

# Marxist Dialectics in Bhandari's People's Multiparty Democracy

**Hari Bahadur Chand**

Madan Bhandari Memorial College, Affiliated to Tribhuvan University

Orc  0009-0004-6756-5345

Email: [harichand4@gmail.com](mailto:harichand4@gmail.com)

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history

Received: 16 Dec. 2025

Accepted: 04 April 2026

### Keywords

Marxist dialectics

PMPD

Socialism

Socialist transition

## ABSTRACT

*Madan Bhandari's People's Multiparty Democracy (PMPD) emerged at a crucial historical moment shaped by two interconnected developments: Nepal's transition from active to constitutional monarchy with multiparty democracy and the global crisis of socialism following the Soviet collapse. In response, Bhandari sought to reformulate socialist transformation within a democratic framework. Although previous scholarship has explored PMPD from party-centered, ideological, and praxis-oriented perspectives, its underlying dialectical logic has received limited scholarly attention. This article addresses that gap by examining PMPD as a dialectical reformulation of socialist transition theory under democratic conditions, reconstructing the theoretical framework through which Bhandari identified Nepal's structural contradictions, envisioned a gradual process of socialist transformation, and formulated PMPD as a historically grounded synthesis. Employing qualitative textual analysis, the study applies the three classical laws of Marxist dialectics—the unity and interpenetration of opposites, the transformation of quantity into quality, and the negation of the negation—as its principal analytical framework. The analysis demonstrates that each law performs a distinct yet interconnected function within PMPD: the first illuminates Nepal's mutually constitutive social contradictions, the second grounds a cumulative strategy of democratic mass mobilization, and the third conceptualizes PMPD as a dialectical sublation of both feudal autocracy and authoritarian socialism. These operations collectively reveal PMPD as a systematic application of materialist dialectics to Nepal's historical conditions, contributing to creative Marxism and socialist transition theory while foregrounding a significant non-Western intervention in debates on democracy and socialist transformation.*

## Introduction

Madan Bhandari (1993b) formulated People's Multiparty Democracy (PMPD) at a critical moment in both the national and international communist movements. In Nepal, communist parties faced a theoretical and practical dilemma over whether to embrace multiparty democracy

and participate in the People's Movement of 1990 against the partyless Panchayat system. Although communists traditionally viewed multiparty democracy as a form of capitalist democracy, they opposed the Panchayat system and supported democratic change, and advocated the restoration of multiparty democracy in the country. Accordingly, in 1989, CPN (ML) adopted multiparty democracy,

formed the United Left Front, and allied with communist and liberal parties to overthrow the Panchayat regime (Pokhrel, 2024). This national transition coincided with a global crisis in socialism following the collapse of the Soviet Union. The failure of Soviet-style socialism raised fundamental questions about the relationship between socialism and democracy, party leadership and popular sovereignty, and revolutionary versus democratic transformation. In response, PMPD sought to revitalize communist politics through democratization by learning from the failures of authoritarian socialism and incorporating both Nepali and international socialist experiences (Pokharel, 2023). PMPD addressed two major challenges. First, it aimed to redefine socialism after the collapse of Soviet communism by distancing the Nepali communist movement from authoritarian state socialism while preserving its commitment to social transformation. Second, it theorized participation in multiparty electoral democracy as a legitimate and strategically necessary path for advancing socialist politics in post-1990 Nepal (Bhandari, 1993b). In this sense, PMPD emerged as a response both to Nepal's democratic transition after 1990 and to the broader global crisis of socialist theory in the early 1990s.

Scholarly engagement with PMPD has been substantial, though it has been relatively concentrated within a limited set of theoretical approaches. Existing literature on PMPD has generally developed along three main strands. First, party-centered studies explain PMPD chiefly as the ideological framework of the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist–Leninist) [CPN–UML]. They highlight its function in legitimizing electoral participation following the democratic movement and in differentiating the CPN (UML) from more insurrectionary communist groups. The CPN (UML)'s Chairman, K. P. Sharma Oli (2025), argues that Bhandari's PMPD adapts Marxism to Nepali conditions by combining democracy, pluralism, and socialism while rejecting authoritarianism, violence, and dogmatism in

favor of peaceful socio-economic transformation. The party's General Secretary, Shankar Pokharel (2023), asserts that PMPD has profoundly shaped Nepal's post-1990 politics by influencing democratic movements, communist governance, constitutional development, Maoist integration, and socialism-oriented reforms through its phased model of democratic transformation. Similarly, the CPN (UML)'s Central Committee Member and former Senior Vice-President, Ishwar Pokhrel (2024), argues that Bhandari's PMPD adapts Marxism to Nepal through multiparty democracy, rejecting dogmatism and surrenderism; decades of political success and constitutional change validate its socialist vision. These scholarly perspectives from the CPN (UML)'s dignitaries offer valuable insider viewpoints that some readers may interpret as advocacy-oriented.

Second, the praxis-oriented explanations of PMPD focus on its praxis in various sectors and largely avoid its dialectics. Praxis refers to the application of theory, principle, or idea into practice: the idea that philosophical understanding should not remain abstract but must guide transformative social action. Praxis emphasizes that people change society through conscious political activity, while also changing themselves in the process (Marx, 1845). The praxis-oriented scholarship of PMPD spans many sectors, such as ecology and the environment, patriotism, industrialization, and rhetoric.

Chapagain (2023) argues that PMPD connects socialism with political ecology through anti-imperialism, people's sovereignty, inclusion, participatory resource control, and resistance to neoliberal commodification of nature. Emphasizing biodiversity protection, traditional environmental knowledge, and ecological justice, the article presents PMPD's environmental dimension as an emerging interpretive framework. It also logically reveals the politics of environmental knowledge, though more concrete historical examples would strengthen its analytical coherence. Rimal (2025) argues that capitalism has evolved from Industry

1.0 to 5.0 while continually reproducing alienation and exploitation in new forms. Using a Marxist–Leninist and PMPD framework, the article contends that technological progress reshapes rather than resolves capitalism’s contradictions, and that democratic socialist governance inspired by PMPD could redirect technology toward social justice and human welfare. Rimal presents PMPD as a possible response to global capitalism, but its broader applicability beyond Nepal remains open for further comparative study. Rimal also notes that Industry 5.0’s “human-centric” discourse may simultaneously encourage inclusive innovation and reinforce existing corporate and surveillance structures without adequate democratic safeguards (62). Pokhrel (2023) argues that PMPD emerged less as a purely theoretical adaptation of Marxism than as a patriotic response to Nepal’s geopolitical vulnerabilities, including external pressure, regional power asymmetry, and the dangers of armed revolt in a small landlocked nation. From this perspective, Bhandari’s commitment to peaceful multiparty politics reflected strategic nationalism aimed at protecting Nepali sovereignty and avoiding foreign intervention. Pokharel further contends that the post-Bhandari CPN (UML) has struggled to fully realize this patriotic vision in practice. At the same time, the discussion could benefit from a broader consideration of how nationalism, sovereignty, and regional relations interact, as well as how structural factors such as coalition politics and parliamentary fragmentation may also shape the party’s later challenges.

