

People's Multiparty Democracy: Digital Challenges and Democratic Adaptation in Nepal

Surendra Prasad Pandey

Former Finance Minister, Government of Nepal

Orc  0009-0005-6703-5667

Email: surendra.pandey8@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 09 Jan 2026

Accepted: 22 May 2026

Keywords

PMPD

Artificial intelligence

Platform capitalism

Digital democracy

ABSTRACT

People's Multiparty Democracy (PMPD), introduced by Madan Bhandari and adopted by the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist–Leninist) in 1993, represents one of the most distinctive ideological innovations in modern Nepali political thought. By proposing “people’s democratic state power” in place of “people’s democratic dictatorship,” the doctrine reconciles Marxist political goals with competitive multiparty democracy, grounding legitimacy in popular participation. However, since PMPD’s formulation in the early 1990s, the global political economy has been immensely transformed by the rise of digital capitalism, social media, and artificial intelligence—developments that have fundamentally reshaped political communication, electoral behavior, and democratic governance. This study analyzes the historical evolution of PMPD and evaluates its relevance in the contemporary digital environment. Drawing on qualitative historical analysis and political theory, it examines PMPD’s emergence in the context of Nepal’s democratic struggles and the global crisis of socialism following the collapse of the Soviet Union, and explores the implications of network society, platform capitalism, surveillance capitalism, algorithmic governance, and digital disinformation for democratic politics in Nepal. The study argues that PMPD must expand beyond its traditional emphasis on electoral democracy and political pluralism to incorporate digital governance, data sovereignty, and algorithmic accountability—adaptations necessary to preserve democratic legitimacy and ensure the resilience of political institutions in the age of artificial intelligence.

Introduction

Democracy is one of the oldest systems of governance, practiced in diverse forms across the world. Over time, it has been adopted and adapted by numerous countries, resulting in a wide range of institutional models and practices. Despite its long historical lineage, democracy remains a dynamic and evolving political system. Its meaning and operational modalities have been continuously

redefined and reshaped, largely in response to the unique historical experiences, socio-political contexts, and normative aspirations of the societies that practice it. This inherent complexity and fluidity of democracy have been widely acknowledged in the scholarly literature.

Democracy is a tricky concept to work with, even though much has been written about it already. There are no definitive answers

to what democracy is—not even in this handbook. Democracy is complex and ever changing. It changes because its practitioners are what defines it, and when people and society change, so does democracy. Thus, it is best not to think about democracy as a fixed end-goal, but instead as an ever-evolving process. There is no one right answer—there are many. (Danish Youth Council, 2021:17)

This understanding of democracy as an evolving and context-dependent process is particularly relevant in the case of Nepal, where diverse models of democratic governance have been practiced over time. As elsewhere in the world, the country's system of governance has remained in a state of evolution, shaped by continuous experimentation and learning from its own political experiences. Rather than adhering strictly to a single external model, Nepal has drawn upon and adapted elements from various democratic systems. Consequently, the form of democracy practiced in Nepal does not correspond neatly to any singular, country-specific model.

Amid this process of experimentation, Bhandari (1993) advanced a distinctive framework of governance that sought to respond to the changing global political order, Nepal's geopolitical realities, and the aspirations of its people. Known as People's Multiparty Democracy (PMPD), this framework represents an organic and context-sensitive model of governance, and has since become the party's guiding ideological principle.

PMPD emerged as a significant ideological development in the evolution of Nepal's communist movement. Madan Bhandari, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist–Leninist)—abbreviated as the CPN (UML)—formulated the concept during a period of intense political transformation both at home and abroad. The doctrine sought to reconcile the Marxist objective of socialist transformation, understood in accordance with the Nepali reality and the Manifesto of the Communist Party's proposition

that socialism must “be different in different countries,” with the institutional framework of competitive multiparty democracy as outlined by Marx and Engels (1888/2010:26–27) in the ten-point program.

The restoration of democracy in 1990 occurred at a critical juncture in global political history. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the disintegration of communist regimes across Eastern Europe created a profound ideological crisis within the international communist movement. In this context, PMPD offered a new theoretical framework that enabled communist parties to operate within democratic institutions while maintaining socialist objectives. The doctrine was formally adopted by the Fifth National Convention of the CPN (UML) in 1993 (Pokhrel, 2024:4) as a “Program of Nepali Revolution,” and has been accepted as the party's guiding ideological principle since the Eighth Congress held in 2009 (Bhusal, 2023:187).

Bhandari's formulation of PMPD represented a strategic departure from traditional communist ideology by recognizing multiparty competition as a legitimate path toward socialism. Bhandari (1995) argued that “socialism cannot become stable or sustainable if it is imposed by force without establishing an independent and self-reliant national economy. The experiences and outcomes of numerous countries have proven this” (177). He further elaborated that after the era of Marx and Lenin, global conditions had developed enormously, and that PMPD had been formulated to preserve and develop the revolutionary essence within a multiparty form suited to Nepali conditions (Bhandari, 1995:171).

Scholars have emphasized that PMPD represents a creative adaptation of Marxism to Nepal's specific historical conditions. Adopting fourteen clauses (Bhandari, 1995:332–340), it combines the principles of political pluralism, constitutionalism, and electoral competition with the long-term goal of socialist transformation. Political analyses of the doctrine consistently highlight its emphasis on democratic legitimacy, popular sovereignty,

and social justice as fundamental components of political development.

However, the political environment in which PMPD was originally formulated has undergone dramatic transformation over the past three decades. The rise of digital technologies, social media networks, and artificial intelligence has fundamentally altered the nature of political communication and democratic participation. Information flows are increasingly mediated by digital platforms controlled by global technology corporations, generating new forms of power and influence within democratic societies (Zuboff, 2019).

These developments have given rise to what Castells (2010) describes as the “network society,” in which social, economic, and political processes are structured around digital information networks (3). Scholars of political economy have similarly characterized the contemporary global system as “platform capitalism” (Srnicke, 2017:1), in which digital platforms serve as the primary infrastructure for economic and informational exchange.

In this context, political mobilization increasingly occurs through decentralized digital networks rather than through traditional party organizations. Within the globalized neoliberal order, new social movements (NSMs) (Goldstone, 2015)—such as the Arab Spring, Occupy Wall Street, and the Yellow Vest protests—organized largely through social media platforms, have emerged as influential actors in democratic politics. These movements frequently operate outside established institutional frameworks and rely heavily on digital communication technologies.

Nepal has begun to experience similar transformations in recent years. Movements such as Occupy Baluwatar, Enough is Enough, regular protests at Maitighar, and the Gen Z protest of September 2025 are illustrative examples (Suwal, 2025). Youth-driven political mobilizations, social media activism, and digital political campaigns have become increasingly prominent. The growing influence of social media platforms has

also facilitated the spread of misinformation and disinformation, which can distort public discourse and influence electoral outcomes—the very foundation of democracy (Nilafdeen, 2026).

Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies further intensify these dynamics by enabling algorithmic targeting, automated propaganda, and large-scale data manipulation (Arslan, 2025:106). These developments pose significant challenges to democratic governance and raise important questions about the future of ideological frameworks such as PMPD.

This paper argues that the conceptual framework of PMPD must evolve to address the challenges posed by the digital transformation of politics—challenges confronted by both the CPN (UML) and the Nepali Congress in the 2026 elections, within the political order that emerged after 1990. While the doctrine successfully reconciled socialism with multiparty democracy in the early 1990s, it must now incorporate new dimensions of digital governance, algorithmic accountability, and data sovereignty in order to remain relevant in the twenty-first century.

The fundamental characteristics of democracy vary across scholars and countries, yet there are certain intrinsic qualities of a vibrant democracy that include political pluralism, the rule of law, the right to private property, periodic elections, the separation of powers, individual freedom, and participation and inclusion, among others.

Marxists argue that Western democracy, operating within capitalism, exploits labor and generates surplus capital that forms the basis of capital accumulation, thereby widening the gap between the haves and the have-nots and ultimately inviting conflict between the rich and the poor. Socialism, in this view, is the only means of resolving this problem.

The central idea of PMPD is that while exercising the fundamentals of Western democracy to enhance individual freedom and protect private property, it simultaneously attempts to reduce the gap between

the rich and the poor in order to establish social justice. It is thus an amalgamation of the merits of Western democracy and the sound practices of socialism—a system introduced in Nepal in keeping with the global political order and the fundamental human aspiration for a better and more prosperous life.

Globalization has transformed the political order across the world, and the evolution of communication and information technologies—most recently digital technology—has emerged as a primary driver of that transformation. The exponential growth and innovation in these technologies have generated algorithmic surplus value in place of human surplus value, producing specialization on the one hand and creating and widening the digital divide on the other. Increasingly, data is collected, stored, and controlled by large corporations, enabling them to monitor human behavior, capture attention, and shape conduct systematically. Through algorithmic processes, these corporations monetize virtually every human activity.

The advancement of technology comes with significant costs. It has enabled the spread of misinformation and disinformation, which can manipulate public opinion and pose a broader threat to democracy.

Capitalists hold that individual freedom is the lifeblood of capitalist democracy, while Marxists emphasize collective rights and oppose the exploitation of workers by employers. PMPD, however, recognizes individual rights while also seeking a middle path that protects the collective rights of workers and simultaneously acknowledges the legitimate interests of employers. In its elaboration of the doctrine, PMPD attempts to balance both dimensions.

Existing literature interprets PMPD as a context-specific ideological innovation that adapts Marxist–Leninist principles to Nepal's multiparty democratic framework. Scholars generally emphasize its role in reconciling class-based

politics with electoral pluralism, presenting it as both a strategic and theoretical shift within the communist movement. Research has traced its evolution from a response to global socialist decline to a guiding framework for democratic participation and governance in Nepal. While much of the scholarship focuses on its ideological foundations and political application, relatively limited attention has been given to its relevance in the digital age and its capacity to respond to emerging democratic challenges. This gap points to the need for renewed analysis that situates PMPD within contemporary transformations in political communication and citizen engagement.

This study addresses the following central question: how can PMPD, originally developed in a pre-digital political environment, be reinterpreted to remain relevant in an era shaped by digital capitalism, algorithmic governance, and artificial intelligence? By situating PMPD within both classical ideological debates and contemporary technological transformations, the paper evaluates its capacity to adapt as a framework for democratic governance in the twenty-first century.

Methodology

This research adopts an interpretive analytical framework to examine the ideological evolution of PMPD. Emphasizing qualitative inquiry, the study engages with key texts, CPN (UML) party documents, and scholarly interpretations to trace shifts in ideological articulation over time. This approach enables a contextual understanding of how PMPD has responded to changing political, economic, and technological conditions.

The study is grounded in an interdisciplinary theoretical framework that draws on Marxist political economy, theories of digital capitalism, and democratic theory. Marxist analysis provides tools for examining class relations and structural inequality, while concepts such as network society and platform capitalism help explain the changing nature of power in the digital era. These

perspectives are combined with democratic theory to analyze questions of legitimacy, participation, and governance. This integrated approach makes it possible to examine PMPD both as an ideological construct and as a framework operating within changing socio-technical conditions.

The philosophical foundation of this paper is primarily rooted in critical constructivism, while also incorporating elements of critical realism. The study proceeds from the assumption that political concepts such as democracy are not fixed or inherently tied to a singular ideological system, but are historically interpreted, contested, and reconstructed through political practice and ideological struggle. In this sense, democracy is not understood solely as a construct of capitalism; rather, it can also be reinterpreted within a communist ideological framework, as demonstrated by PMPD as articulated by Bhandari.

At the same time, the paper recognizes that political realities are not entirely discursive or fluid. Institutional arrangements such as constitutional supremacy, the rule of law, periodic elections, and guarantees of political freedom constitute objective structural conditions that shape political practice. The fourteen clauses of PMPD reflect this institutional dimension by emphasizing democratic principles alongside socialist transformation. Accordingly, the reality examined in this paper is understood as both constructed and structured: constructed through the ideological reinterpretation of democracy within communist thought, and structured through enduring institutional and constitutional frameworks that provide stability to political life.

This study employs a qualitative research design combining historical analysis, political theory, and contemporary policy analysis. The Comparative-Historical Analysis (CHA) approach in political theory uses in-depth process tracing and comparative case studies to generate or test normative and empirical theories, challenging the

disconnect between abstract and historical reality (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003:8). Skinner (Edling & Mörkenstam, 1995) argues that political thought must be understood through the “intentions” of authors within their historical context, and that the crucial purpose of his contribution has been to illuminate the relationship between theory—that is, reflection on political life—and political practice, a relationship that is clearly demonstrated in PMPD.

Data sources

In order to strengthen the article academically, a large number of relevant, accessible, and reliable data sources have been used, which not only enhance the article’s readability but also its academic rigor. The study relies primarily on secondary sources, including clearly identifiable documents and datasets: Academic journal articles on PMPD and Nepali political ideology, including peer-reviewed publications in journals such as *Studies in Nepali History and Society* and *Economic and Political Weekly*.

Foundational scholarly works on digital capitalism and network society, including *The Rise of the Network Society* by Manuel Castells (Castells, 1996) and *Platform Capitalism* by Nick Srnicek (Srnicek, 2017).

Official political documents of the CPN (UML), including party manifestos, policy documents, and proceedings from national congresses (CPN [UML], various years).

Political speeches and writings of Bhandari, particularly his formulations of PMPD as compiled in party publications and congress reports (Bhandari, 1995).

Contemporary studies and datasets on digital democracy and artificial intelligence, including media and policy analyses—among them Kharel’s characterization of Nepal as a “digital battleground” in the context of rising AI-generated content—as well as national-level internet usage data from DataReportal and the Internet Service

Providers' Association of Nepal. These sources report that over 56 percent of Nepal's population is online, including approximately 14.8 million Facebook users, 4.3 million Instagram users, and 2.2 million TikTok users (Ojha, 2026).

