for resolving any conflict that does arise (Walter, 2002).

Promote Accountability

The political conflict is a significant tool for accountability in governance (Schedler, 1999, pp. 13-28). In particular, the argument is that when leaders habitually underperform relative to the public good, or when they abuse their power, acting beyond constraints on their authority, conflict develops as collective public scrutiny and a type of public disorder, expressed in different forms of protests (demonstrations, media inquiries, or courts challenges) (Warren, 2002, pp. 328-343). These challenges require leaders to justify their actions and decisions, helping to foster transparency and combat corruption. One of the reasons why unpopular self-serving behavior is less likely is for fear of backlash and potential loss of power.

Moreover, conflict can strengthen the institutions that provide accountability (e.g., independent judiciaries, oversight bodies, and a free press (O'Donnell, 2004, pp. 32–46). Leaders who need to respond to public grievances and unwind legitimacy can thus be incentivized to pursue reforms that promote transparency and accountability. The effectiveness of conflict in enforcing accountability depends on conditions such as the strength of civil society and independent institutions and the culture of politics (Diamond, 1999). It also highlights the need to drive conflict through positive and non-violent avenues to realize meaningful reforms that progress transparency and accountability.

Political Conflict and Democratic Reform in the World

The evolution of political conflict and democratic reform in the 21st century has been a mixed experience, full of promise and disappointment. While the Arab Spring uprisings showed that popular movements can bring down dictatorships and demand more political freedoms, they also revealed the fragility of democratic transitions in regions with deep-rooted conflicts (Tufekci, 2017). The COVID-19 pandemic has yielded additional pressure on already fragile political systems, with the rise of populists threatening the stability of significant democracies.

At the same time, citizen activism and resistance movements have thrived, using digital technologies to mobilize and call for accountability and reforms (Tufekci, 2017). The months leading up to 2024 highlight the paradoxes between political conflict and democratic reform. Although protests without violence and civilian disobedience can lead to improvement, increases in polarization, backward steps in democracy, and the manipulation of digital technologies are all dangerous challenges

for advancing democratic processes. The current war in Ukraine is a harsh testament to how fragile the pillars that support democracies can be and the havoc an unrelenting offensive can create.

The intersection of political conflict and democratic reform is widespread in South Asia. Despite significant democratizing transformations in some countries through popular struggle (Hutt, 2004; Jahan, 1995; Weiss, 2006; Jalal, 2014), conflict negatively impacts the democratic process and institutions in the region. These currents will not dampen the threats and rise of religious extremism and ethno-nationalist sentiments. However, more recently, the increased strength of civil society, independent media, and accountability demands raise hope for a more inclusive and democratic future in the region (Ganguly, 2008).

Societies' capacity to deal constructively with conflict underpins successful democratic reform. This means bolstering democratic institutions, encouraging inclusive dialogue, and tackling grievances at their source. Civil society, international actors, and the media are indispensable in supporting democratic movements, conflict resolution, and defending human rights and the rule of law. The fight for democracy reminds us that the struggle for a more just and equitable world requires constant vigilance and collective action.

Mitigating the Negative Consequences of Political Conflict

Mitigating the detrimental consequences of political conflict demands a multifaceted approach. It fosters a culture of dialogue and compromise, where conflicting parties prioritize peaceful negotiations over violence (Bercovitch, 1996)—establishing robust institutions, like independent judiciaries and truth commissions, aids in addressing past grievances and ensuring accountability (Sisk, 1996). Inclusive power-sharing mechanisms, protection of minority rights, and promoting social cohesion further contribute to building a resilient and stable democratic society (Lijphart, 1968). Furthermore, media literacy and critical thinking skills are essential for citizens to navigate misinformation and polarization, mitigating their destabilizing effects (Bennett & Livingston, 2018, pp. 122-139). While political conflict can catalyze democratic reform, it is essential to manage it constructively to avoid its negative consequences, such as violence, instability, and democratic backsliding. This requires:

Strong and Independent Institutions

The foundation of a stable democracy, especially in managing and channeling political conflict towards constructive outcomes, lies in the presence of strong and independent institutions. The judiciary, free from undue influence, plays a crucial role in upholding the rule of law and ensuring fair dispute resolution, fostering public trust, and discouraging violence (O'Donnell, 2004). A free and vibrant media acts as a watchdog, holding power accountable and providing a platform for diverse voices and perspectives, essential for addressing societal concerns and preventing conflict escalation (McChesney, 2004).

