

Unravelling the Premises of Power Sharing, Democratic Ideals and Nation-Building and its Institutional Challenges

Dr. E. Benrithung Patton

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Fazl Ali College, Mokokchung: Nagaland, India.

Abstract

This paper explores nation-building as a complex term, highlighting its ambiguity and historical growth. Nation-building is described as a societal process that happens gradually and is impacted by political, technological, and economic shifts. For a new state to be legitimate, citizens must actively shape a shared political will. This is the central idea. Power-sharing is a contentious and potentially pacifying practise that is being studied in nations where identity groups are divided. The study emphasises the significance of institutional design as political violence around the world increases. For long-term stability, nation-building is important because it fosters a unified identity, frequently via education. Problems, however, lead to critical questions about its suitability, especially in light of the democratic peace paradigm, and they end with a variety of factors to take into account for successful nation-building initiatives.

Keywords: nation-building, identity, legitimacy, power-sharing, democratic

‘Nation-building’: its foundational framework

The phrasing ‘nation-building’ is frequently used, yet it is still ambiguous and contentious. Its meaning is implied rather than defined in a large portion of the policy documentation. The more abstract process of creating a feeling of community or shared identity among the diverse groups who make up the population of a single state is attributed to as ‘nation-building.’ “Nation-building involves the creation of a national identity that supersedes local identities and loyalties that might compete with and preclude broader identification with the state” (Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict, 2022).

It is crucial to consider how theories of nation building have changed over time, as well as the other ideas they have both replaced and embraced. Many people think that nation building is an evolutionary process rather than a revolutionary one, that it takes time, and that it is a social process that cannot be sped up from the outside. It took a very long time for the city-states of Greek to develop into a nation, the city-states of Germany to form the union and then a nation, the diverse languages and cultural groups of France to form the nation of France, and the development of China from the warring kingdoms. These developments were the result not only of changes in political leadership but also of changes in technology and economic processes (the agricultural and then the industrial revolutions), as well as of other factors.

The community of citizens who wish to create a nation and take charge of this process is the subject of ‘nation-building’ (Dinnen, 2006). A shared political will must be shaped with the active involvement

of representative citizens if ‘nation-building’ is to be successful. The citizens must grant the new state the essential legitimacy. Effective collective decision-making frequently necessitates forcing individual parties to make sacrifices for the common good, therefore commitment to the common good and to a shared community are crucial (eg. to protect the environment for future generations). The foundational components of community, shared values and ties, must support these sacrifices in order for them to be considered legitimate and, as a result, either forced onto the community or ineffectively accomplished. The modern nation-state is supported in large part by citizenship. People must embrace and comprehend their role as citizens, together with the rights and obligations that this includes, in order for important institutions like the political and judiciary systems to function effectively. Citizenship serves as the cornerstone of the social contract that binds individuals to a particular nation-state and vice versa. The sense of belonging to a larger political community can be weakened or undermined when individual identities and allegiances are based primarily on membership in nationality and other highly localised groups. The appeal of sub-national identities is likely to endure or even grow stronger in places where states have either never operated effectively or have stopped to do so, hurting efforts to forge a sense of national community.

Power sharing as a paradigm for nation-building

A stable and inclusive nation is built on an architectural foundation, which is what power sharing looks like as a nation-building paradigm. Power sharing is fundamental to the governance plan because it prevents any one party from controlling the political landscape. Power sharing orchestrates a political composition that harmonises varied interests, much like a well-composed symphony where several instruments contribute to the main tune. This method avoids discordant notes that could cause social splits by acknowledging the inherent significance of inclusive decision-making. Power is distributed across different various sectors and communities, creating a resilient national structure that can withstand the challenges posed by its heterogeneous structure. Power sharing has been the subject of a contentious public discussion, with proponents emphasising its possible pacifying qualities while opponents highlight its spectacular failures, the risk of a lack of accountability, and the possibility of political rivalry in large coalition administrations.

Power sharing, at its core, creates a democratic fabric that encompasses the principles of participation and representation. Citizens participate actively in shaping the fabric of their country rather than acting as passive observers in the loom of governance. By ensuring that political threads are woven throughout the populace’s collective will, power sharing helps to weave a storey of inclusivity and shared ownership. By promoting a political environment where various views are not only heard but also included in the decision-making process, it is consistent with democratic ideals. When this democratic tapestry is unfolded, it portrays a picture of a dynamic and involved society in which power is not centralised in the hands of a select few but rather distributed across the populace.

