South Asia

GURHARPAL SINGH

In the theorization and general discussion of democratization South Asia occupies a distinctive space. The region, comprising India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan, and the Maldives, is home to 1.4 billion people (almost 22 per cent of the world's population), of whom around 550 million live below the poverty line. As recent events have demonstrated, in the popular imagination South Asia is commonly characterized as suffering from chronic political instability, protracted ethnic conflicts and the ever-present threat of nuclear war. But South Asia also boasts some of the oldest democracies in the developing world. India remains – despite its many limitations – the premier example, the 'largest democracy' in the world, and Sri Lanka, its current difficulties notwithstanding, is a reasonably strong contender as a viable developing democracy. Pakistan and Bangladesh, though sharing a common ancestry, have had prolonged periods of alternation between civilian and military rule. And Nepal has managed a transition from a monarchy to a parliamentary democracy. In one form or another democratic governance in South Asia has taken root against formidable odds, and while the post-colonial history of these states is not one of linear progress, it would be misleading to suggest that democratization is essentially a short-term contemporary phenomenon.

Directly or indirectly, democratization has been central to the study of South Asian politics over the last decade. Coinciding with the 'third wave', it reflects seismic changes within the governance of South Asian states. These changes embrace the collapse of dominant party systems, the transition from military or monarchical regimes (Pakistan,

Bangladesh and Nepal), the rise of violent ethnic conflicts, the social mobilization of previously excluded groups, economic liberalization, the emergence of a vibrant civil sector, regionalization and localization in the face of globalization, international pressure, and domestic demands for political reform. The old certainties that defined the post-colonial order are fast disappearing; the new order is yet to emerge. Transition best represents South Asian politics today, and democratization as an overarching theme most appropriately encapsulates this change.¹

Key issues

Although the sheer size and diversity of the region – India is itself of continental dimensions – defies any meaningful generalizations, the common experience of statehood has given rise to similar concerns in the efforts to establish viable democracies (Jalal 1995). At the risk of a great deal of simplicity – and violence – the most important of these concerns as identified in the literature are: political consolidation; structural social change; democratic transition; and the impact of international developments.

In the last decade much of the analysis of South Asian politics has been preoccupied with the rise of ethno-national movements – in Kashmir, Punjab, and the North-Eastern States, the emergence of the Hindu right (India), Sindh (Pakistan) and the Tamil–Singhalese conflict (Sri Lanka). Explanations of these movements have ranged from standard accounts of political management to those that question the very bases of political consolidation broadly understood as both institutionalization and statehood (Singh 2000). Inasmuch as these movements are resilient, speak the language of ethno-nationalism and lay claim, rightly or wrongly, to self-determination, they have magnified the failures of South Asian states to build legitimate democracy that commands consent freely given (Tambiah 1996). Indeed, violent peripheral ethno-nationalist movements – and the aggressive mainstream reaction to them – have, in large measure, undermined ‘official’ nationalism while simultaneously throwing into doubt the post-colonial project in which

nation- and state-building were envisaged as the handmaidens of democracy. For some writers, this confrontation has revealed the state-centric nature of 'official' nationalisms in South Asia and the limited progress made in democratizing the state in the half century since independence (Jalal 1995). For others, ethnocracies or ethnic democracies, it is suggested, are the more appropriate way to conceptualize the South Asian democratic experience (Singh 2000: 35–55). Despite these disagreements, the problems of political consolidation are real. Whether it is the more relatively institutionalized democracies like India or Sri Lanka or more fragile polities in transition in Bangladesh and Nepal, the inability to overcome permanent threats to the stability of existing regimes has retarded the processes of consolidation. At best it has made consolidation uneven and partial; at worst a frequent prey to institutional decay, mismanagement and political populism. In a region in which the understanding of the nation and the state is deeply contested, the idea and practice of democracy is similarly compromised by the inability firmly to resolve these differences in durable constitutional designs.²