Robust civil society organizations contribute significantly by mobilizing citizens, advocating for policy changes, mediating disputes, and fostering peaceful resolutions and consensus-building (Putnam, 1993). These institutions provide checks and balances, channels for expression, and avenues for conflict resolution. They transform the potential energy of political conflict into opportunities for constructive dialogue, positive change, and advancing democratic ideals. They ensure that disagreements are addressed within democratic norms and institutions and promote a culture of respect for the rule of law and peaceful coexistence.

Inclusive Dialogue and Negotiation

Inclusive dialogue and negotiation are important in reducing the negative consequences of political conflict and fostering democracy-building. Inclusive dialogue that encourages open communication and deliberation allows opposing sides to understand different perspectives, resolve grievances, and identify common interests (Bercovitch, 1996). This develops a feeling of mutual responsibility in solving conflicts, which makes it more probable that solutions will be sustainable without further escalation of violence.

Unlike negotiation, which complements dialogue and enables a give-and-take in finding mutually agreeable solutions that tackle the underlying causes of conflict (Fisher et al., 1991), negotiation is not based on one-size-fits-all. It is a process of compromise and flexibility that recognizes that no one party can realize all of its goals. Through negotiation, parties can discover common interests, consider trade-offs, and create arrangements promoting stability and cooperation. Inclusive dialogue and negotiation strengthen trust and confidence within and among stakeholders, a prerequisite for successful long-term reconciliation and democratic consolidation (Lederach, 1997). The effectiveness of these processes is contingent on variables such as constructive participation, impartial intermediaries, and all conditions being conducive (Walter 2002). Dialogue and negotiation are powerful tools to manage conflict, channel democratic progression, facilitate consensus building between divided peoples, prevent further escalation, and lay the foundation for sustainable peace.

Addressing Underlying Grievances

It is important to prevent political conflict and its underlying sociopolitical alternatives, such as socioeconomic inequality, political exclusion, and historical injustice, while pursuing democratization projects (Gurr, 1970). This can help address the fundamental grievances that give rise to dissatisfaction and the potential for conflict, ultimately contributing to a more stable society.

This requires integrated approaches involving multiple policy interventions. This relates to a process of human development (Kraus et al. (2019)), promoting economic opportunities for marginalized segments of the population, equal access to education and healthcare, and encouraging political participation throughout the community (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2006). To mention one, Truth and reconciliation commissions are ways to address historical injustices that develop healing and conciliation (Hayner, 2001). It also suggests that good governance, transparency, and accountability promote trust and social cohesion, which help prevent conflict and create space for democratic development (Rothstein, 2011).

Conclusion

Political conflict is a two-edged sword for democratic reform. It can catalyze change by illuminating the shortcomings of current institutions and mobilizing calls for reform. Unaddressed conflict can turn violent, instigating instability and setting back democratic progress. The effectiveness of conflict-based democratic reform is contingent on various conditions, including the type and strength of the war, the degree of division within the political system, the robustness of democratic institutions, and the influence of foreign actors.

These dynamics are important for policymakers and practitioners interested in promoting democratic reform in societies affected by conflict. By acknowledging that conflict is restorative as well

as destructive and implementing systems to prevent it from being destructive while allowing it to have a restorative role, we can harness conflict to build more open, responsive, and resilient democracies.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2006). *Economic origins of dictatorship and democracy*. Cambridge University Press.

Alesina, A., & Perotti, R. (1996). Income distribution, political instability, and investment. *European Economic Review*, *40*(6), 1203-1228.

Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education* (4th ed.). Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication*, *33*(2), 122–139.

Bercovitch, J. (1996). *Resolving international conflicts: The theory and practice of mediation*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Berlin, I. (1969). *Four essays on liberty*. Oxford University Press.

Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J. (2011). *Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict*. Columbia University Press.

Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. Yale University Press.

Dahl, R. A. (2015). *On democracy* (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.

Dalton, R. J. (2008). *Citizen politics: Public opinion and political parties in advanced industrial democracies* (5th ed.). CQ Press.

Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing democracy: Toward consolidation*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (2nd ed.). Penguin Books.

Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gaddis, J. L. (2005). *The Cold War: A new history*. Penguin Books.

Ganguly, S. (2008). *Democracy and diversity in India: Challenges and opportunities*. Foreign Policy Research Institute.

Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why do men rebel?* Princeton University Press.

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. MIT Press.

Hayner, P. B. (2001). *Unspeakable truths: Confronting state terror and atrocity*. Routledge.

Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. University of California Press.

Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Simon & Schuster.

Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Who are we?: The challenges to America's national identity*. Simon & Schuster.

Hutt, M. (2004). *Himalayan people's war: Nepal's Maoist rebellion*. Indiana University Press.

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2016). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*. Cambridge University Press.

Jahan, R. (1995). *The elusive agenda: Mainstreaming women in development*. University Press Limited, Dhaka.

Jalal, A. (2014). *The struggle for Pakistan: A Muslim homeland and global politics*. Harvard University Press.

Kaufman, S. J. (2001). *Modern hatreds: The symbolic politics of ethnic war*. Cornell University Press.

Kriesi, H. (2014). The populist challenge. *West European Politics*, *37*(2), 361–378.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford University Press.

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown.

Lijphart, A. (1968). *The politics of accommodation: Pluralism and democracy in the Netherlands*. University of California Press.

Linz, J. J., & Stepan, A. (1996). *Problems of democratic transition and consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and post-communist Europe*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, *53*(1), 69–105.

Mamdani, M. (2001). *When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton University Press.

Mansfield, E. D., & Snyder, J. (2005). *Electing to fight: Why emerging democracies go to war*. MIT Press.

McChesney, R. W. (2004). *The problem of the media: U.S. communication politics in the 21st century*. Monthly Review Press.

McCoy, J., & Myers, D. J. (2004). *"Polarization and the Global Crisis of Democracy." Paper presented at the conference on "The Global Crisis of Democracy," University of California, Los Angeles*.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking the world politically*. Verso Books.

Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A concise introduction*. Oxford University Press.

O'Donnell, G. A. (2004). Why the rule of law matters. *Journal of Democracy*, *15*(4), 32–46.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.

Reilly, B. (2002). *Democracy in divided societies: Electoral engineering for conflict management*. Cambridge University Press.

Rotberg, R. I. (2004). The failure and collapse of nation-states: Breakdown, prevention, and repair. *When states fail: Causes and consequences* (pp. 1-50). Princeton University Press.

Rothstein, B. (2011). *The quality of government: Corruption, social trust, and inequality in international perspective*. University of Chicago Press.

Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). *The semi-sovereign people: A realist's view of democracy in America*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Schedler, A. (1999). Conceptualizing accountability. In A. Schedler, L. Diamond, & M. F. Plattner (Eds.), *The self-restraining state: Power and accountability in new democracies* (pp. 13–28). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Simons, A., & Birkland, T. A. (2018). *Policy process theory*. Routledge.

Sisk, T. D. (1996). *Power sharing and international mediation in ethnic conflicts*. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Sriram, C. L., & King, J. C. (2003). Identity, conflict, and cooperation in international river basins. *International Negotiation*, *8*(2), 203-234.

Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Teorell, J. (2010). *Determinants of democratization: Explaining regime change in the world, 1972-2006*. Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, C. (2004). *Social movements, 1768-2004*. Paradigm Publishers.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.

Tyler, T. R. (2006). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, pp. *57*, 375–400.

Walter, B. F. (2002). *Committing to peace: The successful settlement of civil wars*. Princeton University Press.

Warren, M. E. (2002). What does corruption mean in a democracy? *American Journal of Political Science*, *48*(2), 328-343.

Weiss, G. (2006). *Sri Lanka's Conflict: Realities, Representations, Resolutions*. Routledge.