Bhandari’s PMPD can be understood as a form of Marxist rhetorical praxis, where rhetoric is not a neutral persuasion but an ideological practice shaped by material conditions and class struggle. Operating within the superstructure, rhetoric both reproduces and contests dominant ideologies through institutions such as media, education, and politics (Marx & Engels, 1976). It also functions as a medium of resistance through counter-hegemonic discourse and class-conscious mobilization (Gramsci, 1971). Within this framework, Karki

(2023) interprets Bhandari as a rhetorician whose use of ethos, pathos, and logos—along with metaphor, repetition, and narrative framing—helped construct PMPD’s legitimacy and popular resonance in post-1990 Nepal. With his effective rhetorical strategies in communicative style, Bhandari makes his ideological claims accessible to diverse audiences, contributing to his status as a democratic leader and to PMPD’s broader political traction, Karki highlights. In the same line of rhetoric, Karki (2025) examines PMPD through rhetorical and semantic network analysis, arguing that it functions not merely as a political doctrine but as a coherent discursive architecture through which socialist transformation is articulated and organized. Analyzing Bhandari’s writings, Karki identifies three interconnected semantic clusters: “Party–Revolution–Leadership, Democracy–Multiparty–System–People, and Principle–Ideology–Unity” (30), which together constitute a “revolutionary grammar” (38) synthesizing Marxist commitment with democratic pluralism. The study demonstrates how language within PMPD actively shapes political meaning and ideological orientation.

Third, a body of scholarship engages PMPD theoretically by examining its Marxist–Leninist ideological foundations and democratic orientation. Dhakal (2023) argues that PMPD represents a creative adaptation of Marxism to Nepal’s historical and political conditions. Retracing Bhandari’s ideological evolution from Naxalite-influenced activism—“drawing inspiration from the Naxalite movement in the West Bengal state of India” (65)—to democratic socialism, Dhakal contends that PMPD transformed a marginal communist movement into Nepal’s most electorally successful left force by emphasizing peaceful mass politics, alliances, and competitive democracy. Some critics, however, maintain that this strategic orientation prioritized electoral success over deeper socialist transformation. Similarly, Roka (2024) conceptualizes PMPD as a “transitional roadmap to socialism” (98) rather than a permanent political

arrangement. According to Roka, PMPD envisions a democratic transition from semi-feudalism toward socialism through stages including the consolidation of democratic state power, the weakening of feudal and comprador structures, the development of national capital, and the expansion of social ownership and cultural preparedness. The study further emphasizes the importance of sustained left unity and ideological commitment for advancing socialist transformation.

Taken together, these three strands of scholarship demonstrate that PMPD has generated substantial academic and political engagement across ideological, practical, and theoretical domains. Existing studies have significantly contributed to explaining PMPD's role in Nepal's democratic transformation, socialist discourse, governance practices, rhetorical formation, and strategic adaptation of Marxism to local realities. At the same time, much of the literature tends either to emphasize PMPD's practical achievements or to defend its ideological legitimacy, while giving comparatively limited attention to its internal dialectical tensions, contradictions, and unresolved theoretical ambiguities. Questions concerning the relationship between socialism and multiparty competition, nationalism and globalization, revolutionary transformation and parliamentary pragmatism, as well as ideology and political practice, remain insufficiently theorized. Consequently, there is a clear need for a more critically balanced and dialectically informed analysis of PMPD that moves beyond descriptive interpretations. Such an approach would not only deepen scholarly understanding of PMPD itself but also contribute more broadly to debates on democratic socialism, Marxist adaptation, and the changing courses of left politics in Nepal and beyond.

The absence of substantial dialectical-theoretical analysis of PMPD constitutes a significant gap in the scholarship for several reasons. First, Bhandari (1993b) consistently framed PMPD in explicitly Marxist theoretical terms, insisting it represented

not a departure from Marxism but its creative development under new historical conditions—Marxism applied to Nepali specificity. To read PMPD without engaging its Marxist theoretical claims is to misread it at the level of authorial intention. Second, how Marxist dialectics operates within competitive pluralist frameworks remains one of the central unresolved problems of twentieth-century left political theory. From Bernstein's (1993) revisionism through the Austro-Marxist interwar debates, from Gramsci's (1971) elaborations on hegemony and the war of position to Poulantzas's (1978) theorization of the state as a site of class struggle, Marxist theory has repeatedly grappled with the relationship between dialectical materialism and democratic political forms without arriving at settled conclusions. Bhandari's PMPD represents a specific, contextually grounded contribution to this debate that has not been adequately recognized as such.

More specifically, the scholarship has not examined the three dialectical operations constituting PMPD's theoretical core: the operation of the law of unity and interpenetration of opposites across Nepal's structural contradictions; the operation of the law of transformation of quantity into quality within PMPD's theory of revolutionary strategy; and the operation of the law of negation of the negation in PMPD's self-positioning as a historically specific socialist synthesis. Each operation involves a specific theoretical move within the Marxist dialectical tradition with implications extending beyond the Nepali context. Thus, the three classical laws of Marxist dialectics operate within the political framework of PMPD in ways that reveal the theoretical possibilities and inherent tensions of socialist politics under competitive multiparty conditions.

The purpose of this article is to examine PMPD as a dialectical reformulation of socialist transition theory under democratic conditions. It seeks to recover and analyze the theoretical architecture of PMPD—the specific dialectical operations through which Bhandari diagnoses Nepal's structural

contradictions, theorizes the cumulative strategy of socialist transition, and positions PMPD as a historically specific synthesis—to assess its contribution to Marxist political theory and its significance for left politics beyond the Nepali context. The article does not seek to evaluate PMPD’s empirical success as a political program, nor to adjudicate between competing normative assessments of Nepali communist politics. Its object is strictly theoretical: to read PMPD as a serious intervention in the Marxist tradition and to analyze the dialectical logic of that intervention.

