THE GIFT OF THE THRONE: SOVEREIGNTY, SURVIVAL, AND THE VOLUNTARY TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY IN BHUTAN

Dr Pranav Kumar,

Assistant Professor,
Motilal Nehru College, University of Delhi.

ABSTRACT

Bhutan's transition from absolute to constitutional monarchy in 2008 constitutes one of the most anomalous cases of democratic transition in contemporary political science. Unlike the paradigmatic 'Third Wave' democratizations analyzed by Huntington (1991), which were typically driven by popular mobilization, economic crisis, or the collapse of authoritarian legitimacy, Bhutan's democratization was a deliberate, top-down process engineered and enforced by the Fourth King, Jigme Singye Wangchuck, upon a citizenry that had not demanded it. Bhutan has completed the first full term of its parliamentary democracy, the question of why this extraordinary transfer of power occurred demands rigorous academic attention. This paper argues that the transition was a calculated, multi-layered strategic act, simultaneously driven by three interlocking imperatives: (1) the perceived necessity of institutionalizing the philosophy of Gross National Happiness (GNH) beyond the contingency of benevolent individual rule; (2) a pre-emptive response to the existential security lessons derived from the fates of Bhutan's neighbors--particularly the 1975 merger of Sikkim and the Maoist insurgency in Nepal; and (3) the domestic political imperative to manage the Lhotshampa refugee crisis and rehabilitate Bhutan's international standing. The paper concludes that the Bhutanese case represents a unique variant of 'defensive democratization'--a process in which sovereignty and monarchical continuity were best preserved not by resisting democracy but by gifting it, on the Crown's own terms, before it could be demanded.

Keywords: *Bhutan, democratization, Gross National Happiness, Jigme Singye Wangchuck, Sikkim precedent, Lhotshampa crisis, Third Wave, constitutional monarchy, top-down transition*

INTRODUCTION: THE DEMOCRATIC ANOMALY OF THE HIMALAYAS - THE BHUTAN PARADOX - DEMOCRATIZATION WITHOUT DEMAND

When Bhutan elected its first parliament on March 24, 2008, there was neither revolution, foreign occupation, nor governmental collapse. No protests filled the streets of Thimphu; no underground movement burst into the light. There was no economic meltdown that destroyed the credibility of the old order. Only a monarch who had enjoyed nearly total control, and who also enjoyed great popularity among his people, made a decision after twenty-nine years of steady reforms that democracy was the best possible future he could give his people.

At the core of the paradox of Bhutanese democratization is the fact that the people were not 'ready' for democracy. Nor, according to most reports, did they even desire it. Polling and local meetings conducted by the Crown Prince in districts throughout the country between 2001 and 2005 reportedly demonstrated widespread discomfort

with replacing royal authority with the competitive arena of politics (Mathou, 2000). Political parties were a completely new phenomenon in a society historically organized along Buddhist lines, feudal land-tenure systems, and the unified authority of the Druk Gyalpo (Dragon King). Yet, on March 24, 2008, Bhutan voted.

Therefore, the question is not whether Bhutan democratized--that is now well documented--but why. This study argues that any satisfactory explanation of the transition cannot be based on one factor alone. It argues that the transition should be seen as the result of a complex and highly rational royal calculation that combined philosophical conviction with pragmatic geopolitical considerations, the need to manage a domestic crisis, and a deep-seated awareness of the vulnerability of small countries in a chaotic world. The Fourth King may have believed in democratic values as much as any other democratizing leader, but he was primarily a prudent statesman who understood that the only way to protect the sovereignty, cultural identity, and development philosophy of his kingdom was to fundamentally change the kind of state Bhutan was before either internal or external forces forced the issue.