Analytical approach

This research adopts a multi-dimensional analytical framework to explore the ideological evolution, theoretical foundations, and contemporary relevance of PMPD. By integrating historical, discursive, and contemporary political analyses, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of how PMPD has developed over time and how it engages with the evolving digital political landscape in Nepal.

The research applies three analytical methods:

Historical analysis

Historical analysis is employed to trace the emergence and consolidation of PMPD within Nepal's unique political context. This method situates the development of the ideology against the backdrop of global socialist transformations, examining how international ideological shifts and domestic political dynamics shaped its formulation and early adoption.

Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is applied to investigate the conceptual language, rhetorical strategies, and ideological structures embedded in PMPD. The study focuses on the writings of Bhandari and subsequent political interpretations to understand how ideas were framed, communicated, and institutionalized within the CPN (UML) through PMPD.

Contemporary political analysis

Contemporary political analysis evaluates recent political developments to assess the ongoing relevance of PMPD in Nepal's evolving democracy. Special attention is given to the influence of digital technologies and social media, exploring how these

platforms are reshaping political mobilization, public discourse, and citizen engagement.

These three approaches are employed in a complementary rather than sequential manner. Historical analysis provides the contextual foundation by examining the conditions under which PMPD emerged and developed. Discourse analysis builds on this foundation by exploring how the ideology was articulated and institutionalized through political language and leadership narratives. Contemporary political analysis extends the inquiry into the present by assessing how these ideas interact with ongoing transformations in the digital political environment. Together, these methods enable an integrated understanding of PMPD as both a historically grounded and continuously evolving framework.

Results and Discussion

Theoretical foundations of PMPD

PMPD emerged as a historically contingent ideological response to Nepal's prolonged democratic struggle and the global transformation of socialist politics in the late twentieth century. Its intellectual and political foundations can be traced to the political crisis of 1960, when King Mahendra dissolved the democratically elected parliament and imposed the partyless Panchayat system, thereby establishing a centralized autocratic political order that banned political parties and curtailed democratic freedoms. Following the dissolution of parliament, leaders and cadres of both the Nepal Communist Party (NCP) and the Nepali Congress were jailed, exiled, or forced underground to avoid state repression. In this context, Pushpa Lal Shrestha, the founding General Secretary of the NCP, proposed a joint struggle against King Mahendra with the objective of restoring the dissolved parliament (Bhusal, Panthi, & Sapkota, 2021:128). Although democratic forces—including the Nepali Congress and various communist factions—initiated sustained resistance against the Panchayat regime, ideological divisions prevented the emergence of a unified opposition

for several decades. The Nepali Congress remained aligned with liberal democratic traditions, whereas communist parties largely adhered to orthodox Marxist–Leninist principles and revolutionary strategies (Bhusal et al., 2021).

The political environment began to shift significantly after the nationwide student protests of 1979 developed into a broader people’s uprising, compelling King Birendra to announce a national referendum (Nepal Communist Party Marxist–Leninist, 1989:75). This period enabled the Communist Party of Nepal (Marxist–Leninist) [CPN–ML] and other opposition forces to expand their organizational reach and consolidate their mass base throughout the country. Eventually, the CPN (ML) unified with the CPN (Marxist) to form the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist–Leninist) [CPN–UML]. Simultaneously, global transformations within the socialist world exerted a profound influence on the ideological reorientation of Nepal’s communist movement. Deng Xiaoping’s economic reforms in China and Mikhail Gorbachev’s political reforms in the Soviet Union—particularly Glasnost and Perestroika—became central subjects of debate within the underground communist movement. These international developments encouraged communist leaders to reassess the viability of rigid one-party revolutionary strategies in Nepal’s changing political environment.

Within this evolving political and ideological context, Bhandari emerged as the principal architect of a new democratic orientation within Nepal’s communist movement. The concept of PMPD was first articulated by Bhandari (1989) as a framework to establish an independent secular state and rule of law with a multi-party democratic system. Recognizing his ideological contribution, the Fourth Party Congress of 1989 elected Bhandari as the party’s General Secretary. PMPD subsequently became a major ideological foundation for the communist movement’s participation in the People’s Movement of 1990, which restored multiparty democracy in Nepal.

The intellectual foundation of PMPD lies in its attempt to reconcile classical Marxist theory with democratic political institutions. Rejecting the conventional Marxist–Leninist emphasis on one-party rule and authoritarian “New Democratic” frameworks, Bhandari argued that socialism in Nepal could not be achieved through centralized revolutionary authoritarianism, but rather through democratic competition, constitutionalism, and popular participation (Bhandari, 1995:174). In this sense, PMPD represented both a strategic and theoretical departure from orthodox revolutionary communism by recognizing multiparty competition as a legitimate mechanism for socialist transformation under Nepal’s specific historical conditions. The doctrine was formally institutionalized through the Fifth National Congress of the CPN (UML) in 1993 and later reaffirmed as the party’s guiding ideological principle (Pokhrel, 2024). PMPD can thus be understood as a state-oriented political strategy of socialist transformation through constitutional and electoral legitimacy.

Several Nepali scholars have interpreted PMPD as a distinctive ideological synthesis shaped by both global communist debates and Nepal’s own democratic struggles. Pokhrel (2024:2) argues that the doctrine emerged from a critical reassessment of international communist experiences alongside the specific historical conditions of Nepal’s democratic movement. Similarly, Dhakal (2023) characterizes PMPD as a political and social theory that combines Marxist principles with Nepal’s unique socio-economic realities, describing Bhandari’s formulation as a creative reinterpretation of Marxism aimed at addressing changing class relations, political structures, and Nepal’s geopolitical context (Dhakal, 2023:62). Dhakal further emphasizes that the public image and credibility of party leadership were essential for establishing ideological legitimacy among the people, and identifies Bhandari’s charismatic

leadership as a crucial factor in the popular acceptance of PMPD (Dhakal, 2023: 71).

Scholars also note that PMPD institutionalized democratic pluralism within Nepal's communist movement by legitimizing electoral competition and constitutional democracy. Karki (2025:39) argues that the conceptual architecture of PMPD integrates democratic competition, party leadership, and ideological unity into a coherent political framework that balances democratic institutions with socialist objectives. In his assessment, "unlike post-Marxist projects that gravitate toward depoliticized pluralism or technocratic reformism, PMPD maintains ideological firmness. Its synthesis of revolution, principle, and unity reflects a deep commitment to democratic socialist transformation. It avoids both the authoritarianism of traditional socialism and the atomism of neoliberal democracy, proposing instead a people-centered, historically grounded model of system-building Marxism" (Karki, 2025:39).

AI, social media, electoral challenges, and class reconfiguration

The proliferation of social media has fundamentally transformed the production and circulation of information, blurring the boundaries between information, misinformation, and disinformation in contemporary democratic contexts. While accurate information supports informed citizenship and public deliberation, misinformation—unintentionally false or misleading content—and disinformation—deliberately fabricated or manipulated narratives—pose significant challenges to democratic governance. There is an urgent need for a dedicated institution, at both the national and global level, comparable in significance to the Bretton Woods institutions or the United Nations, capable of tracking misinformation and disinformation in real time.