In this regard, this article raises three research questions, each corresponding to one of the three classical laws of Marxist dialectics as they operate in Bhandari’s PMPD. First, how does the law of unity and interpenetration of opposites structure PMPD’s diagnosis of Nepali society and its construction of a socialist political doctrine? This question addresses how PMPD holds in productive tension four interpenetrating contradictions—social formation, democratic socialist state, transitional political economy, and national and international engagement—without collapsing them into a single privileged axis of analysis (Table 1). Second, how does the law of the transformation of quantity into quality shape PMPD’s theory of revolutionary strategy? This question focuses on three main issues: how PMPD explains the gradual growth of democratic mobilization and political consolidation, how it develops the material and institutional foundations of society, and how it transforms social consciousness. Through these gradual changes, a qualitative transition toward socialism becomes historically possible (Table 1). Third, how does the law of the negation of the negation work in PMPD’s effort to define itself as a historically specific form of socialism? This question focuses on two main issues: first, how PMPD rejects both feudal autocracy and Stalinist dogmatism; and second, how it develops as a new socialist synthesis. PMPD does not simply discard these earlier systems. Instead, it rejects their negative aspects while preserving some of

their progressive elements. Through this process of double negation, PMPD emerges as a dialectical form of “*Aufhebung*” [sublation] (Hegel, 2010:xvii)—a new stage that both overcomes and incorporates aspects of the past—rather than as a simple compromise between different ideologies (Table 1).

The significance of this inquiry is threefold. At the level of Marxist theory, recovering PMPD as a dialectical intervention contributes to mapping the resources available within the Marxist tradition for theorizing socialist politics under democratic conditions. It enriches the comparative analysis of twentieth-century Marxist revisionism by adding a Nepali proposition to a debate dominated by Western European theoretical traditions. Bhandari’s formulation deserves recognition as a serious attempt to work through the relationship between dialectical materialism and democratic political form. At the level of transition theory, PMPD offers a model for rethinking socialist transition beyond insurrectionism. It theorizes a credible, theoretically grounded route to structural transformation through the patient accumulation of democratic power. Understanding the dialectical logic underpinning this model is essential for assessing both its viability and its limits.

## Methodology

This article uses a qualitative research design to examine how Marxist dialectics shape and operate in PMPD. The analysis is grounded in the three fundamental laws of dialectics: the unity and interpenetration of opposites, the transformation of quantity into quality, and the negation of the negation. These laws form the philosophical core of classical Marxism. Together, they represent what Marx (1976) described as a method “exactly opposite” to Hegel’s idealism—one that insists on grounding ideas in material reality rather than the other way around (102). Alongside this dialectical framework, the article conducts close textual analysis of two key primary texts by Bhandari (1993b): “*Nepali Krantiko Karyakram, Janatako*

*Bahudaliya Janabad* [People's Multiparty Democracy: A Program of Nepali Revolution]" and "*Bahudaliya Janabadbare Kehi Kura* [Some Precepts of Multiparty Democracy]." Drawing on both the dialectical framework and the textual analysis, the study identifies nine analytical categories, organized under three broader dimensions of dialectics (Table 1). These categories are presented and discussed with textual evidence in the Results and Discussion section.

## Results and Discussion

### Operation of Marxist dialectics

The law of unity and interpenetration of opposites holds that contradictions are not external collisions but internal to every structure. Lenin, systematizing Marx's method, called this "the most important" dialectical law, defining it as "the recognition of the contradictory, mutually exclusive, opposite tendencies in all phenomena and processes of nature" (Lenin, 1976:357). In capitalism, capital and labor are simultaneously dependent upon and antagonistic to each other—neither can exist without the other, yet their relationship is one of irreconcilable conflict, constituting society through its internal antagonisms (Marx & Engels, 2002).

The law of transformation of quantity into quality holds that gradual quantitative accumulations produce sudden qualitative transformations. Engels asserts: "Mere quantitative differences, beyond a certain point, pass into qualitative changes" (Engels, 1987:63). In social terms, the incremental deepening of structural contradictions does not produce proportional linear reform but rupture, revolution as a change not of degree but of kind.

The law of negation of the negation holds that every historical formation generates its own negation, and that negation is itself negated, producing a higher synthesis. Engels elaborated this most systematically as "an extremely general—and for this reason extremely far-reaching and important—law of development of nature, history, and thought" (Engels, 1947:92). Applied to history, feudalism is negated by capitalism, which is itself negated by proletarian revolution—not a return to the primitive but a higher-order resolution preserving what was historically progressive. Taken together, these three laws present history as a dynamic, self-contradicting totality: not a linear progression but a spiraling movement driven from within by conflict, negation, and transformation.

**Table 1: The operation of Marxist dialectical laws in Bhandari's PMPD**

| Marxist dialectical law                                                                                       | Analytical category in PMPD                                                                                                                                                                         | Dialectical function                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Law I: Unity and interpenetration of opposites</b>                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Contradictions are not external to each other but co-constitutive—each presupposes and sustains its opposite. | 1. <i>Structural contradiction-field of Nepali society</i> (class, caste, region, gender, geopolitics)                                                                                              | Establishes Nepal's social formation as the complex totality of interpenetrating contradictions that PMPD must address simultaneously—the dialectical ground of the theory. |
|                                                                                                               | 2. <i>The central political dialectic: democracy and socialism</i> (multiparty competition; constitutional supremacy; rule of law; separation of powers; human rights; majority/minority principle) | Holds competitive pluralism and socialist state power as interpenetrating opposites that coexist without mutual negation—the defining tension of PMPD as a political form.  |