The second major trend evident in the literature is the focus on social change as the key variable in explaining recent developments. Epitomized in the novelist Naipaul's phrase as 'a million mutinies' (Naipaul 1990), it captures graphically the tumultuous social mobilization of previously quiescent classes – peasants, lower castes, the petit bourgeoisie – who were the silent spectators during the transfers of power from colonial rule. Modernization, urbanization, economic liberalization and affirmative action policies have brought these classes/groups into the political systems, and thereby have altered fundamentally the character of existing institutions and state policies. This mobilization has been associated with populist styles and idioms in political life in which personalities and symbolism have replaced effective delivery. According to Varshney (2000: 12–13), on the other hand, the change signifies the emergence of 'plebeian politics' along the lines of social democracy in Europe in the late nineteenth century. A visible transfer of power is taking place from the upper to lower castes, from the privileged to underprivileged and from the Western-educated elites to 'sons of the soil' (Corbridge and Harriss

2000). Such change is most apparent in the populous northern states of the Indian Union. In Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Nepal 'plebeian politics' has also made itself felt, though perhaps less so in terms of representation than in generating demands upon the respective political systems. In sum, social change is 'reinventing' South Asian polities by creating new pressures for change through gradually displacing the traditional elites who have so far managed the post-colonial settlement.

In Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan the democratization literature (Waseem 1996; Talbot 1999; Baral 2001) has also been concerned with the theme of transition. While in Pakistan the post-1988 transition suffered a dramatic reversal in 1999, when a military coup led by General Pervez Musharraf overthrew the government of Nawaz Sharif, Nepal's transition has been disturbed by a widespread Maoist insurgency. Bangladesh's parliamentary democracy remains precarious, in spite of having experienced two alternations of power between the leading political parties. In these three states the transition has been influenced by the efforts of previous regimes to frame the processes of democratization. Pakistan's embedded 'praetorian state' effectively scuttled the post-1988 phase of democratization (Waseem 2001); it is currently in the process of fashioning a new polity that establishes a permanent status for the armed forces. Likewise Nepal's monarchy reluctantly conceded parliamentary democracy in 1990, but against the backdrop of the palace massacre (2001) and the insurgency it has been trying to rein in politicians through the emergency and the anti-corruption drive (Singh 2002). Bangladesh's difficult transition has been shaped primarily by the bitter contest between the Awami League and the Bangladesh National Party – an entity sponsored by the earlier military regimes.

The impact of international developments is a recurrent theme in the literature on democratization in South Asia (Chadda 2000). The end of the second Cold War coincided with the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and redefined the geopolitics of the region, which had been locked in proxy superpower rivalries. The Soviet Union's collapse, which undermined the Nehruvian settlement in India, precipitating the end of centralized planning and the beginning of

economic liberalization, created new openness in a unipolar world. Simultaneously the development of new communications technologies eroded the strict control on political communications that had been a characteristic feature of South Asian states (Rajagopal 2001). Combined, these changes generated two sets of external pressures that directly affected democratization in the region. First, some writings recognize that the 'good governance agenda' arising from the Washington consensus has imposed prescriptive requirements for public policy based on accountability, transparency and decentralization (Ahmed 2001). Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Nepal have felt the conditionality of this agenda, particularly in dealing with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (Singh 2002). And if India thus far has avoided such blandishments, it is because some of the major initiatives, such as those in the reform of local government, have anticipated these developments in some measure. The second area where international developments have made a significant contribution, according to some analysts, is in creating a transnational wedge of local and international activists who have, through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other organizations, created a vibrant civil society sector committed to deepening democracy and establishing international norms in such fields as human rights, women's rights, and environmental protection. South Asia is sometimes described as the 'NGO capital of the world' (Kudva 1996:1), where social and political conditions are ideal for non-state organizations, and all the more so as the capacity of the state to influence social change is undergoing serious decline.

South Asian experience and democratization

Given the range and depth of the themes currently analysed by specialists studying democratization in South Asia, what do these studies have most to offer a critical understanding of democratization as process in a broader sense? There are many empirical and theoretical lessons that cannot be adequately covered in a short survey; but taking the region as whole five aspects merit more detailed consideration.