An important question that arises in this context is whether an effective mechanism can be developed to monitor and regulate misinformation and disinformation. Although the creation of a single

global regulatory authority may not be practicable, a layered governance approach appears more feasible. At the national level, this could involve establishing an independent regulatory body responsible for overseeing digital communication, ensuring transparency in political advertising, and coordinating responses to disinformation.

At the platform level, regulatory measures should include requirements for greater transparency in algorithmic processes, clear labeling of automated or AI-generated content, and accountability in content moderation practices. Restrictions on manipulative practices such as micro-targeting in political campaigns may also be necessary. In addition, strengthening digital literacy among citizens is essential so that individuals are better equipped to evaluate information critically.

In Nepal's context, such interventions would need to be carefully designed to avoid undermining freedom of expression. The challenge lies in maintaining a balance between regulation and democratic rights, ensuring that efforts to counter disinformation do not become instruments of political control. Scholars such as Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) highlight how digital platforms amplify these dynamics through rapid dissemination, algorithmic prioritization, and low barriers to content creation—processes that can erode public trust, polarize political discourse, and complicate evidence-based policymaking. Addressing the interplay between information integrity and digital communication has therefore become a critical concern for sustaining democratic accountability and resilience.

The rise of social media has created both opportunities and challenges for democratic politics. Sunstein (2017) has warned about how social media can divide citizens into separate political camps, making democracy more polarized and constructive political dialogue increasingly difficult. Today, social media influencers are actively involved in communicating political messages, including those related to elections (von

Sikorski et al., 2025). Social media was similarly central to political contention during Nepal's recent general election of 2026, with the Election Commission noting widespread use of hate speech and deepfake videos produced using readily available artificial intelligence tools (Ojha, 2026).

The World Economic Forum (2026) has identified misinformation and disinformation as among the top two global risks, warning that AI-generated false information could undermine the very foundations of democracy by eroding public trust in institutions, manipulating voter behavior, and intensifying political polarization. Disinformation flows often consist of large volumes of independently produced false content designed to generate clicks and shares in support of prevailing social media business models. When such “for-profit” fake news acquires partisan dimensions, it may be amplified by social media bots and integrated into broader disinformation campaigns. This has weakened public trust not only in democratic political institutions and the press, but also in educational and civil society institutions—a distrust that is not merely temporary but reflects the hollowing out of party structures and diminished electoral representation.

Digital platforms enable broader participation and facilitate rapid communication between citizens and political actors, but the same technologies can equally be used to spread disinformation, manipulate public opinion, and polarize political communities. Scholars have identified algorithmic amplification as a key mechanism through which misinformation and disinformation spread rapidly across digital networks. Artificial intelligence intensifies this transformation by enabling automated communication, predictive analytics, and synthetic media production (Arslan, 2025; Raghavendra, 2026). In electoral contexts such as Nepal, AI-driven communication contributes to digitally mediated electoral asymmetry, in which access to technological infrastructure increasingly becomes a determinant of political influence (Ojha, 2026; Nilafdeen, 2026).

The newly emerged Cockroach Janata Party of India has been criticized for misusing digital technology. Its rise has demonstrated how an unexpected overnight political development, assisted by artificial intelligence, can produce political disruption of significant magnitude. The movement was ironically triggered by remarks made during a Supreme Court hearing, in which Chief Justice of India Surya Kant stated that some individuals “infiltrate professions like cockroaches”—a statement he later clarified referred to individuals using fraudulent qualifications. Frustrated youth subsequently appropriated the term to protest unemployment and political dysfunction, and the movement evolved into a viral digital pressure campaign rather than a formally institutionalized political organization.

One of the most significant aspects of the Cockroach Janata Party's emergence is its explicit use of artificial intelligence in constructing the movement's political infrastructure. According to Dhakal (2026), the party's founder acknowledged using AI tools—including Claude and ChatGPT—to design the party's visual identity, draft its manifesto, and establish its web presence within twenty-four hours. This illustrates broader transformations in the political economy of organization. Activities that previously required teams of designers, strategists, and political organizers working over extended periods can now be compressed into a highly accelerated, AI-assisted process, with the website, poster aesthetics, anthem, and meme templates all emerging from this compressed digital production cycle. Such developments raise important questions about the future of political organization itself. If the infrastructure of a political movement can be assembled almost instantaneously, barriers to political mobilization decrease dramatically—but the slower processes through which movements historically developed ideological depth and organizational coherence may weaken correspondingly. In this sense, the Cockroach Janata Party functions as a proof of

concept for AI-enabled political organization (Dhakal, 2026).

AI therefore poses both risks and challenges for electoral politics. Disinformation—commonly understood as false, inaccurate, or misleading information intentionally shared to deceive recipients (Bontridder & Poulet, 2021:2)—has been amplified by deepfake content and synthetic media technologies. AI tools also facilitate automated misinformation campaigns, while bot-driven political polarization contributes to hate speech and social division. In addition, AI raises significant concerns regarding data authenticity, informational integrity, and electoral manipulation. In emerging democracies such as Nepal, where digital literacy and regulatory frameworks remain relatively limited, these dynamics may substantially influence electoral outcomes and political stability. According to Nilafdeen (2026), disinformation remains one of the most serious threats to electoral integrity, with Nepal “grappling with the scale of the threat that disinformation poses to society and democracy at large” (para. 10).

This concern has also been echoed by the Election Commission of Nepal, which has reported widespread use of hate speech and deepfake content, including AI-generated videos falsely depicting candidates insulting opponents or using obscene language. Commission Information Officer Suman Ghimire described this as a “concerning issue,” noting that more than 600 cases had been referred to authorities, with around 150 handled by police (Ojha, 2026).

At the same time, AI and digital capitalism are restructuring traditional forms of class formation. Classical Marxist categories are increasingly being reconfigured through the emergence of platform capitalist classes controlling data infrastructures (Srnicsek, 2017), data-producing populations generating behavioral surplus value (Zuboff, 2019), precarious digital labor systems (Murdock, 2025), and digitally excluded populations lacking adequate infrastructural access (National Statistics

Office, 2024a). Inequality in the digital age is therefore not only economic but also algorithmic, informational, and epistemic.

There are indications that disparities in internet access may also be influencing patterns of political participation and electoral behavior across regions of Nepal. In areas with limited digital connectivity, political engagement continues to rely largely on traditional party structures and face-to-face mobilization. In contrast, urban and digitally connected populations appear more exposed to social media-driven political communication. While these observations require systematic empirical validation, they suggest a possible relationship between digital access and emerging forms of political influence—one that further research using electoral data and regional indicators of digital penetration would be necessary to examine more rigorously.

