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**Topic:** Application of Seyla Benhabib’s ‘Universalist Model of Deliberative Democracy’ Baluchistan

Seyla Benhabib’s Universalist model of deliberative democracy is constructed as a product of an independent politico-philosophical position that finds its unique place in the realm of identity politics, and multiculturalism. The position validates normative political theories of earlier thinkers that encourage multiculturalism (to the extent where it is not strong or mosaic multiculturalism) and cultural contestation which exists by virtue of social constructivism but disagrees with contemporaries on the spatial aspects of discourses that are essential to the functionality and coexistence of multiple cultural, social, religious and ethnic groups. The spatial aspects pertain to restrictions applied on public and private spaces where discourses that involve public reason and opinion formation have their place. Benhabib’s model validates equality and inclusivity of members of particular groups in socio-political discourses that are of mutual importance.

Reification of ethnic groups and opportunities of coexistence that lie in matured and reasonable discourses and principles of universal moral respect and recognition for the “other” where the other is taken as a ubiquitous term for both individuals and cultures other than the self or your own culture, are democratic standards that are mapped onto Baluchistan’s case where impermeable cultures, that are embodied in rich Baluch traditions, ethno-nationalism and sectarian violence, are barring the province from getting embedded into the national mainstream.

Baluchistan is Pakistan’s largest province by area and the smallest by population. There are certain international and local factors at play including tribalism in the area where ‘personal interests’, a notion that deliberative democrats think is what rendered the
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classic deliberative model to be undesirable but is an essential to negotiations which form an integral part of his model, are obstacles in the way of consensus building in the province.

The paper explores avenues and platforms that can facilitate the interaction of Benhabib’s Universalist model of deliberative democracy with the status-quo democracy in Baluchistan that exists by virtue of the 2013’s general elections in Pakistan. The interaction can prove vital as a guiding mechanism and political resolution of conflicts that exist between the Government of Pakistan and the local Balochis.

Seyla Benhabib creates new dimensions to debates over identity politics and intensified cultural conflicts by proposing a dual-track deliberative democracy model in which the space for dialogue/discourse and contestation over multicultural, ethno-religious and legal conflicts is not only the established institutions privileged to decide such matters but rather civil society movements, cultural, religious and political associations that form the unofficial/unrestricted public sphere. The deliberative democracy model rests on the discourse model of ethics which supports participation in discourses of all those affected by the decisions. This is to some extent consistent with political liberalism of John Rawls except that Benhabib’s deliberative model asserts the inclusion of the unofficial public sphere and focuses on non coercive and non final processes of opinion formation in the unrestricted public sphere. Benhabib believes that discourse ethics are validated by presupposition of universal moral respect and egalitarian reciprocity which in turn are expanded by three normative conditions that also form the basis for functionality of pluralist structures; they are egalitarian reciprocity, voluntary self-ascription and freedom of exit and association.

Insurgency and uprising against the federal government are seen as a direct result of growing resentment/deprivation amongst the Baloch population and misusage of government incentives by the tribal Sardars who have harbored personal armies while disallowing the government’s development funds trickle down to the general public. This has serious implications for Pakistan as a federation since the local populace is demanding provincial autonomy and particular religious and ethnic groups are garnering support for separatist movements.

Umbreen Javaid, a Political Scientist from University of the Punjab, analyzes the political and religious situation of Baluchistan within the extremes of national unity and provincial autonomy; two political aspirations that, according to a popular view held by a majority of Pakistan’s political scientists, clash with each other.


‘For decades, separatists in Baluchistan have been fighting a guerrilla war for control of the province’s resources. Whenever the central government tried to explore the natural resources of Baluchistan, the Baloch Sardars opposed it, since they saw no local benefit to this’. Nasreen Akhtar sees the growing resentment in Baluchistan as an upshot of non-representative and authoritarian military-led rule that denied people the political freedom, empowerment and much needed autonomy, all of which have contributed to the separatist movement and ethnic tensions that have worked to the detriment of the civilian government’s efforts to build national narratives that can bind the society. The province has now become a battlefield for local and international power-mongers and political opportunists who are advancing their interests in the region’s copious mineral and natural resources.

The paper is used to analyze if the reasons given by the Balochis in asking for a separate homeland are justified in the context of Benhabib’s legitimization of separatist movements. In claims of culture, her normative model includes conditions whose non-
existence legitimizes demands for separate homeland by cultural groups. Is economic and political exploitation and power politics that is forcing the Sardars to ask for a separate homeland justify separate homeland demands from the Balochis and disintegrate what might transform into a peacefully coexisting multicultural society.


The paper co-authored by Titus and Swidler analyzes ethnic-nationalism in Baluchistan as a tendency evolving out of political aspirations developed during the colonial period when self-governing, autonomous states were envisaged by tribal and nationalistic leaders to personally consume the economic and natural endowments of the region without being answerable to any supreme authority. Since after joining Pakistan their aspirations remained unfulfilled, so they reinforced anti-federation sentiments and separatist narratives to retain their diluted control over the region.

The author puts forth the thesis that although much of the current crisis in Baluchistan is explained by Pakistan Government’s centralization plans and authoritarian regimes that had the least regard for the rights of geographically disconnected Baloch minority, but the conflict cannot be understood without observing it in the Pak-Afghan relations context. The British left a virtually undefined border between Pakistan and Afghanistan called the Durand line and the issue has been manipulated to evoke ethnic assimilations by Afghanistan to win back the support of the local Pashtuns and Balochis while the Pakistanis have evoked international boundary laws and nationhood narratives to uphold the sovereignty of the Durand line to hinder unnecessary inflow of Afghan refugees.