First, the overwhelming concern of analysts of democratization in South Asia regarding political consolidation suggests a profound disquiet about the teleology of democratization. In a region in which democracy preceded nation and state-building the challenges have been correspondingly difficult. The experience of South Asian states – of India in particular, it is asserted – offers a revisionist interpretation of accounts in which state and nationhood are seen as the *sine qua non* of effective democratization. According to some (Chadda 2000; Kohli 2001: 1–19) the Nehruvian state and its progeny appear to have successfully managed the challenge of building a developing democracy while reconciling a plural conception of nationhood, even if it is bitterly contested in the peripheral regions. In Sri Lanka, too, the consociational arrangement between Sinhalese and Tamil elites appears to have broken down only in the late 1970s (Tambiah 1986). Moreover, if statehood and nationhood are seen as necessary pre-requisites of effective democratization, then Bangladesh, Nepal and, to lesser extent, post-1971 Pakistan should have been more successful in managing the transitions. Even allowing for the fact that some readings suggest that a ‘centralised state’ (Kohli 2001: 19) might be the efficient secret of Indian democracy’s success, or that the shortcomings of transitions in Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan can be attributed to failures of nation- and state-building, the South Asian experience, by and large, does not conform to the European ideal or the experience of democratization in Southeast Asia.

Second, the problems of political consolidation that beset most states in South Asia highlight a more basic concern with the effectiveness of post-transition democracy: that is, the substantive nature of democracy and its varied experience. Political decay, de-institutionalization and malgovernance have become the familiar lament of those who have attempted to explain away the tenuousness of post-transition regimes. Yet more considered responses have sought to rework Moore’s (1981) thesis in the light of comparative South Asian experience. In India, for instance, the effectiveness of provincial democracy varies enormously, with populous states like Bihar on the verge of anarchy, while others like Kerala have become models of social democracy. These variations, notes Heller (2000) – and the

argument is applicable to other Indian provinces as well as to post-transition regimes in Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan (1988–99) – can be understood if we revisit Moore’s thesis, paying close attention to constitutional design and the configuration of class forces in contributing to a ‘virtuous cycle of democratization’. Kerala’s case, Heller argues, demonstrates that a hierarchical, caste-ridden society can be transformed into one in which associational life and class organizations flourish within a democratic culture. Indeed ‘if democracy works better today in Kerala, it is because its citizens are active and organised and because horizontal associations prevail over vertical (clientelistic) forms of association’ (Heller 2000:501). The emergence of civil society there is not the function of elite engineering or regional cultural tradition but the outgrowth of conflict and social mobilization over the last half-century. In a region where even the best models of democracy function without substantive horizontal associations, Kerala offers a salutary counterfactual example.

Third, there is a broad consensus that within South Asia the ‘third wave’ has coincided with ‘democratization from below’. Whereas the ‘second wave’ was primarily elite-driven and reflected a colonial bequest, developments since 1989 have had a greater impact in encouraging political participation and decision-making at the village level and upwards. Institutional changes made as a result of external pressure – or in anticipation of it – have radically transformed the nature of local government, which had largely been left in abeyance since decolonization. In India the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act (1993), which established *panchayati raj* (village rule), with delegated funds and reservation for backward classes/castes and women, has created a new cadre of trained democrats in India’s 800,000 villages. Ironically, although *panchayati raj* was originally intended to undermine the states and to centralize power in New Delhi even further, its actual consequences have been to rework local democracy in ways that now engage the previously excluded and underprivileged. Reforms of local government in Bangladesh and Pakistan have also had similar unintended consequences by providing new structures that have unleashed decades of frustration, though in Pakistan the current military regime has sought to use local power to legitimize its

rule. But perhaps the most significant impact of 'democratization from below' has been to foster, along with the activities of NGOs, a transparency and accountability culture that manifests itself in manifold forms of citizen activism – in local movements against corruption in the disbursement of development funds, and increasing demands to audit government programmes. These movements have increasingly international sponsorships, and some have been quite successful in influencing policies at the local level. The growing culture of democratic accountability, more than anything, is likely to provide the firm bedrock for a systemic transformation of governance from below in South Asian states.