Democracy and the transformation of the global left

The emergence of PMPD also reflects broader transformations within the international socialist movement. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 led to a global reassessment of Marxist political strategies. Bhandari proposed and secured the approval of a political report during the Fifth National Congress of the CPN (UML) that critically evaluated the dissolution of the Soviet socialist system:

The inability to maintain a system of control and balance in the process of building socialism, establishing an excessively centralized system of state control over everything, failing to develop accountability in each unit of production, the absence of incentives to increase productivity, the inability to research and develop new technologies, and the failure to creatively move forward by evaluating the new conditions emerging in the course of competition with capitalism... the highly centralized control system of a vast bureaucratic apparatus that tried to forcibly

impose and regulate the desires of the state's central bodies down to the level of every individual weakened the internal life of Soviet socialism." (Bhandari, 1995: 223–224)

This, according to Bhandari (1995), caused stagnation and deadlock in Soviet society. At such a historical juncture, the reforms introduced by Gorbachev in the name of peace, disarmament, and comprehensive restructuring initially received widespread support from the Soviet people. However, Bhandari argued that those reforms were liquidationist in both class essence and national interest, ultimately leading to the collapse of socialism and the disintegration of the Soviet state (224).

In the aftermath of the USSR's dissolution and the collapse of socialist governments in Eastern Europe, many left-wing parties across the world increasingly adopted democratic socialist approaches emphasizing electoral competition, civil liberties, and constitutional governance. Within this broader ideological transition, PMPD can be interpreted as Nepal's contribution to the global evolution of democratic socialism. According to Pokharel (2023), PMPD constituted a program of Nepali revolution that sought to integrate core democratic values and socialist principles within Nepal's evolving geopolitical landscape. The ideology sought to reshape the trajectory of the Nepali nation-state by strategically positioning it to advance both popular welfare and national interests. Bhandari's vision thus emerged as an effort to reformulate communist politics under changing global conditions (115–116).

PMPD represents an attempt to overcome the historical tension between revolutionary socialism and parliamentary democracy by integrating both traditions within a single ideological framework. In the changing global political order, neither democracy nor socialism alone appeared sufficient. Consequently, PMPD incorporated principles such as pluralism, individual freedom, the rule of law, rights to private property, social security, the

minimization of class inequality, land reform in an agrarian economy, and recognition of diversity in a society comprising 142 recorded ethnic and caste groups. These principles reflected an effort to adapt socialist politics to Nepal's concrete socio-political realities.

However, the ideological assumptions underlying PMPD were historically grounded in a political environment where communication, organization, and mobilization were mediated primarily through party structures and territorially organized networks. The emergence of digital capitalism has fundamentally disrupted these mediating structures. Political communication is now increasingly organized through algorithmic systems, social media platforms, and data-driven informational flows (Castells, 2010; Srnicek, 2017). Consequently, political legitimacy is no longer constructed solely through party organization or electoral competition but also through digitally mediated attention economies and systems of algorithmic visibility (Zuboff, 2019). This transformation introduces a significant discontinuity between the institutional logic of PMPD and the emerging political ecology of platform capitalism, and PMPD must therefore be reinterpreted as a framework operating within digitally reconfigured conditions of political power.

Technology, in this context, cannot be understood as politically neutral. Artificial intelligence, although socially transformative, has largely been developed within the imperatives of capitalist accumulation and profit maximization. AI must therefore be analyzed as an endogenous force within the shifting logics of capitalist organization, where it actively restructures property regimes, reshapes circuits of surplus extraction, and redefines the capacities and functions of the state (Dyer-Witheford et al., 2019). In many respects, AI capitalism intensifies tendencies already identified by Marx. The expansion of digital infrastructures has accelerated capital accumulation while widening inequalities between those who possess technological access and those excluded from it, thereby deepening the global digital divide.

In explaining Britain's emergence as the first dominant industrial capitalist power, Marx identified two central processes: the enclosure of domestic land and the extraction of resources through colonial expansion and labor exploitation. Drawing on Harvey's (2003) revisionist interpretation, it can be argued that the consolidation of digital capitalism in the United States has been propelled by analogous dynamics. Neoliberal privatization and deregulation have generated a new enclosure movement in which control over digital infrastructures and informational activity has become concentrated in the hands of a small number of mega-corporations. Simultaneously, the continued exploitation of offshore labor and material resources sustains global circuits of digital accumulation. These developments coincide with worsening ecological crises and deepening global inequalities, producing an increasingly uneven distribution of social and environmental costs (Murdock, 2025).

Grounded in dialectical analysis, Historical Materialist theory predicts that technological transformations generate new productive possibilities that eventually reshape relations of production. As these relations expand across the economic system, pressures emerge to transform prevailing property relations and usher in a new mode of production. Advancing AI appears to be generating conditions for a potentially post-capitalist mode of production. However, the trajectory and character of this transition appear considerably more complex than anticipated in classical formulations of historical materialist theory, which envisioned communism as the inevitable successor to capitalism (Mattos, 2019). In the contemporary digital economy, information and data increasingly function as strategic assets and new means of production, supplementing and in some respects superseding the traditional categories of land, labor, and capital.

Under these conditions, PMPD's original synthesis of democracy and socialism requires theoretical

expansion beyond the institutional assumptions of the late twentieth century. The challenge is no longer confined to reconciling parliamentary democracy with socialist transformation, but extends to understanding how political sovereignty, democratic participation, and social ownership can be rearticulated within an emerging regime of digital capitalism structured by algorithmic governance, platform monopolies, and data extraction.

PMPD as an ideological synthesis: Between Marxism, democratic pluralism, and digital capitalism

PMPD represents an ideological synthesis that seeks to reconcile Marxist political economy with liberal democratic institutionalism. Marxism emphasizes the structural transformation of property relations and class power (Marx & Engels, 2010), whereas liberal democracy prioritizes procedural legitimacy through electoral competition and constitutional governance (Danish Youth Council, 2021). PMPD intervenes in this binary by proposing a dialectical mediation between revolutionary transformation and democratic institutionalism. It neither rejects multiparty democracy as a bourgeois construct nor abandons the socialist objective of reducing structural inequality. Instead, it redefines democracy as a continuous process of popular legitimacy through competitive elections embedded within a socialist developmental orientation (Bhandari, 1995; Karki, 2025). This positions PMPD as a transition-oriented ideology in which political pluralism serves as the operational mechanism for socialist transformation.

However, the rise of digital capitalism has fundamentally altered the structure of the political economy within which PMPD operates. Castells (2010) conceptualizes the network society as a system in which power is organized through digital information networks, such that political communication and mobilization are increasingly mediated through digitally networked infrastructures rather than exclusively through

territorial party organization and conventional institutional structures.

Srnicek (2017) similarly identifies digital platforms as infrastructures for data extraction, behavioral tracking, and economic coordination. These platforms shape political communication by controlling informational visibility and engagement, with the result that political legitimacy is increasingly produced through digitally mediated attention economies and algorithmic systems rather than solely through deliberative democratic institutions or electoral processes.

Zuboff (2019) further conceptualizes surveillance capitalism as a system in which behavioral data is extracted, analyzed, and monetized to predict and influence human action, producing what she terms “instrumentarian power”—a form of power that operates through behavioral modification rather than coercion. In this context, political discourse becomes increasingly dependent on algorithmic prioritization rather than deliberative democratic processes, posing structural challenges for ideologies such as PMPD.