There is a strong trend for some nationality, ethnically or religiously divided countries to implement some form of power sharing. And there is a wealth of abstract evidence and journalistic stories that point to power sharing having the ability to play a significant role in reducing violence. The consensus model of democracy, which is characterised by power sharing and the decentralisation of power at all levels, was chosen by many prosperous and peaceful countries that are ethnically and religiously divided (Lijphart, 1999). These illustrations support recent research showing that democratic institutions have a substantial impact on how political power can be dispersed and regulated (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2001;

Besley & Persson, 2011; Burgess *et al.* 2015). Surprisingly little conclusive statistical evidence linking power sharing to peace exists despite the increased interest in it (Francois *et al.* 2015). Despite a few significant exceptions, such as those provided by Cederman *et al.* (2013), Gates *et al.* (2015), and Strom *et al.* (2017), identification concerns are still crucial since the introduction of power sharing may be endogenous and because national limits are insufficient as a safety net. Since most research rely on larger institutional elements, the lack of quantitative data on power sharing is another barrier.

Political violence has reached distressing heights throughout human history, and efforts to prevent it have been made consistently. These extremes were notably evident in the 20th century. On the one hand, it was characterised by two World Wars, numerous instances of mass murder of civilians, horrifying suppression carried out by a number of totalitarian regimes, as well as numerous ongoing ethnic civil wars. On the other hand, there are significant growth in democratic initiatives and peacekeeping activities. We are currently experiencing a turnaround, with formerly peaceful regions of the world destabilising into extreme levels of violence. This is happening after an age of optimism about humanity's ability to reduce armed conflict (Pinker, 2012). The problem has gained prominence among major international organisations (the United Nations, the World Bank, the IMF, and the OECD), and policy evaluations from the academic community can be a significant aid in this endeavour.

Power sharing to prevent violence has been one permeating notion. Power sharing connote the precise divisions and combinations of power that guarantee that different groups have some degree of equal 'participation' in the institutions of a state and/or shared 'ownership' of its assets. This can be accomplished by creating a federation, a central government of national unity, or autonomous, non-governmental entities that serve as a check on the executive branch of government. Countries like Switzerland, Belgium, and Lebanon have long-standing systems of power sharing across various religious or linguistic groups. Since the 1998 Agreement, a similar system has also been in effect in Northern Ireland. Other nations, including as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Mali, have attempted it with less success.

Power sharing, as a paradigm, builds stable pillars in the political architecture of the country. Like load-bearing buildings, these pillars sustain the weight of governance and keep it from collapsing into anarchy or chaos. Power sharing establishes institutions that act as sentinels defending against corruption and the misuse of power by upholding the values of openness, responsibility, and the rule of law. This innovative strategy guarantees that the nation's governance is firmly established and resilient to both internal and foreign shocks. As a consequence, the nation is resilient and the rule of law is upheld, giving its people the confidence that their rights are upheld and their opinions are taken seriously.

Power sharing becomes more prevalent on the international scene and becomes a diplomatic language that is in line with the values of inclusivity and collaboration. Nations that engage in domestic power sharing tend to be better at cooperative diplomacy. International relationships become anchored by the capacity to recognise and value other points of view and work together to find answers. This skill at diplomacy not only raises the nation's profile internationally, but also puts it in a position to spur multilateral endeavours. A nation can become a global partner and contribute to a world where nations work together on the basis of mutual respect and shared values by introducing the concepts of power sharing to the international arena.

Institutional patterns and power dynamics

The way governments, organisations, and societies work is shaped by the interplay between power dynamics and institutional patterns. Establishing the ground rules and determining the allocation and

utilisation of power are the functions of institutions, which include both formal structures and informal norms. Comprehending these dynamics is essential for grasping decision-making procedures, distribution of resources, and the general stability of social structures. In order to stack the playing field in favour of democracy and arbitrate disputes in calm, if not productive, scholars and practitioners agree that institutional design is the most important policy tool at our disposal (Barnes, 2001; Belmont *et al.* 2002; Horowitz, 2002; Norris, 2002). A sighting of wide comparative politics discussion on democracy and power sharing helps in evaluating the externally sponsored endeavour to create democratic institutions and the subsequent consolidation of democracy in post-conflict developing countries. The majority of the power sharing discourse is focused on the requirement to give institutional assurances and protections to groups within divided community, even multinational states.