Fourth, the strength of 'democratization from below' in some ways can be attributed to the impact of social movements or social activism, particularly, though not exclusively, since the early 1990s. Social movements have been identified as an important component of democratization in Latin America, but their contribution in South Asia has tended to be overlooked because of the state-centric nature of much of the analysis. As the effectiveness of political parties at all levels has declined, social movements have begun to take over the discursive and organizational space between state and society (Katzenstein *et al.* 2001). These movements, of course, vary enormously, from some whose vision is transformative to others that are essentially single-issue organizations. Among the most prominent are women's, environmental and local movements, with a variety of agendas at the local, regional, national or international level, often collaborating with multinational organizations and NGOs to bring their demands to the international audience. Some academics have interpreted the rise of the Hindu right as a social movement that does not only seek political power, but also aims to effect long-term social change in values through the advocacy of *Hindutva* (Hinduness) (Basu 2001). The same in a sense could be argued of other revivalist or fundamentalist movements in other faiths. Nonetheless, taken collectively the influence of these movements far exceeds their numbers. Interestingly, social movements have tended to eschew electoral politics, which have become the arena for 'representing and endorsing essentialised identities and institutionalising them' (Katzenstein *et al.* 2001:

269). Instead, they frequently articulate interests within the judicial-administrative apparatus of the state primarily because the latter is far more receptive to the demands of interest rather than identity, and allows the state to negotiate the diversity of interests that 'perform a very different democratic function than party or electoral politics' (Katzenstein *et al.* 2001: 269). If institutional sclerosis sometimes seems to typify most South Asian states, then it is in the sphere of the social, we are informed, that the real resilience of democratization is to be found. Social activism may not always meet the threshold of institutional significance, but in South Asia it provides an important 'discursive space in which new and transformative meanings are constantly being generated' (Katzenstein *et al.* 2001: 269). Such social movements provide a crucial element of renewal and cohesion, and the most promising prospects for enduring reform.

Finally, critiques of democratization have generated a lively debate about the relevance of the process in South Asia. Much as Marxist analysis provided a counterpoint to modernization theory in the 1960s and 1970s, today an equivalent intellectual space in South Asia is occupied by post-structural analysis that combines the traditional anti-colonial agenda with critiques of 'Western-style' democratization. At one level there is the frontal assault on the 'good governance agenda' and its political prescription as 'the new political economy', in which, it is claimed, concepts like social capital have masked the actual appropriation – through liberalization – of capital through the obfuscating discourse of neoliberal economics (Rajasingham-Senanayake 2001). At another there is a fundamental effort to interrogate key concepts and assumptions that sustain democratization. For instance, drawing on the experience of South Asian societies, Kaviraj and Khilnani (2001) have highlighted how unhelpful a concept like 'civil society' can be in understanding the politics of developing societies. They question whether civil society *can* be politically manufactured in the ways that appear to be implicit in some of the writing on democratization and explicit in the work of multinational agencies engaged in development. That this kind of engineering might be tantamount to inflicting violence on South Asian societies is also a point noted by Nandy (2001), a psychologist turned political scientist. For him the project of

democratization has to be located in a deeper understanding of how modernity has impacted on traditional societies through secular states. Much of the *anomie* present in South Asian politics and societies, insists Nandy, is the result of renewed searches for certainty manifest in the appeal of Hindu, Islamic and Singhalese 'fundamentalism'. These uncertainties have been compounded by globalization and economic liberalization, introducing dimensions of personal development that are at odds with traditional precepts. For Nandy, any meaningful understanding of such changes cannot be structured within familiar paradigms such as mass society: they require, above all, a recognition of the relevance of indigenous knowledge systems, which are refusing to die but are at the mercy of secularizing states. The need to realign the cultural and the political in South Asia might be suggestive of a 'clash of civilizations' in which the whole project of representative democracy is being called into question. But for Nandy the failure to recognize the potency of indigenous knowledge systems and to structure political institutions accordingly – the state, representative institutions, electoral systems – is the root cause of social and political dissonance, of schizoid political cultures that mimic modernity while exuding xenophobic fundamentalisms.

Constraints on democratization in South Asia

There is little doubt that today democratization in South Asia has become a multifaceted process that is both deepening in its form and extending across the region. Even when there have been recent reversals, as in Pakistan, these setbacks have had to acknowledge the need to restore the democratic process. Yet in a wider sense we need to be wary of arguments that predict an ever-onward march of democratization: in reforming or establishing new institutions to meet the challenge of change, South Asian political elites have proved quite adept at producing outcomes that can be profoundly undemocratic. In the light of this, what are the major constraints on democratization in the future?