The ideological assumptions underlying PMPD were historically grounded in a political environment where communication and mobilization were mediated through party structures and territorial organization. The emergence of digital capitalism has disrupted these mediating structures and reconfigured the relationship between political power, communication, and legitimacy. Consequently, PMPD must increasingly confront questions concerning data ownership, algorithmic governance, platform monopolization, and digital inequality within the broader transformation of contemporary capitalism.

The proliferation of social media has fundamentally transformed the production and circulation of information, blurring the boundaries between information, misinformation, and disinformation in contemporary democratic contexts. While accurate information supports informed citizenship and public deliberation, misinformation—

unintentionally false or misleading content—and disinformation—deliberately fabricated or manipulated narratives—pose significant challenges to democratic governance. Scholars such as Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) argue that digital platforms amplify these dynamics through rapid dissemination, algorithmic prioritization, and low barriers to content creation—processes that erode public trust, intensify political polarization, and complicate evidence-based policymaking. The relationship between information integrity and digital communication has therefore become a critical concern for sustaining democratic accountability and resilience.

Social media has introduced systemic vulnerabilities into democratic governance through the rapid spread of misinformation and disinformation (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). In emerging democracies such as Nepal, these dynamics pose significant risks to electoral integrity and institutional trust. AI-generated content, deepfakes, and automated disinformation campaigns further intensify these challenges (CXO Digital Pulse, 2026; Ojha, 2026). Sunstein (2017) argues that such digital environments contribute to political polarization by fragmenting citizens into isolated ideological communities, thereby weakening constructive democratic dialogue. These developments produce a broader structural crisis of epistemic governance in which democratic decision-making is increasingly shaped by algorithmic systems and synthetic informational environments.

The technological risks associated with misinformation and disinformation carry wider and longer-term implications for politics and governance. The World Economic Forum (2026) identifies misinformation and disinformation as among the top two global risks, warning that AI-generated false information could undermine democratic elections worldwide by eroding public trust in institutions, manipulating voter behavior, and intensifying political polarization. The report further observes:

Deepening divides along political, cultural or identity lines within societies are being amplified by technological risks, such as Misinformation and disinformation (#2). This corrodes public discourse, weakens crisis responses and is propagated by technological advancements, such as in AI. These developments in turn heighten the risks of increased digital distrust and dilution of ambitious socio-environmental decision-making amid shifting short-term priorities and increasingly nationalistic narratives. Technological risks overall remain an ongoing and significant concern for respondents, with Cyber insecurity at #6 reflecting the increasing frequency and sophistication of cyberattacks targeting critical infrastructure, businesses and government. However, the low ranking of Adverse outcomes of AI at #30 in the two-year time frame indicates that respondents view these risks as still relatively distant or as a segment of other more current risks. (World Economic Forum, 2026:16)

Disinformation flows today involve large volumes of independently produced false content designed to generate clicks, shares, and advertising revenue within the business models of digital platforms. When such “for-profit” fake news acquires partisan characteristics, it is often amplified through coordinated bot networks and integrated into larger disinformation campaigns. This process has contributed to the erosion of trust in democratic institutions, including the press, political parties, educational institutions, and civil society organizations—a loss of trust that is not merely ephemeral but reflects deeper structural problems such as weakened political representation and the hollowing out of party systems.

Digital platforms enable broader political participation and facilitate rapid communication between citizens and political actors, but the same technologies can equally be used to manipulate public opinion, spread disinformation, and polarize political communities. Social media influencers are

now actively involved in communicating political messages, including those related to elections (von Sikorski et al., 2025). In Nepal, social media remained at the center of political contestation during the recent general election of 2026, with the Election Commission reporting widespread use of hate speech and deepfake videos generated through readily available artificial intelligence tools (Ojha, 2026). These developments demonstrate how algorithmic amplification and AI-assisted communication technologies are reshaping electoral politics in fragile democratic contexts.

The emergence of AI-assisted political mobilization further illustrates the transformative impact of digital technologies on democratic processes. The newly emerged Cockroach Janata Party in India has been criticized for its extensive use of AI tools in political organization and communication. According to Dhakal (2026), the movement emerged in response to controversial remarks by Chief Justice of India Surya Kant regarding individuals who infiltrate professions like cockroaches, prompting frustrated youth to reclaim the insult as a symbol of protest against unemployment and political dysfunction. The movement rapidly evolved into a viral public pressure campaign supported by AI-generated political branding and communication strategies.

Dipke, the founder of the movement, acknowledged using AI tools such as Claude and ChatGPT to design the party’s visual identity, draft its manifesto, and develop its online presence within a single day (Dhakal, 2026). The website, poster aesthetics, political anthem, and meme templates all emerged from this compressed AI-assisted process. This is significant because it demonstrates how artificial intelligence dramatically lowers the barriers to political organization. Activities that previously required teams of designers, strategists, and writers working over extended periods can now be accomplished rapidly by individuals equipped with generative AI tools. While this may democratize political mobilization, it also reduces the institutional and organizational

friction that historically compelled political movements to develop gradually and cultivate substantive ideological depth. In this sense, the Cockroach Janata Party represents a proof of concept for AI-enabled political organizing, raising profound questions about the future of democratic participation and political legitimacy.

These developments raise important policy and governance questions about how democratic societies should respond to misinformation and disinformation. There is a growing need for institutional mechanisms capable of monitoring and responding to harmful digital content at both national and global levels. Although the establishment of a single global authority comparable to the Bretton Woods institutions or the United Nations may not be practicable, a layered governance framework appears more feasible. At the national level, this could involve independent regulatory bodies responsible for overseeing digital communication, ensuring transparency in political advertising, and coordinating responses to disinformation campaigns.

At the platform level, regulatory interventions may include requirements for greater algorithmic transparency, mandatory labeling of automated or AI-generated content, and stronger accountability mechanisms in content moderation. Measures to limit manipulative practices such as micro-targeting in political campaigns may also become necessary. Equally important is the strengthening of digital literacy among citizens so that individuals are better equipped to critically evaluate information within increasingly complex digital environments.

In Nepal's context, however, such interventions must be carefully designed to avoid undermining democratic freedoms and freedom of expression. The challenge lies in balancing the regulation of harmful digital content with the protection of democratic rights, ensuring that measures intended to combat disinformation do not themselves become instruments of political control. Ultimately, the growing influence of social media, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic communication

systems suggests that the future of democratic governance will increasingly depend on the ability of societies to manage the tensions between technological innovation, political participation, and information integrity.

Migration, middle-class expansion, and transnational political subjectivity

Labor migration has created a transnational political field in which Nepali citizens increasingly participate in domestic politics from abroad. Over 7.6 million labor permits were issued in the past thirteen years (Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security, 2025), indicating large-scale outward migration and growing national economic dependence on foreign employment. Migrant workers influence domestic politics through remittances, digital communication, and family-based electoral influence networks. Through social media platforms, online political discussions, and financial support to families at home, migrants remain actively connected to Nepal's political processes despite their physical absence. This has produced a form of transnational political subjectivity in which electoral behavior is shaped not only by domestic grievances but also by external economic dependency and experiences gained abroad.