What insight the institutional prescriptions of power sharing can provide to post-conflict rebuilding efforts that are not primarily hampered by the problem of nationality in this construct in an effort to generalise from a body of literature that emphasises nationality as the fundamental political cleavage in a nation. For instance, the post-conflict democracy-building processes in Cambodia, East Timor, and Afghanistan are similar in that they place more emphasis on leaders' efforts to hold onto power and their relationship to popular involvement than on the prominence of group identity in politics. Instead of competition among identity groups concerned about their security and political power after a conflict, the transition to democracy and its subsequent consolidation have focused on fights among elites in each case.

The framework for organisational and societal functioning is provided by formal institutions, such as governmental entities, legal frameworks, and bureaucratic structures. The formal distribution of power is determined by the defined roles and hierarchies found in these institutions. Formal institutions can exhibit hierarchical, decentralised, or a hybrid pattern that influences the decision-making and implementation process. Under a federal system, for instance, authority may be distributed throughout several levels of government, or in a centralised government structure, power may be concentrated at the top.

On the other hand, unwritten social conventions, rules, and practises that govern conduct inside a society or organisation are referred to as informal institutions. The dynamics of power can be greatly impacted by these unofficial patterns. Decision-making processes are influenced by social hierarchies, cultural norms, and networks of influence that frequently function outside the boundaries of official systems. Gaining a comprehensive understanding of power dynamics in a particular setting requires the recognition and comprehension of these informal institutions.

The readings on power sharing does, however, provide insight into how legitimate governance systems might be developed in political systems that do not accept all-or-nothing decisions. Both theoretical arguments and actual information can be found in abundance in the description on power sharing and democracy. Understandably, power sharing is construed as a systems inclusively as the behaviours and frameworks that encourage broad-based governing coalitions that are typically inclusive of all significant mobilised groups in society (Sisk, 1996). The notion that institutions and practises can be put together in many ways to enhance democratic conflict management is highlighted by understanding power sharing in this way.

The tactics used to exercise, negotiate, and challenge power inside a system are referred to as power dynamics. Politics, the economy, society, and culture are just a few of the ways that power can appear. Decision-making authority, policy beneficiaries, and potential marginalisation are all influenced by the allocation of power. As conditions change, society changes, and outside factors come into play,

power relations change too. When power dynamics are analysed, it is necessary to look at how various actors or groups within institutions negotiate their interests, exercise influence, and deal with difficulties. In decision-making processes, institutional structures and power dynamics are vital. Which interests are given priority, how decisions are made, and who gets to speak up are all influenced by the official and unofficial conventions that exist inside organisations. Predicting and interpreting decision outcomes requires an understanding of power dynamics. It also highlights possible areas of disagreement or opposition within the framework.

Addressing injustices and improving the efficiency of organisations and communities require an understanding of institutional patterns and power relations as well as a critical evaluation of them. Targeted interventions are made possible by identifying locations where power is concentrated or where particular people are marginalised. Restructuring institutional patterns and establishing more equal power relations can be aided by initiatives that support inclusivity, accountability, and transparency. As a result, any organisation or society must consider the interaction between institutional patterns and power dynamics. Comprehending these components in detail offers valuable perspectives on decision-making processes, the individuals with sway, and the distribution and contestation of power. It provides the framework for formulating policies that promote equity, diversity, and efficient government.

Decoding Nation-Building: Challenges, Cooperation, Prosperity

A thorough grasp of the fundamental components that determine the fate of nations emerges from disentangling the complex web of power sharing, democratic ideals, and nation-building challenges. A robust and peaceful nation is created by skilfully weaving together the diverse strands of a nation, as demonstrated by the investigation of power sharing as a paradigm for nation-building. Democratic values are like a participatory governance symphony; they reverberate through the power-sharing corridors, highlighting the role that inclusion and representation play in the orchestration of a thriving society.