The work is a review of Bohman’s ‘Public deliberation: pluralism, complexity and democracy.’ James Bohman constructs the deliberative model of democracy by
combining the critical social theory of Habermas and pragmatism of John Dewey. He aims to shed light on the gap between the theory that constructs the deliberative model and the practice of public deliberation that is central to the establishment of a democratic system based on the deliberative model. He believes the normative democratic theory to be a set of ideals that presuppose a just social, political order while there exist huge question marks on how such ideals would be realized. So, the paper discusses at length the discrepancies that exist between the normative theory and practice of deliberative democracy in presence of modern social conditions.


Pakistan’s political history is wrought by military incursions and civil-military divide/conflicts which on quite a few occasions have proved to be a nemesis for Pakistan’s troubled democratic system. In ‘Pakistan’s Armored Democracy, Aqil Shah, a former Rhodes Scholar, discusses the role of military in democratization and in establishing prosperous relations with Pakistan’s internal and external political entities. Election cycles under the military and its control over government formation and foreign policy are arguments used to testify that the real power, although ostensibly transferred to the civilian governments, still rests with the military.

The paper is used to understand political dynamics of the province and see how ethnic identities dominate democratic and political discourses. Prospects of an application of a model of Universalist deliberative democracy is dependent upon transfer of political power from the military to civilian governments so more inclusive systems can evolve that facilitate discourses based on principles laid down as premises of Benhabib’s model.


The application of a western style nation state concept and modern centralization ideals in a developing state like Pakistan are identified as major obstacles to national integration. Nasreen Akhter discusses the contributors to ethnic divide in Pakistan and
develops a thesis that state elites regardless of their professional and institutional belonging are responsible for application of western constructs in the developing world which does not have the receptive grounds for such ideals to be realized.

While most ethnic conflicts in Pakistan have been explained by either military-civil divide, or historically, in context of boundaries drawn by the British near the end of the colonial era, this paper seems to take a novel perspective that builds on the premise that elites, whether part of the military, Baloch tribals or erstwhile British imperials are responsible for the current division in Pakistan and their vested economic and political interests have polarized the political space.


Ethnic fragmentation has engulfed most ex-communist and western states of the world including the pluralistic United States, Canada, France and Spain. While Marxists believe that socialism can bring an end to ethnic consciousness, non-Marxists are of the view that urbanization and modernization can help replace particularism by universalism which shall drive societies away from ethnic nationalism. Lipset and Jalali discuss if self-determination, international aid to resolve ethnic conflicts and modernization/globalization can be productive in solving the ethnic crises. To do so, they use cases from ex-communist states including the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.


Aayushi Prakash observes the impact of traditional and contemporary media on the ongoing conflict in Baluchistan. The author draws on models derived from Galtung and built upon by Lynch and McGoldrick to examine the impact of peace journalism which is defined as media representations of the ongoing conflict, on post-congress-resolution Baluchistan; the congressional resolution granted the right of self-determination to the Balochis. Baluchistan continues to be under-represented in the Pakistan media which has
proliferated in size and impact to become the leading space in the unofficial public sphere where dialogues on political, social and cultural issues are held.

Although Prakash’s paper concentrates on variables that connect post-colonial journalism efforts to maintenance of peace in the region, one pertinent question it can help address in context of my research is that ‘Can cultural contests be resolved peacefully for different identity groups to coexist in Pakistan where one province (Baluchistan) is undemocratically neglected in popular media coverage?’


Barth’s ‘ethnic groups and boundaries’ is a collection of essays written as post-conference resolutions after an anthropology-sociology conference in Bergen in 1967 that brought together contemporary social anthropologists including Barth himself to settle ethnic identity issues and decide on a common understanding of ethnic groups that were assumed to be separated by identifiable ethnic boundaries. While the emphasis of the book is on the identification and taxonomical classification of ethnic groups, it is divergent in ways the authors address the persistence and maintenance of ethnic groups. As Barth writes in the Introduction that ethnic boundaries persist despite flow of personnel across them and ethnic distinctions do not depend on absence of social interaction and acceptance.

Barth's definition of ethnic groups and how their interaction does not blur the boundaries between them is the focus of the book. His definitions are used to find similarities between his delineation of ethnic groups with Benhabib's cultural classifications to see if ethnicities and cultural associations can be used as interchangeable terms or if one is dependent on/subset of the other. Baluchistan's inability in becoming a multicultural society is rooted in its strong, impermeable ethnicities that are disallowing migration from other provinces while promoting tribalism and ethnic assimilations. Barth’s research is instrumental in the attainment of an interface where Benhabib’s model of deliberative democracy that is based on tenets of multiculturalism and Barth’s research that is
focused on defining ethnicities overlap/interact. Interestingly, Barth’s socio-
anthropological focus has been the Pashtun ethnicity for which he examines the ethnic
trends in the Swat region in Pakistan. While Swat is not Baluchistan, Pashtuns are the
second largest ethnic group in Baluchistan and Barth’s definition of ethnicities already
contains ethnic behavior that is typical of the Balochis.