In today's globalized world, increasing international migration flows have intensified debates surrounding out-of-country voting (OCV) and the political participation of citizens residing abroad. According to United Nations estimates, the number of international migrants worldwide increased from 174 million in 2000 to 272 million in 2019, meaning that one in every 28 people globally now lives outside their country of origin (Siwakoti, 2024). Of these, approximately 202 million migrants were of working and voting age, between 20 and 64 years old. South Asia constitutes one of the world's major regions of origin for international migrants, with countries such as Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and Nepal experiencing significant labor

outmigration. At the same time, remittances have become increasingly central to national economies. Nepal ranks among the countries most dependent on remittance inflows, with remittances accounting for approximately 28.6 percent of GDP (Siwakoti, 2024). These developments have elevated migration and diaspora engagement into matters of “high politics,” particularly regarding citizenship, electoral rights, and democratic inclusion.

Globally, out-of-country voting has gained momentum in recent decades, driven by diaspora communities seeking greater political inclusion and recognition within their countries of origin. While the extension of voting rights abroad is increasingly viewed as part of democratic expansion, it remains a contested issue that each state must evaluate in relation to its own legal, political, and institutional contexts. Governments implementing OCV mechanisms must navigate complex administrative arrangements, legal implications, political contestation, and the financial costs of organizing elections beyond national borders (European Union Global Diaspora Facility, 2024). The growing international attention to diaspora participation was particularly visible during the large number of elections held worldwide in 2024, when diaspora voting and transnational political activism increasingly shaped democratic discourse across countries. Diaspora voters frequently navigate multiple identities, loyalties, and political experiences acquired across different national contexts, producing forms of political engagement that extend beyond conventional territorial understandings of citizenship and electoral participation.

Simultaneously, Nepal's expanding middle class (National Statistics Office, 2024b) has generated new political expectations regarding governance, transparency, accountability, and effective public service delivery. Exposure to global labor markets, digital technologies, and democratic practices in other countries has further intensified demands for institutional reform and economic opportunity within Nepal. However, traditional political

parties have struggled to effectively integrate these emerging social groups and address their aspirations, contributing to growing political fragmentation, voter dissatisfaction, and digital mobilization.

In this context, Nepali migrant workers and diaspora communities have increasingly expressed dissatisfaction that established political parties and leaders failed to create adequate employment opportunities within the country, compelling many citizens to seek economic security abroad. They have further argued that the national economy continues to function substantially because of remittances sent by migrant workers and diaspora populations. Studies demonstrate that remittances contribute significantly to Nepal's economy, accounting for a major share of the country's GDP (Aryal, 2022). Despite this economic contribution, migrant workers and diaspora communities continue to face exclusion from meaningful political participation, particularly regarding electoral rights and representation. Research has highlighted the persistent challenges faced by Nepali migrant workers in exercising their voting rights despite their central economic contribution to the nation (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2018).

Political parties themselves increasingly recognize the electoral influence that migrant communities exercise over domestic voters. Migrants often maintain close economic and social ties with families in Nepal and are able to shape political opinions through financial dependency, social influence, and digital communication networks. As noted by Ganesh Gurung, chief of Nepal's Policy Research Institute, migrant workers “have a lot of influence” because they frequently remain the primary breadwinners of their families while also being highly active on social media platforms that facilitate political discussion and criticism of successive governments. Surveys conducted by migrant rights organizations following the 2025 political uprising further indicated that nearly 90 percent of overseas Nepali workers expressed

strong interest in participating in elections from abroad (*The Straits Times*, 2025). Such findings demonstrate the growing significance of migrant political engagement in shaping domestic political discourse and electoral behavior, despite continued exclusion from formal voting mechanisms.

Diaspora communities have further advanced the principle that “once Nepali, always Nepali,” arguing that dual citizenship provisions are necessary to maintain stronger political, economic, and emotional ties with the homeland. However, successive governments and political parties have been unable to resolve this issue. Similarly, migrant communities frequently express frustration that other countries are advancing more rapidly in terms of development and economic progress—due to more effective governance, stronger institutions, and long-term policy planning—while Nepal continues to experience weak implementation capacity and political instability. Such perceptions have contributed to declining trust in traditional political leadership and growing support for alternative political actors, reform-oriented discourse, and anti-establishment political narratives among migrant communities and younger voters.

Implications for PMPD in the digital age

The transformations outlined above suggest that PMPD must undergo conceptual expansion to remain relevant. While originally designed as a synthesis of Marxism and multiparty democracy (Bhandari, 1995), PMPD must now address the structural realities of digital capitalism (Snicek, 2017; Zuboff, 2019).

Digital governance and platform regulation are increasingly imperative. Castells (2010) defines the current era as a network society in which power and social structures are increasingly shaped by information networks rather than traditional institutions, and argues that state intervention must balance digital rights with the immense political influence exercised by technological monopolies. As a result, many individuals, institutions, and

governments remain insufficiently aware of the risks associated with digital governance and are therefore highly vulnerable to misinformation and disinformation.

On the question of data sovereignty as political economy, Castells (2010) warns that large digital platforms function as private gatekeepers of the internet, their opacity limiting democratic transparency and granting these corporations disproportionate influence over global public opinion and economic flows. He further argues that data sovereignty has emerged as a central battleground of the contemporary political economy, where data exists not merely as code but as a critical national resource, infrastructural asset, and source of geopolitical power.

Regarding algorithmic accountability as a democratic principle, Arslan (2025) argues that when viewed through the lens of democratic theory, algorithms cannot merely be efficient—they must also be legitimate, auditable, and accountable to the citizens they affect. Algorithms frequently rely on historical datasets that reproduce existing social biases, and a democratic approach therefore requires continuous bias audits to ensure that software systems do not reinforce structural inequalities, violate principles of equality, or systematically disenfranchise marginalized groups.

The Danish Youth Council (2021) views digital literacy as a foundational civic infrastructure for building robust digital citizenship, emphasizing the need to equip young people with critical thinking skills, ethical understanding of algorithms, and practical advocacy capacities necessary for safe participation in democratic processes. Ojha (2026) argues that the regulation of AI-driven political communication should primarily aim to protect democratic integrity by ensuring transparency, preventing algorithmic bias, and combating AI-enabled disinformation. PMPD can thus be reinterpreted as a dynamic governance ideology capable of adapting to networked and algorithmically mediated democracy.

Conclusion

PMPD emerged as a creative and context-sensitive ideological response to Nepal's democratic transition and the broader transformations of global socialist politics in the late twentieth century. By integrating democratic pluralism with socialist objectives, PMPD offered a distinctive political framework that guided the communist movement in Nepal, balancing aspirations for social justice, economic transformation, and participatory governance. However, the rapid advancement of digital technologies and artificial intelligence has profoundly reshaped the political landscape. Social media networks, platform capitalism, and algorithmic governance have introduced new centers of power that operate beyond traditional state and party oversight, influencing public opinion, political mobilization, and policy discourse. These developments challenge conventional mechanisms of accountability and highlight the need for ideological frameworks to adapt to digitally mediated political realities.