| Marxist dialectical law                                                                                                                           | Analytical category in PMPD                                                                                                                                                                        | Dialectical function                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                   | 3. <i>Mediating economic and cultural contradictions</i> (socialist transformation + market mechanisms + foreign capital + compensation; caste, religion, language, gender, education, healthcare) | Integrates the class contradiction with its non-class counterparts (patriarchy, caste hierarchy, capitalist market relations) as co-constitutive axes rather than secondary or derivative, and mediates socialist property goals against transitional economic realities.           |
|                                                                                                                                                   | 4. <i>National and international contradictions</i> (sovereignty; anti-imperialism; foreign policy; friendly/enemy powers; national army; non-resident Nepalis)                                    | Frames nationalism and internationalism as interpenetrating: sovereignty is asserted through—not against—calibrated international engagement, refusing both autarky and subordination.                                                                                              |
| <b>Law II: Transformation of quantity into quality</b>                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Incremental accumulation in distinct domains—organizational, material, institutional, and subjective—each produces its own qualitative threshold. | 5. <i>Democratic mass mobilization and political consolidation</i> (periodic elections; leftist unity; united front; revolutionary strategy)                                                       | Accumulation of democratic participation, party unity, and alliance-building produces the qualitative threshold of a transformed political order—peaceful revolution through organized electoral and mass action.                                                                   |
|                                                                                                                                                   | 6. <i>Development of material and institutional base</i> (energy, transport, communication, tourism, local/regional development; state, governance, judiciary, bureaucracy reform)                 | Consolidates two quantitative vectors—expansion of productive forces and progressive reform of inherited state institutions—whose combined accumulation generates the economic and governmental base upon which qualitative socialist transformation becomes historically possible. |
|                                                                                                                                                   | 7. <i>Transformation of social consciousness</i> (education, culture, healthcare, sports)                                                                                                          | Gradual ideological and civic reform cumulatively shifts mass consciousness—the subjective condition required for qualitative social transformation; quantity of cultural work yields a qualitatively new political subject.                                                        |

| Marxist dialectical law                                                                                                                               | Analytical category in PMPD                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Dialectical function                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Law III: Negation of the negation</b>                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Each negation preserves what is historically progressive in what it overcomes; the second negation recovers that preserved content at a higher level. | <p>8. <i>Double negation: feudal autocracy and Stalinist dogmatism</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>First moment:</b> Constitutional supremacy, rule of law, human rights, multiparty competition—negating feudal monarchy while retaining its partial democratic achievements.</li> <li>o <b>Second moment:</b> pluralist open society, majority/minority principle, rejection of one-party dictatorship—negating authoritarian Marxism-Leninism while retaining socialist class analysis and transformation goals.</li> </ul> | PMPD performs a double sublation (Aufhebung): it negates feudal order without abolishing inherited democratic gains, and negates dogmatic socialism without abandoning Marxism's emancipatory core—each negation preserving what the prior form achieved while elevating it to a higher synthesis.                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                                                                                                                                       | <p>9. <i>PMPD as dialectical socialist synthesis</i>—historical specificity (people's multiparty democracy; program; strategy; selective transitional retention of market mechanisms, foreign capital, and compensation)</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | PMPD emerges as the higher synthesis: Classical Marxism negated and preserved through Nepali historical conditions, combining class struggle, democratic pluralism, nationalism, and peaceful transition into a coherent original doctrine. The selective retention of prior economic elements within socialist transition demonstrates the negation of the negation at the economic level—prior relations are not abolished absolutely but sublated into a new structure. |

Source. Author 2026

### The law of unity and interpenetration of opposites

The first and foundational dialectical law—the unity and interpenetration of opposites—holds that every phenomenon contains within itself contradictory forces that are simultaneously opposed and mutually conditioning. It is this law

that provides PMPD with its structural architecture: Bhandari does not begin with abstract ideals but with a diagnosis of concrete, living contradictions in Nepali society, and proceeds to construct a political doctrine that holds those contradictions in productive, synthesizing tension rather than resolving them through the crude suppression of one side.

### ***Structural contradiction-field of Nepali society***

Bhandari grounds the entire argument for PMPD in a precise diagnosis of Nepal's social formation as a complex of interpenetrating contradictions that cannot be resolved by any simple or one-sided political formula. The analytical starting point of PMPD is Bhandari's (1993b) characterization of Nepal as a society defined by overlapping, interpenetrating contradictions. Bhandari (1993b) declares at the outset that "Nepal is in a part-feudalist and part-colonialist state"—a formulation that is itself dialectical, designating Nepal's social formation not as one thing or another, but as the dynamic coexistence of two antagonistic modes of economic organization (312). The feudalist class, "comprador bureaucracy," and "foreign monopolizing capitalists" together perpetrate what Bhandari (1993b) calls "merciless exploitation and repression of the entire working-class people," while 40 percent of arable land is held by 9.44 percent of upper-class families, and more than 70 percent of the people have fallen below the poverty line (312).

Yet Nepal's contradictions are not reducible to class alone. Bhandari identifies the interpenetration of national and geopolitical contradictions—Nepal's landlocked situation creating structural dependency while simultaneously demanding sovereign assertion. Class contradiction is interpenetrated with national contradiction: "the fundamental conflicts in the contemporary Nepali society include the clash of people with feudalists, comprador bureaucracy, monopolizing foreign capitalism, and imperialism" (Bhandari, 1993b:314). These forces do not operate independently; they condition each other, mutually reinforcing Nepal's underdevelopment and dependency. The dialectical unity of all these contradictions—class, caste, gender, region, and geopolitics—constitutes the objective ground from which PMPD springs as a theoretical response (Bhandari, 1993b:312).

### ***The central political dialectic: democracy and socialism***

The most philosophically significant instantiation of the unity of opposites in PMPD is the synthesis of socialism and constitutional multiparty democracy as the doctrine of the revolutionary state. In orthodox Marxist-Leninist theory, these two principles are not merely distinct but opposed: socialism entails the dictatorship of the proletariat and the supersession of bourgeois democracy, while multiparty competition implies the perpetuation of class-differentiated political representation. Bhandari refuses this opposition and insists on their dialectical unity.

Bhandari (1993a) argues that "the essence of the state power relates to state mechanism; its form aspect relates to governance," and that the multiparty competitive system is a form of governance, not a class essence (169). Therefore, adopting the multiparty form does not determine the class character, the essential content, of the state. This is a dialectical argument of the first order. The unity of opposites is at work in the relationship between form and content: form and content are not identical, but neither are they simply separate—they interpenetrate and condition each other, while remaining analytically distinguishable. Bhandari applies this principle to demolish the dogmatic equation of socialism with one-party governance: "the ruling form of a state with multiparty competition does not have only one essence. There can be many essences of the state with this form. Under the multiparty system, many types of states are operating across the world" (Bhandari, 1993a:169). A multiparty form can carry socialist content; a one-party form can carry bureaucratic-authoritarian content. Neither form determines essence.