The remainder of this paper proceeds as follows. Section Two provides an overview of how the Bhutanese case fits into the larger theoretical literature on democratization. It identifies where the Bhutanese experience deviates from accepted theories of democratization. Section Three presents the philosophical basis for the transition through an examination of the Gross National Happiness (GNH) paradigm. Section Four discusses the geopolitical and regional security interests underlying the transition. Particular attention is given to both the Sikkim precedent and the Nepal warning. Section Five explores the domestic dimensions of the Lhotshampa crisis and its relationship to the democratization agenda. Section Six chronicles the incremental institutional development of the democratization process from 1981 until 2008. Finally, Section Seven synthesizes these factors in terms of a theory-based model referred to as the Wangchuck Model.

THE BHUTANESE TRANSITION IN THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Any attempt to engage seriously with the democratization of Bhutan requires locating it in relation to--and in contrast with--the major theories of the field.

In The Third Wave, Huntington (1991) described the ways in which the last two decades of the twentieth century saw the collapse of many authoritarian regimes and their replacement by democratic systems. He identified three types of transitions: transformation, in which reforms are initiated by the ruling elite themselves; replacement, in which transition occurs through popular revolution; and trans placement, in which negotiation between the ruling elite and opposition organizations leads to transition.

At first glance, Bhutan appears to follow the path of transformation: reforms initiated by the ruling elite. However, it diverges from Huntington's model in a significant way. No opposition existed; no viable alternative government was capable of replacing the existing government through popular revolution; and no civil society organization had made known its desire for negotiation regarding the transition. The transition came about because of the decision of a ruler facing no immediate threat from either internal opposition or external intervention.

Similarly, Linz and Stepan's (1996) framework of democratic transitions also fails to provide a sufficient explanation. Their analysis assumes either that the breakdown of authoritarianism has occurred before the democratization process can take place or that there is a division between 'soft-liners' and 'hard-liners' within the ruling elite. As noted previously, none of these conditions existed in Bhutan. The Fourth King served as both hard-liner and soft-liner; he was both the current ruler and the architect of his own transfer to a new system of democratic rule. Thus,

following O'Donnell and Schmitter (1986), the transition resembled a pact--but one entered into, in effect, by one actor with himself.

More relevant theoretical perspectives can be located in the literature on 'defensive democratization' (Bogaards, 2009) and 'pre-emptive liberalization' (Gandhi & Przeworski, 2006). These bodies of research suggest that incumbent rulers may initiate democratic changes not in response to pressures exerted by an opposition movement but as a pre-emptive measure to limit potential vulnerabilities in the future. In this context, by creating institutionalized rules of the game, rulers hope to establish a mechanism through which they can secure their advantages, including the defense of core state values and institutions, before demands for change become too great to resist. This logic applies closely to the Bhutanese case, although it was executed over an unusually extended period and accompanied by an unusual degree of philosophical commitment, which separates it from more typical examples of cynically implemented liberalization in this literature.

In addition to demonstrating how anomalous the Bhutanese example is for political science theory, the case presents researchers with an opportunity to investigate a particular kind of democratization that does not arise in response to opposition demands or crises, but from the ruler's vision of the institutional structures most likely to promote national survival, protect cultural identity, and provide a stable basis for development. This paper refers to this class as 'prophylactic democratization.' Prophylactic democratization has been studied far less than other forms of democratization.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL IMPERATIVE: GNH AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE GOOD LIFE

To understand why the Fourth King selected democracy as the path forward for Bhutan's future, it is essential to grasp the philosophical approach to development that he implemented throughout his reign. In 1972, at the age of sixteen, Jigme Singye Wangchuck became the ruler of a nation that, relative to most countries in the world, was among the poorest on earth by traditional economic standards. His response did not involve establishing policies designed to maximize GDP through export-based development and foreign direct investment. Rather, he created a new development strategy for the kingdom, using language articulated as early as 1972--'Gross National Happiness is more important than Gross National Product' (Thinley, 1998)--which evolved over the next thirty years from a phrase representing commitment to a new development strategy into a full-fledged governmental structure for organizing governance under four pillars: (1) sustainable and equitable socio-economic development; (2) environmental protection; (3) preservation and promotion of culture; and (4) good governance. For understanding the significance of the transition, the fourth pillar, 'good governance,' is particularly relevant. Within the GNH context, good governance has been defined from its inception as more than a process-oriented condition or requirement; rather, it represents an institutional prerequisite for achieving all other forms of human flourishing (Ura, 2004).