But there are difficulties along the way. Nations have complicated environments that need to be carefully navigated due to institutional patterns and power relations. Power dynamics impact the fair allocation of opportunities and resources, and formal institutions and informal norms influence decision-making. As we delve into the heart of nation-building, it becomes evident that addressing these challenges is imperative for fostering stability, justice, and progress. Recognizing that nation-building is a continuous process requiring flexibility and a dedication to democratic values is crucial while taking on these problems. Formal or informal, the institutions we establish become the foundation of a nation. It becomes crucial to foster inclusive, accountable, and transparent institutions as a result. Furthermore, it is critical that we recognise past wrongs, promote social cohesiveness, and accept the complexity of variety as we defend power sharing and democratic principles.

Conclusively, the dissection of power dynamics, democratic principles, and institutional challenges in the context of nation-building is a sophisticated exploration into the complex forces that shape the course of national history. It is a call to action, imploring societies to navigate these complexities with discernment and wisdom, understanding that real nation-building is a cooperative effort in which diversity's threads are not only preserved but also celebrated and power is distributed in a way that secures the prosperity and well-being of all citizens.

References

1. Acemoglu, D. and J. A. Robinson (2001). 'A theory of political transitions'. *American Economic Review*. 91 (4): 938-963.
2. Anonymous. *Nation building: Why some countries come together*. Princeton University. Retrieved from <https://assets.press.princeton.edu/chapters/i11197.pdf>
3. Barnes, S. H. (2001). 'The contribution of democracy to rebuilding post conflict societies'. *American Journal of International Law*. 95: 86–101.
4. Belmont, K., Mainwaring, S. and Reynolds, A. (2002). 'Introduction: institutional design, conflict management, and democracy'. In Reynolds, Bendix, Reinhard, eds., *Nation building and Citizenship* Berkeley: University of California Press.
5. Besley, T. and T. Persson (2011). 'The logic of political violence'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 126: 1411–1445.
6. Burgess, R, R. Jedwab, E. Miguel, A. Morjaria and G. Padró i Miquel (2015). 'The value of democracy: Evidence from road building in Kenya'. *American Economic Review*. 105: 1817–1851.
7. Cederman, L-E, K. Skrede Gleditsch and H. Buhaug (2013). *Inequality, grievances and civil war*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict. Third Edition. (2022).
9. Francois, P, I. Rainer and F. Trebbi (2015). 'How is power shared in Africa?'. *Econometrica*. 83: 465–503.
10. Gates, S, B. A. Graham, Y. Lupu, H. Strand and K. W. Strøm (2016). 'Power sharing, protection, and peace'. *The Journal of Politics*. 78 (2): 512–526.
11. Horowitz, D. L. (2002). 'Constitutional design: proposals versus processes'. In Bendix, Reinhard. *Nation building and Citizenship*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 15–36.
12. Kant, Immanuel (1983). *Perpetual Peace, and Other Essays on Politics, History, and Morals*. Hackett Publishing Company.
13. Lijphart (1999). *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
14. Mueller, Hannes, Rauh, Christopher and Rohner, Dominic (2003). 'Power sharing, conflict and state building Hannes'. In *Nation Building Big Lessons from Successes and Failures*, Dominic Rohner and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya (Ed). Centre for Economic Policy Research Press. London: UK.
15. Norris, P. (2002). 'Ballots not bullets: testing consociational theories of ethnic conflict, electoral systems, and democratization'. In Reynolds, ed., Bendix, Reinhard. *Nation building and Citizenship*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 206–47.
16. Pinker, S. (2012). *The better angels of our nature: Why violence has declined*. Penguin Books.
17. Sisk, T. (1996). *Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflicts*. Washington DC: Institute of Peace Press.
18. Sisk, T. (2003). 'Power-sharing after civil wars: matching problems to solutions'. In Darby and Ginty Mac, *Contemporary Peacemaking*. London: Macmillan. 139–50.
19. Stephenson, Carolyn (2005). *Nation Building- Beyond Intractability*. Retrieved from https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/nation_building/%3B
20. Tolz, Vera (1998). 'Forging the Nation: National Identity and Nation Building in Post-Communist Russia'. *Europe-Asia Studies*. 50 (6): 993–1022.