As developments in Afghanistan and Kashmir have illustrated, the problem of political consolidation afflicts all

South Asian states, and holds the potential to undermine or arrest progress towards more open and participatory regimes. Because South Asia's 'soft states' cannot guarantee territorial integrity, there is always the temptation to resort to violence or encourage majoritarian nationalisms as legitimizing ideologies. These weaknesses arise mainly from the failure to evolve viable polities that combine democracy and social pluralism in ways that reject majoritarian impulses. It may well be that we are witnessing a peaking of the idea of homogenizing nationalism in the region, of the idea of 'one nation, one state'. Equally, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that such a judgement is probably premature. In India the ruling right-wing Bharatiya Janata Party recently established a constitutional review commission with a view to assessing the efficacy of the 'Westminster model', a decision that its critics alleged was an attempt to move the country towards a presidential system that would make it more possible for the party to implement its Hindu nationalist agenda. In Sri Lanka the externally sponsored peace accord aimed at resolving the Tamil insurgency is facing increasing difficulties from parties representing the Singhalese majority. In Nepal the parliamentary regime and the conduct of the counter-insurgency against Maoist guerrillas have failed to adequately recognize the extreme social diversity of the country. In Bangladesh the newly elected Bangladesh National Party is said to be promoting Islamicist policies. And in Pakistan Musharraf proposed changes to the constitution make few concessions to plural governance. In short, with perhaps the notable exception of some states in India, there has been remarkably little new innovation in the shape of new forms of governance that promote and institutionalize diversity. This major shortcoming is remarkable, given that South Asia is the most socially diverse region in the world. For democratization in South Asia to become a self-perpetuating process, it would seem that the challenges of political consolidation have to be met by reconciling the needs of the process of governing plural societies at all levels.

The tensions between social pluralism and political majoritarianism that plague South Asian states are rooted in the political elites' mindsets, which are singularly lacking in alternative visions of political reform. In contrast with other

regions – eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union – the post-1989 changes have not generally produced, with one or two provincial exceptions, political elites, either traditional or new, with radically alternative visions of democratic futures – visions where the secular trends of ‘downsizing’, ‘decentralization’ and ‘deregulation’ and ‘right-sizing’ the state are embraced as reforming projects capable of mobilizing new constituencies. Perhaps, as Lustick (1993) observes, the threshold costs for counter-elites to be able to undertake these kinds of reforms are currently too high. But given the size of the sub-continent and the range of problems of governance, such alternative agendas should have found natural appeal. That they have not, or have been imposed piecemeal by external agencies, indicates that for political elites in South Asia the concept of statecraft is largely one founded in the post-colonial transition, with nation- and state-building as a sacred testament. Naturally, this outlook has created an innate conservative attitude towards reform, where often change is conceded only when the pressures becoming unmanageable. Change, moreover, has sometimes taken place by default (for example, as, in the case of regionalization in India), rather than as a result of conscious political design. In contemporary South Asia it could be reasonably surmised that elite inertia rather than overt hostility to political reforms is the main constraint on further democratization.

Lastly, it has been suggested that the effectiveness of democratization as a process is much richer in societies where class politics with horizontal associations is the norm (Heller 2000). In so far as this hypothesis can be applied to South Asia, it offers sobering lessons. Traditionally left-wing parties, including the communist parties, have found it difficult to establish constituencies, despite the widespread poverty throughout South Asia. Communist parties have been successful in creating enclaves in some provinces, such as West Bengal, Tripura and Kerala, largely, though not exclusively, by championing regional nationalisms or, as in Nepal, by undertaking an anti-establishment struggle. In a region where caste, language, religion, and tribe mediate class-consciousness, horizontal associations of the kind found in developed capitalist societies have been very thin on the ground. Systematic and rapid industrialization might

erode vertical loyalties, but at current rates this is likely to be a very gradual process. In the absence of class politics some commentators have noted a healthy development from clientelism to identity politics (Heller 2000). Whether this presages class politics remains to be seen, for there is no certainty that industrialization will supplant the politics of identity. In so far as class politics articulates a 'modern' politics of interest, with attendant demands for equity, it would constitute a profound challenge to current state policies of affirmative action and representation that combine pre-modern conceptions of identity with modern, democratic notions of distributive justice.