The Problem of Dynastic Contingency

It is clear that the Fourth King's major epiphany leading to democratic reform was the realization that the GNH paradigm, as a philosophical basis for development, was highly vulnerable to the personal preferences and abilities of each succeeding monarch. The Fourth King believed that there were no institutional guarantees to ensure that a future monarch would have the same degree of commitment to the GNH vision. According to reports of his remarks during the early 2000s, while consulting with local districts in Bhutan, 'Bhutan's development cannot be left to the accidents of birth' (Wangchuck, 2000). That is, if one monarch were seen as incompetent, or uninterested in the GNH framework, much of what had taken decades to develop could be destroyed in one generation.

While the Fourth King's concern over potential dynastic contingency may have appeared speculative at first glance, the murder of nine members of Nepal's royal family by the Crown Prince in June 2001 was an extreme example of how quickly a ruling dynasty could become dysfunctional.

To protect his GNH vision from becoming another casualty of dynastic failure, the Fourth King decided to take the GNH philosophy out of the hands of the monarch and place it within the constitutional mandates of Bhutan's new democracy. Accordingly, Article 9 of the 2008 Constitution made GNH an integral part of the Bhutanese state by stating that 'the State shall strive to promote those conditions that will enable the pursuit of Gross National Happiness' (Constitution of the Kingdom of Bhutan, 2008). This action allowed the Fourth King to separate the philosophy of GNH from himself as monarch, thereby making democracy the strongest institutional guarantor of the GNH vision.

Democracy as the 'Good Governance' Pillar Made Manifest

There is another layer of reasoning supporting the philosophical case for democratization. 'Good governance' within the four dimensions of Gross National Happiness (GNH) represents effective public administration, yet the values of transparency, accountability, rule of law, and citizen involvement in governmental decision-making sit uneasily with absolute monarchy. Therefore, when the King's advisors understood the contradiction between the structure of GNH and the value of good governance, they knew that at some point the 'good governance' pillar would have to take an institutionalized democratic form (Mancall, 2004).

The Fourth King therefore did not see himself as giving up a developmentally enlightened role through the abdication of power, but instead as completing a process of nation-building whose inner logic led inevitably to democratic institutions. The Constitution of 2008 thus marked the completion of the GNH project and represented neither its abandonment nor a departure from it.

THE SHADOW OF NEIGHBORS: GEOPOLITICAL LEARNING AND THE REGIONAL SECURITY CALCULUS

If the philosophical imperative explains why the Fourth King believed democracy was desirable, the geopolitical imperative explains why he believed it was urgent. Bhutan is a small, landlocked state of approximately 700,000 people, situated between the two most populous nations on earth. Its foreign policy options are severely constrained by geography, and its sovereignty has always been a function of delicate calibration between Indian patronage, Chinese pressure, and the management of its own internal cohesion. In this context, the political histories of Bhutan's immediate neighbors--particularly Sikkim and Nepal--must be understood.

The Sikkim Precedent of 1975

The merger of Sikkim with India in 1975 is still considered one of the most influential events in contemporary Bhutanese strategic thinking. Like Bhutan, Sikkim was a small Himalayan kingdom with its own distinctive cultural identity, Buddhist traditions, and ruling dynasty. However, after a referendum in 1975, the legitimacy of which was challenged by many observers, Sikkim became part of India. Several factors contributed to this outcome: the political weakness of the Chogyal (the King of Sikkim), who had lost the trust of his population; internal ethnic tensions between the Lepcha-Bhutia minority and the Nepalese-speaking majority; and the strategic calculations of India in the wake of the 1971 Bangladesh War, during which India demonstrated increased assertiveness in managing its Himalayan buffer states (Rose, 1977).