The positive synthesis—the people's democratic state—is then theorized as the dialectical unity of democratic form and socialist content: "multiparty relates to the ruling system and democracy refers to the state power. Our multiparty democratic program integrates such matters" (Bhandari,

1993a:170). The two elements—multiparty competition (democratic form) and people's state power (socialist content)—are interpenetrating opposites within PMPD, each presupposing and conditioning the other. This is the central dialectical tension of PMPD as a political doctrine, and Bhandari articulates it here with the greatest theoretical precision of any of his texts.

Bhandari (1993b) specifies that the people's democratic state will be organized under “the supremacy of the constitution,” with “all organs of the state” organized and operated accordingly (318). Simultaneously, “people's multiparty democratic system will be set up” (Bhandari, 1993b:318). These two commitments—constitutional supremacy and socialist transformation—are not presented as a compromise between socialism and liberalism but as a dialectical synthesis in which each presupposes the other. Constitutional supremacy protects the gains of the people's democratic revolution from reversal by either reactionary forces or the revolutionary vanguard itself. Bhandari is explicit that “the revolutionary power and the people's state authority also should not be without a constitution. They also should run under the constitution,” adding that “the establishment of the revolutionary power over the constitution has caused chaotic circumstances, thereby leading to harmful results in many countries” (Bhandari, 1993b:332).

The interpenetration of opposites is further visible in the constitution's simultaneous guarantee of “human rights and fundamental democratic rights” on one hand and the “people's democratic dictatorship”—redefined as “people's democratic state authority”—on the other (Bhandari, 1993b:338). One pole (democratic rights for all) and the other pole (class-based state power) are not opposed but co-constitutive: the democratic state exercises its authority precisely by extending rights, not by suspending them. This is a rigorous application of the dialectical law: the opposites—democracy and socialist state authority—interpenetrate and define each other rather than exclude each other.

### *Mediating economic and cultural contradictions*

The dialectical logic of the unity of opposites operates across two registers that PMPD insists on treating as co-constitutive rather than hierarchically ordered: the contradiction between socialist transformation and transitional market realities, and the contradiction between class struggle and non-class axes of oppression: caste, gender, religion, and cultural exclusion. The methodological move in each case is the same: neither side of the opposition is suppressed or deferred; both are held in productive, synthesizing tension.

On the economic register, Bhandari (1993b) acknowledges that “without sufficient material development and industrialization of the country, the socialist society presenting ‘work according to qualification and wage according to the work’ cannot be set up” (339). The revolutionary state cannot leap directly to socialism; it must first develop the productive forces that make socialism materially possible. This produces the doctrinal position of the “mixed economy” as an “essential character of our democratic economic system” (Bhandari, 1993b:319). The state will play a “frontier role” in uplifting the poor while simultaneously “the private sector will be encouraged to play a role in the economic development of the country” (Bhandari, 1993b:320). Foreign capital and technology will be “allowed in the country by fixing a ceiling” to ensure positive effects on the national economy (Bhandari, 1993b:322). Even the provision for compensating certain property owners during land reform is dialectically rationalized: “the party wants to transform and engage all others in the industry, trade, and business by supplying them compensation”—the former feudal property-owning class redirected from one social role to another rather than simply destroyed (Bhandari, 1993b:330).

The treatment of the private sector reflects this dialectical intermediacy. Bhandari (1993a) cautions that “the monopoly of the private sector over people and the country should not be allowed,” while simultaneously recognizing

that the transition to socialism requires the prior development of a strong national economy that the private sector contributes to (178). The private sector is neither simply endorsed nor simply negated; it is held in dialectical tension with collective forms of ownership and state regulation within the transitional economic framework. The contradiction between private and collective economic activity is not resolved by the simple suppression of one side but by their sustained interpenetration within the transitional political economy.

On the cultural and social register, PMPD integrates caste, gender, religion, and cultural exclusion as co-constitutive dimensions of Nepal's principal contradiction, not as secondary or derivative phenomena to be addressed after the class struggle is resolved. The program commits to ending "the monopoly of religion" while simultaneously eradicating "all monopolies and prerogatives of a particular caste, language, and culture"—commitments that operate in dialectical tension with the revolutionary demand for cultural transformation (Bhandari, 1993b:327). Thus, the national democratic culture will be developed by "ending the evil influence of feudal and imperialist culture" (Bhandari, 1993b:326). Cultural preservation and cultural transformation are thus interpenetrating demands. The treatment of women is similarly dialectical: Bhandari demands both formal legal equality—"similar pay for a similar job to men and women," equal rights over ancestral property—and substantive affirmative measures, including "special programs to liberate women from ignorance and backwardness" (Bhandari, 1993b:328). The unity of formal equality and substantive redistribution reflects the same dialectical integration of liberal rights and socialist transformation that is characteristic of PMPD as a whole.

Bhandari's (1993a) account of the multi-class character of a new democratic society is the key passage: "In a new democratic society, there

are individuals and classes of destitute laborers, national capitalists, poor farmhands, rich farmers, and adamant nationalists. Thus, the new democratic society stands as a multi-class society" (173). This is a sociological diagnosis of the interpenetration of class contradictions within the new democratic social formation—not a simple two-class opposition between bourgeoisie and proletariat, but a complex of multiple class positions with overlapping and contradictory interests that the new democratic state must mediate.

### *National and international contradictions*

PMPD addresses the contradiction between Nepali national sovereignty and the reality of international engagement—a contradiction that cannot be resolved by embracing one pole (isolationist nationalism) or the other (dependent internationalizing). Nepal's landlocked geography, Bhandari (1993b) observes, "compels its inhabitants to develop the country by maintaining friendly relationships with neighboring countries" (311-312). Sovereignty cannot be asserted through autarchy; it must be negotiated through calibrated international engagement.

The foreign policy section of PMPD, therefore, holds nationalism and internationalism in dialectical unity: Nepal will pursue "non-aligned, independent, and progressive foreign policy" while developing economic, political, and commercial relations with all countries "based on independence, equity, and mutual benefit" (Bhandari, 1993b:330). Unequal treaties will be abrogated, but Nepal will simultaneously consolidate friendly relations with India and China, develop SAARC, and actively engage the United Nations. Most revealingly, Bhandari's (1993b) analysis of imperialism demonstrates the interpenetration of opposition and cooperation: "while a country undergoes a sharp struggle against the repression of an imperialist country, it maintains normal relations with other imperialist countries" (337). The struggle against imperialism is not a total, undifferentiated negation of all international relations but a dialectically nuanced process of simultaneous opposition and

engagement: a precise expression of the unity of opposites at the level of international politics.