The findings of this study demonstrate that PMPD emerged as an ideological innovation designed to reconcile socialist objectives with democratic pluralism. However, digital capitalism and artificial intelligence have introduced structural conditions not anticipated in its original formulation (Castells, 2010; Zuboff, 2019). Democracy is therefore shifting from a party-centered institutional system to a platform-mediated informational ecosystem (Srnicek, 2017). Within this shift, PMPD must evolve from an electoral governance model into a broader framework of digital democratic regulation and algorithmic accountability. PMPD remains relevant not as a static doctrine but as an adaptive ideological framework capable of responding to the evolving intersections of technology, inequality, and political power in the twenty-first century. From a policy perspective, adapting PMPD to the digital era requires concrete institutional responses. These include developing legal frameworks for data protection and data sovereignty, strengthening the regulation of digital platforms,

and incorporating standards of algorithmic accountability into governance structures. Political parties also need to adapt their organizational practices by engaging with digital forms of communication while maintaining ideological clarity and grassroots connections. Without such changes, there is a risk that the normative commitments of PMPD will remain disconnected from the realities of digitally mediated political life. To remain relevant in the twenty-first century, PMPD must expand its conceptual and practical scope beyond electoral democracy. This requires the integration of strategies for regulating digital platforms, safeguarding data sovereignty, ensuring algorithmic transparency, and promoting digital literacy and civic engagement. By embracing such reforms, PMPD can sustain its role as a dynamic and adaptive ideological framework capable of addressing the complex social, technological, and democratic challenges of the digital age, while continuing to articulate the aspirations of Nepal's evolving citizenry.

References

- Arslan, S. (2025). AI-driven algorithmic propaganda and epistemic authority: Global power competition and the digital political economy. *GPH-International Journal of Applied Management Science*, 5(9), 105–154.
- Aryal, G. R. (2022). The role of remittance on socio-economic progress in Nepal. *Journal of Population and Development*, 3(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jpd.v3i1.48804>
- Bhandari, M. (1995). *Madan Bhandari sankalit rachanaharu bhag ek [Madan Bhandari's collected works—Part 1]*. Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist Leninist) Central Committee.
- Bhandari, M. (1989). *Nepali krantikio bartaman karyakram*. Communist Party of Nepal (ML).
- Bhusal, B. (2023). *Janatako bahudaliya janabadko aitihasik bikaskram [The historical development process of People's Multiparty Democracy]*. Shikha Books.

- Bhusal, B., Panthi, M., & Sapkota, D. (2021). *Nepal Ratna Pushpalal*. Puspahal Smriti Pratisthan.
- Bontridder, N., & Pouillet, Y. (2021). The role of artificial intelligence in disinformation. *Data & Policy*, 3, Article e32. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2021.20>
- Castells, M. (1996). The network society (Vol. 1). In *The information age: Economy, society and culture*. Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- CXO Digital Pulse. (2026, March 3). *Nepal's 2026 election becomes a digital battleground amid AI misinformation surge*.
- Danish Youth Council. (2021). *The democracy handbook: How to actively work with associational democracy*. Danish Youth Council.
- Dhakal, B. (2026, May 20). Everything you need to know about India's Cockroach Janata Party. *Nepal News*.
- Dhakal, T. P. (2023). Madan Bhandari and his theory of People's Multiparty Democracy. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 1(1), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v1i1.58470>
- Dyer-Witheford, N., Kjøsen, A. M., & Steinhoff, J. (2019). *Inhuman power: Artificial intelligence and the future of capitalism*. Pluto Press.
- Edling, M., & Mörkenstam, U. (1995). *Quentin Skinner: From historian of ideas to political scientist*. Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm.
- European Union Global Diaspora Facility. (2024). *Dear diaspora voters*. ICMPD.
- Goldstone, J. A. (2015). Understanding revolutions: The Arab uprisings. In J. Goodwin & J. M. Jasper (Eds.), *The social movements reader: Cases and concepts* (pp. 398–404). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. (2018). *Absent voters in Nepal: Challenges and prospects of enfranchisement of migrants*. International IDEA.
- Karki, M. B. (2025). Mapping a revolutionary lexicon: Semantic networks and the ideological architecture of People's Multiparty Democracy in Nepal. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 3(1), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v3i01.81292>
- Mahoney, J., & Rueschemeyer, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803963>
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2010). *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (S. Moore, Trans.; F. Engels, Ed.). Marxists Internet Archive.
- Mattos, R. S. (2019). *Artificial intelligence, historical materialism, and close enough to a jobless society* (Working Paper No. hal-02502178). HAL.
- Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security. (2025). *Nepal labour migration report 2024*. Government of Nepal.
- Murdock, G. (2025). Artificial intelligence as primitive accumulation: Enclosure, extraction, exploitation. *Communication & Change*, 1, 6 (2025).
- National Statistics Office. (2024a). *Middle class dynamics and socioeconomic trends in Nepal*. Government of Nepal.
- National Statistics Office. (2024b). *Nepal living standards survey IV 2022–23*. Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers, Government of Nepal.
- Nepal Communist Party (Marxist–Leninist). (1989). *Chautho ratriya mahadibesandwara paarit dastabejharu: Rajnitik pratibedan—Nepali krantikio bartaman karyakram* [Documents adopted by the Fourth National Congress: Political report—The current program of the Nepali revolution]. Nepal Communist Party (ML).

- Nilafdeen, A. (2026, March 3). AI disinformation turns Nepal polls into “digital battleground.” *France 24*.
- Ojha, A. (2026, March 4). AI disinformation turns Nepal polls into “digital battleground.” *The Japan Times*.
- Pokharel, S. (2023). Influence of PMPD on twenty-first century political movements in Nepal. *State, society, and development: PMPD perspectives*, 1(1), 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v1i1.58474>
- Pokhrel, I. (2024). The Nepali communist movement and People’s Multiparty Democracy. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 2(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v2i01.67183>
- Raghavendra, S. (2026). *Capitalism, class relations, and the role of the state in the AI era: A Kaleckian view*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28217.22886>
- Siwakoti, G. K. (2024). *The absent voters of Nepal: Challenges and prospects for the enfranchisement of migrants*. International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA). <https://doi.org/10.31752/idea.2024.103>
- Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity Press.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.
- Suwal, S. (2025, November 17). The 2025 Gen Z uprising in Nepal: A three-part analysis. *Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health*.
- The Straits Times. (2025, February 25). Nepali migrant workers influence polls but can’t vote. *The Straits Times*.
- von Sikorski, C., Knoll, J., & Matthes, J. (2025). The political role of social media influencers: Strategies, types, and implications for democracy—An introduction. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642251344208>
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making*. Council of Europe.
- World Economic Forum. (2026, January 14). *The global risks report 2026* (21st ed.). World Economic Forum.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Profile Books.