Conclusion: future trends

In one form or another the theme of democratization will continue to preoccupy scholars of South Asia for the foreseeable future. National peculiarities will, of course, qualify how democratization is adapted, improved and subsequently revised. Nevertheless, in the light of the past and recent developments several broad areas can be identified that are likely to remain the focus of study.

Political consolidation and the effectiveness of the democratic process are likely to remain the key area of research. In the medium term it is unlikely that we will see a dramatic transformation in the concerns of territorial integrity that bedevil South Asian states. In fact the possibilities that some of the 'soft states' might implode, be 'right-sized' (have their boundaries changed) or re-sized (have their internal boundaries changed) as a result of internal and/or external pressures cannot be ruled out (Singh 2001). Barring such outcomes, the concerns with consolidation are likely to persist with those regimes currently negotiating or in the throes of transition – Nepal, Pakistan and Bangladesh. In more established democracies (India, Sri Lanka) the concern with consolidation is likely to be reflected in the evaluation of effectiveness: in a study of the social and political factors that explain variations at national and regional levels, and the growing pressure, from external and internal quarters, for accountability and transparency, democratic audits

and the need to meet international standards in key areas such as human rights, anti-discrimination legislation, and environmental protection. Although international agencies are increasingly imposing 'good governance' conditionality in their dealings with South Asian states, it remains to be seen whether such intervention complements ongoing processes or becomes a source for counter-mobilization.

There is also every likelihood that in South Asia the province will become the key unit of analysis. To be sure, the most challenging examination of democratization has focused on the provincial level; but comparisons between provinces and between South Asian states have been limited or beset by the nationalist polemics that are all too common. Given that there is a growing recognition of the need to view South Asia as a continental entity, a region that is increasingly interdependent in war and peace, with a tremendous economic potential if political stability is ensured, provincial successes and failures will become models to be emulated or avoided. In India Chandrababu Naidu in Andhra Pradesh has become the icon of new governance, delivering political reform and economic change in a way that marks a radical departure from established traditional norms in Indian politics. Developments elsewhere suggest that there are other provincial politicians for whom the agenda of transparency and accountability is appealing, if only to undermine opponents or the ruling political parties (Singh 2002).

The role that social movements play in encouraging the democratization of both the state and society will certainly come under greater scrutiny. As has been indicated previously, thus far this development has been explored mainly at the point of interface with state structures and in terms of how they have been reinvigorated and renewed. But social movements whose vision is transformative have tremendous potential to democratize society as well. There is clearly a great need to examine how social relations are being transformed by systemic social change and the activities of social movements. Whether the erosion of traditional norms results in less hierarchical societies remains to be seen; but it should radically alter conventional social roles. The reluctant acceptance by most South Asian states of the need to address gender discrimination is recognition

of these imminent changes, even if, at times, it is external pressures that have prompted policy initiatives. The iterative experience of these new participatory structures is likely to provide the opportunities and the demand for political reform along lines in which social change can be better represented.

Finally, given the rich intellectual tradition that underpins the analysis of the idea of democracy in South Asia over the last half-century, it is unlikely that the strength of the critiques of democratization will diminish in the future. Whereas such ideological critiques as the Marxist, Hindu, and Islamicist traditions have failed to provide effective counters to the broad processes currently under way, analysts reflecting on the wider implications of the South Asian experience have been to the fore in highlighting the limitations of key concepts such as civil society. This tradition is extremely rich and varied, and it is unlikely that it will concede to democratization as a hegemonic process without offering correctives or some basic revisions. At the same time, while these critiques are likely to draw attention to the shortcomings of democratization processes, their celebration of regional exceptionalism is likely to be tempered by an admission that at best they offer confusing intellectual road maps to achieving more tolerant, transparent and accountable societies. Hence Nandy's pining for neo-Gandhism is as utopian as the Taliban's political agenda in Afghanistan. Both in their own ways are trapped in time-warps of the pre-modern (undemocratic) age.

Notes

- 1 Governability has provided an alternative theoretical framework – see Kohli (1990). But given its association with the politics of order, governability as a concept is inherently limited in its ability to explain the multifaceted nature of the changes currently under way.
- 2 The problems of political consolidation are much more basic than those posed by the management of peripheral provinces. The rise of the Hindu Right in India, for instance, with its objective of a new constitutional design, suggests that the Nehruvian settlement has failed to become a hegemonic project.