### **The law of transformation of quantity into quality**

The second dialectical law—the transformation of quantity into quality—holds that gradual, cumulative quantitative changes in a phenomenon eventually produce a qualitative leap, a fundamental transformation in the nature of the phenomenon itself. This law underlies PMPD's entire theory of revolutionary strategy: rather than positing an immediate, violent rupture, Bhandari theorizes a phased, cumulative process of democratic mass mobilization, economic development, institutional reform, and cultural transformation, through which the quantitative accumulation of democratic and socialist gains eventually produces the qualitative reality of a people's democratic state and the material foundations of socialism.

### ***Democratic mass mobilization and political consolidation***

The most explicit application of the quantitative-qualitative law in PMPD is found in Bhandari's theory of revolution and the role of the party. Bhandari (1993b) is unambiguous that the party must proceed through stages, accumulating strength before attempting a qualitative advance. He warns that the CPN (UML) "opposes unnecessary haste to reach socialism without mature material circumstances," insisting that "a reasonable duration is required to mature a new system" (335). The people's democratic authority "must pass through the three special stages"—eradicating remnants of exploitation, developing productive and cultural sectors on new relations of production, and finally creating the cultural and material conditions for the transition to socialism (Bhandari, 1993b:335).

Thus, PMPD is implemented through a specific political strategy: the party's "highest achievement will be the formation of its absolute majority government through peaceful struggle and legal

competition," after which it "will bring about the maximum reformation progressively for the benefit of people, nation, and democracy" (Bhandari, 1993b:351). The periodic election, described as a mechanism through which parties compete "with ideology, program, and policy," represents the quantitative medium through which the party accumulates political support over time (Bhandari, 1993b:334). Each electoral cycle, each organizational consolidation of sister organizations of workers, peasants, women, youths, and students, and each expansion of the united front represents a quantitative accumulation that gradually shifts the political balance of forces toward the qualitative threshold of revolutionary transformation.

The key formulation is: "the transition toward socialism can be possible after the consolidation of democracy, preparation of material conditions for socialism, and unity of the majority of people supporting socialism" (Bhandari, 1993a:178). Three cumulative quantitative processes—democratic consolidation, material economic preparation, and political mass unity—must each reach an adequate level before the qualitative leap to socialism becomes possible. The revolutionary impatience of those who wish to bypass this cumulative process—the "greedy minority" who "hurry to misuse state power over the majority to establish socialism"—is identified as a fundamental dialectical error: it attempts a qualitative transformation without the necessary quantitative preparation (Bhandari, 1993a:178).

The leftist unity and party unification program similarly reflects this logic: the party "should take initiatives to move ahead in a front with all those agreeing with its perspectives" and "cordially integrate the groups and individuals proven to be like-minded in the theoretical, political, and ideological struggles" (Bhandari, 1993b:348). The accumulation of united forces—through theoretical struggle, alliance-building, and organizational growth—is the quantitative process through which the revolution advances toward its qualitative goal.

### ***Development of the material and institutional base***

PMPD's quantitative-qualitative logic operates simultaneously across two objective domains that are analytically distinct but practically inseparable: the expansion of productive forces and the progressive reform of inherited state institutions. Both constitute vectors of cumulative accumulation whose combined development creates the objective conditions—economic and governmental—upon which qualitative socialist transformation becomes historically possible.

On the material side, Bhandari is consistent throughout that socialist transformation is only possible based on a developed economy. The program's provisions for energy and water resources, transportation and communication, tourism, industrial development, and local and regional development constitute a systematic agenda of incremental economic modernization. The energy policy—aiming to make electricity “the main source of energy for the daily use of people and industries in the country” and to develop hydroelectric projects from micro-scale local initiatives to multipurpose international projects—represents a program of cumulative infrastructural development (Bhandari, 1993b:323). The industrial program envisions a progression from small and medium industries to large-scale industry, moving Nepal from “swelling unemployment and part-unemployment” toward a “competent, strong, and self-reliant national economy” (Bhandari, 1993b:321). The quantitative-qualitative law operates here in two directions: development of productive forces creates the material conditions for a qualitative transition to socialism, while the qualitative transformation of property relations in turn enables a new round of quantitative development on a progressive basis.

On the institutional side, the state system, governance system, judicial system, and bureaucracy are all subjected to programs of progressive reform that accumulate toward a

qualitative restructuring of state power. The existing “bureaucratic administrative system will be eradicated, and the welfare administrative system will be set up” (Bhandari, 1993b:329). The judiciary will be made “free, fair, and capable” through “constitutional provisions to keep the judiciary free from the interventions of the executive” (Bhandari, 1993b:329). The army will be “democratized,” and recruitment opened to all Nepali regardless of “caste, language, and region”—a quantitative expansion of democratic participation within the military institution that represents a qualitative transformation in the class character of the armed forces (Bhandari, 1993b:331). Bhandari (1993b) is explicit that this transformation is itself a form of accumulation: “the people's multiparty democratic system will be gradually developed, enriched, and strengthened in a planned manner. The material conditions will be concretely prepared according to the programs for the society's transitions toward socialism” (319).

### ***Transformation of social consciousness***

The transformation of social consciousness is the subjective dimension of the quantitative-qualitative law in PMPD. Material development and institutional reform alone do not produce socialism; they require a corresponding transformation in the consciousness of the people. Bhandari's programs for culture and education, healthcare, social reformation, and sports are designed to effect precisely this cumulative ideological transformation.

The education program is the most elaborate expression of this. The “prevailing neo-colonial education system” will end and be replaced with “modern, progressive, and quality education” that inculcates “the spirit of authentic democracy, national independence, and practical application” (Bhandari, 1993b:326). Education will be made mandatory and free at the primary and secondary levels, gradually and progressively extended, with special programs for women and repressed ethnicities. Each of these measures represents a

quantitative expansion of democratic education—more students, more women, more marginalized communities gaining access to transformed educational content—that cumulatively produces a qualitative shift in popular consciousness, the subjective precondition for socialist transformation.

Social reformation programs—the gradual eradication of casteism, untouchability, and social superstition “with the cultural reformation movement”—similarly reflect quantitative accumulation: the cultural reformation is “planned,” proceeding by stages, not by immediate edict (Bhandari, 1993b:328). Even the sports sector is integrated into this program of consciousness transformation, explicitly linked to “national pride and dignity” and to the enhancement of “physical and psychological hygiene,” representing the cultivation of the collective social body as a qualitative precondition for national democratic culture (Bhandari, 1993b:332).

### **The law of negation of the negation**

The third and most complex dialectical law—the negation of the negation—holds that historical development proceeds through a double movement of supersession: a first negation that abolishes a given social form while partially preserving its progressive content, followed by a second negation that supersedes the form produced by the first negation, again retaining what is historically valid within it, and producing a higher synthesis that is qualitatively new yet continuous with the historical process that generated it. This is Hegel’s *Aufhebung*: simultaneously cancellation, preservation, and elevation (Hegel, 2010:xvii). PMPD is, in its deepest structure, an embodiment of this law: it performs a double negation—of feudal-autocratic Nepal and of dogmatic one-party socialism—and from that double negation produces the historically specific synthesis of PMPD.

### ***The double negation: feudal autocracy and Stalinist dogmatism***

PMPD enacts the negation of the negation as a single dialectical movement with two distinct moments,

each of which supersedes a prior social form while preserving what is historically progressive within it. The first moment is the negation of the feudal and autocratic order. Bhandari (1993b) diagnoses the 30-year Panchayat regime as a system that “strangled the limited achievements established by the democratic movement of 1951,” making Nepal “the second most impoverished nation in the world” and distorting “the cultural values and assumptions of society” (Bhandari 1993b:313). The people’s movement of 1990 achieved a partial negation of this order: it “ended the autocratic prerogatives of the monarchy,” “established a multiparty system with some limited democratic rights,” and “specified the fundamental rights of people, political freedom, and equality” in the constitution (Bhandari, 1993b:313). PMPD builds on and deepens this negation, calling for the abolition of “the repression, exploitation, the state power of feudalism and comprador capitalism” and the establishment of Nepal as “a free, sovereign, secular, and people’s democratic republic” (Bhandari, 1993b:318). The dialectical character of this first negation lies in what it preserves: PMPD does not negate the constitutional achievements of the 1990 movement but incorporates them into a higher form. The “supremacy of the constitution,” “the rule of law,” “the protection of human rights,” and “the multiparty competition system,” all partially established by the 1990 movement, are retained and elevated within the revolutionary program (Bhandari, 1993b). The first negation advances not to a pre-constitutional condition but to a new constitutional order that preserves democratic gains within a qualitatively higher socialist framework.

The second moment is the negation of dogmatic, one-party, authoritarian socialism. Bhandari (1993b) surveys the history of communist states and observes that “in many countries run by communist parties, the plurality and openness ceased to exist, which did not yield satisfactory results” (333). The excessive centralization of power—whether in an individual or an institution—caused

“disadvantages to society rather than benefits” (Bhandari, 1993b:333). The specific institutional provisions of PMPD are framed as conscious rejections of one-party authoritarian practice: on the multiparty competition system, Bhandari (1993b) argues directly that “it is extremely undemocratic to keep the one-party monopoly with the misuse of the state powers,” noting that “it is natural to exist many parties in a society with a diversity of professions” (334). On the separation of powers, he observes that “not only the centralization of power in the hands of an individual is bad, but it is also equally harmful to centralize power upon an institution” (Bhandari, 1993b:333). On the distinction between party and state, he insists that “the party exercising the powers of the state should not end the difference between the party and the state” (Bhandari, 1993b:333). These are point-by-point negations of the defining features of authoritarian communist practice. The negation of the Leninist leadership principle is perhaps the most theoretically significant: Bhandari (1993b) replaces “dictatorship” with “democratic state authority,” arguing that the term dictatorship “simply refers to a minor aspect of the state” and that the state’s main responsibility is “to carry out welfare for the state and people” (339).

Yet this second negation, too, preserves what is historically progressive in the socialist tradition. PMPD retains the class analysis of society, the leadership role of the proletariat and working class, the Marxist-Leninist ideological framework, the commitment to eradicating feudalism and imperialism, and the long-term goal of socialism and communism. The negation of dogmatic socialism produces not liberalism but a renewed, dialectically enriched socialism—one that has incorporated the critique of authoritarianism without abandoning the emancipatory goals of the Marxist tradition.

### ***PMPD as dialectical socialist synthesis—historical specificity***

The double negation of feudal autocracy and Stalinist dogmatism together produce, in their

*Aufhebung*, the synthesis that Bhandari (1993b) names PMPD. This synthesis is not an eclectic combination of elements drawn from various traditions but a historically specific, dialectically generated political doctrine that emerges from the concrete contradictions of Nepali society and the accumulated experience of the international revolutionary movement.

Bhandari (1993b) himself provides the theoretical account of this emergence: “The CPN (UML) includes many different aspects in its program by analyzing the existing national and international situations and experiences. The party highlights ‘multiparty’ as the main expression standing for all those subject matters that the party adds to its program” (340). In the countries where comparable revolutions occurred, the revolutionary program was called “new democracy,” “people’s democracy,” or “national democracy” according to local circumstances (Bhandari, 1993b:340). In Nepal’s historical context—feudal backwardness, colonial dependency, geopolitical landlocked vulnerability, and the post-1990 establishment of limited multiparty democracy—the synthesis takes the specific form of PMPD.

The synthesis is genuinely higher than either of the negated forms. Unlike feudal-autocratic Nepal, it establishes constitutional democracy, human rights, and popular sovereignty. Unlike dogmatic socialist states, it maintains multiparty competition, the separation of powers, and an open pluralist society. But unlike liberal capitalism, it maintains the socialist class analysis, the leadership of the proletariat and working class, the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolutionary program, and the long-term commitment to socialism. PMPD is, thus, not a middle position between feudalism and socialism, or between capitalism and communism, but a dialectical synthesis that negates and preserves the progressive content of prior social forms while producing something qualitatively new. Bhandari (1993b) makes this explicit: “in whatever way with whatever adjectives the democracy may

be mentioned, and while mentioning the form and content of the program of the CPN (UML) tactfully, the title of its revolution program should be people's multiparty democracy" (340). The naming itself is dialectical: not "democracy" (which would concede the terrain to liberalism), not merely "people's democracy" (which would replicate existing socialist models), but "people's multiparty democracy"—a designation that encodes the double negation within the synthesis.

The operation of the negation of the negation is also visible at the concrete economic level of PMPD's transitional provisions—particularly in the policies concerning foreign capital and compensation for property owners. These represent the dialectical moment of retention within transformation: the preservation of prior economic elements within the framework of socialist transition, not as concessions but as dialectically necessary moments in the movement toward a higher economic order. On foreign capital, Bhandari (1993b) argues that the party "cannot—and should not—shut doors at the foreign capital and technology," acknowledging that "even the developed countries are still incapable of functioning without international and foreign investment" (336). The prior relation (unconstrained imperialist penetration of the economy) is negated by the constitutional framework regulating foreign investment, while foreign capital itself is preserved and redirected toward national development. On compensation for property owners, the feudal land relation is negated, but individuals who held it—where they are willing to contribute to the new society—are not destroyed but sublated: redirected into industry, trade, and commerce. As Bhandari (1993b) explains, "the party wants to transform and engage all others in the industry, trade, and business by supplying them compensation" (336). The feudal landlord is negated as a feudal landlord but preserved as a potential productive element within the new social formation—precisely the movement of *Aufhebung* that the law of negation of the negation describes.

## Conclusion

Bhandari's PMPD imbibes the Marxist laws of dialectics to match the specific historical conditions of late-twentieth-century Nepal. The three laws of materialist dialectics operate in PMPD constitute the generative logic of the doctrine itself. The law of the unity and interpenetration of opposites establishes why PMPD takes the form it does: because Nepal's social formation is a complex totality of co-constitutive contradictions—class and caste, democracy and socialist state power, national sovereignty and international dependency, market necessity and socialist transformation—no single-axis politics can be adequate to it. PMPD's defining commitment to holding these tensions in productive synthesis rather than resolving them by suppressing one pole is a direct expression of this law. The law of the transformation of quantity into quality establishes how PMPD proposes to get there: not through immediate revolutionary rupture but through the phased, cumulative accumulation of democratic mass organization, material infrastructure, institutional reform, and transformed social consciousness, each domain contributing its own quantitative increment toward the qualitative threshold of a people's democratic state and, eventually, socialism. The law of the negation of the negation establishes what PMPD ultimately is: a dialectical synthesis generated by the double supersession of feudal autocracy and authoritarian socialism, preserving the democratic achievements of the 1990 movement and the emancipatory core of the Marxist tradition while negating the historically exhausted forms in which both had been expressed. The result is something neither liberal nor classically socialist but genuinely new: a doctrine of peaceful, pluralist, constitutional socialist transformation whose coherence depends entirely on the dialectical method that produced it. To read PMPD without that method is to miss its architectural entirety.

## References

- Bernstein, E. (1993). *The preconditions of socialism*. (T. H. Tudor, Trans.) Cambridge University Press. (Originally published in 1899).
- Bhandari, M. (1993a). Bahudalīya janavādbāre kehī kurā [Some precepts of multiparty democracy]. In M. Bhandari, *Madan Bhaṇḍārī: Saṅkalita racanāharū* (H. Chand, Trans., Vol. 1, pp. 163–178). Central Committee, CPN (UML).
- Bhandari, M. (1993b). Nepālī krāntiko kāryakram, janatāko bahudalīya janavād [People's Multiparty Democracy: A program of Nepali revolution]. In M. Bhandari, *Madan Bhaṇḍārī: Saṅkalita racanāharū, Vol. 1* (H. Chand, Trans., pp. 309–352). Central Committee, CPN (UML).
- Chapagain, P. S. (2023). PMPD perspective on environment and development. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 1(1)51–60. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v1i1.58469>
- Dhakal, T. (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>
- Engels, F. (1947). *Herr Eugen Dühring's revolution in science*. (E. Burns, Trans.) Marxists Internet Archive (Originally published in 1878).
- Engels, F. (1987). *Dialectics of nature*. International Publishers. (Original work published 1883).
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. (Q. H. Smith, Ed., & Q. H. Smith, Trans.) International Publishers.
- Hegel, G. W. (2010). *The science of logic*. (G. D. Giovanni, Trans.) Cambridge University Press.
- Karki, D. (2023). Bhandari's rhetoric in the 1990s political dynamics: Institutionalizing democracy in Nepal. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 1(1), 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v1i1.58468>
- 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(01), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v3i01.81292>
- Lenin, V. I. (1976). *Philosophical notebooks (Vol. 38 of Collected works)*. Progress Publishers. (Original work published in 1915).
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1976). *The German ideology*. International Publishers. (Original work published 1845/1846).
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2002). *Manifesto of the communist party*. (S. Moore, Trans.) Penguin. (Original work published 1848).
- Marx, K. (1845). *Theses on Feuerbach*. Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K. (1976). *Capital: A critique of political economy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Vol. 1). (B. Fowkes, Trans.) Penguin (originally published in 1873).
- Pokhrel, I. (2024). The Nepali communist movement and People's Multiparty Democracy. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 2(01), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v2i01.67183>
- Pokharel, S. (2023). Influence of PMPD on twenty-first century's political movements in Nepal. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 1(1) 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v1i1.58474>
- Pokhrel, R. (2023). Origin of People's Multiparty Democracy from the perspective of patriotism. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 1(1), 91–114. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v1i1.58473>
- Poulantzas, N. (1978). *State, power, socialism*. (T. P. Camiller, Trans.) New Left Books.
- Rimal, B. (2025). Dialectics of production relations from industry 1.0 to 5.0: An analysis from Marxist-Leninist and PMPD perspectives. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 3(01), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v3i01.81301>

- Roka, D. (2024). People's Multiparty Democracy: A base to socialism. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 2(01), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v2i01.67224>
- Sapkota, M. (2026). Editorial: Theoretical debates and emerging trends of People's Multiparty Democracy (PMPD): What does Marx speak from Nepal? *Journey for Sustainable Development and Peace Journal*, 4(1), 6–30. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jsdpj.v4i1.92169>
- Sharma Oli, K. P. (2025). People's Multiparty Democracy and democratization of the left movement. *State, Society, and Development: PMPD Perspectives*, 3(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ssd.v3i01.81283>