For the Bhutanese elite, the lessons from Sikkim were clear and unambiguous. A monarchy that failed to integrate its people into the political process--and thus governed through royal prerogative rather than popular participation--was perpetually vulnerable to the argument that it had forfeited its right to represent its people. If Bhutan's monarchy appeared anachronistic to its own

citizens, there would be no reliable way to resist the pressures of either India or China if either found it convenient at some point in the future to support a movement for 'democratic reform' as a pretext for deeper intervention. The best defense against such a scenario was to make democratic reform an indigenous achievement, accomplished on Bhutan's own terms.

The Nepal Warning: The Consequences of Delayed Transition

Although the Sikkim precedent showed the tragic result of internal division and foreign intervention in destroying a monarchical system, Nepal demonstrated the danger of a monarchy destroyed by its inability to reform. In the 1990s and early 2000s, Nepal witnessed a long civil war between the government and the Maoist-led Communist Party of Nepal. That conflict ultimately cost nearly 17,000 lives. The civil war was a direct result of the failure of the monarchy and political leadership in Nepal to address major institutional inequalities and establish an inclusive political structure capable of meeting the demands of Nepal's marginalized communities (Thapa, 2004).

In June 2001, the royal massacre took place in Kathmandu, where Crown Prince Dipendra killed nine members of the royal family. The subsequent constitutional crisis further diminished the monarchy. By 2006, King Gyanendra had been stripped of his powers by a mass movement, and in 2008--the same year that Bhutan held its first elections--Nepal officially abolished its monarchy and became a republic. The rapidity of the Nepalese monarchy's downfall, once it began, provided valuable information for the Fourth King as he planned Bhutan's transition.

From what the Fourth King saw in Nepal, one might assume that his primary takeaway was simply that absolute monarchies were no longer sustainable--and he certainly knew this from observing global trends. A more detailed lesson derived from Nepal, however, concerned timing and agency. Nepal's monarchy was reactive; it conceded democratic reforms only when forced to do so and after violence had already broken out. When King Gyanendra attempted to reclaim royal authority in 2005, it was far too late. There was not enough moral authority or goodwill among the general public to allow the monarchy to shape the transfer of formal power while preserving as much of the Crown's symbolic importance as possible.

There seems to be little doubt that the Fourth King was aware of this distinction. By beginning the process of drafting Bhutan's new constitution in 2001--fully seven years before the country's first election--he allowed himself to manage the pace, design, and historical narrative of the transition. The Crown did not retreat because of popular demand; instead, it advanced toward a democratic future that it designed and built itself.

THE INTERNAL DIMENSION: THE LHOTSHAMPA CRISIS AND INTERNATIONAL LEGITIMACY

The transition from monarchy to democracy in Bhutan is important for several reasons, including the need to promote political stability, ensure freedom of expression and the rule of law, and maintain the country's sovereignty and integrity. However, this transition must also be viewed within the framework of one of the most significant internal political crises to have affected Bhutan since independence: the Lhotshampa refugee crisis of the 1990s.

The term 'Lhotshampa' refers to the ethnic Nepalese population located in southern Bhutan. Their ancestors began immigrating to southern Bhutan during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries after being invited by the royal family of Bhutan to reside in the subtropical southern valleys as agricultural workers.

By the late 1980s, the Bhutanese government had become concerned about the demographic implications of the rapid arrival of immigrants into Bhutan. They were primarily living in the southern border regions and maintained strong

cultural, linguistic, and familial ties with Nepal. As a result, in 1988 the Bhutanese government conducted a census, applied its new 1985 Citizenship Act, and implemented numerous assimilationist policies requiring Lhotshampas to wear Drukpa clothing and participate in Drukpa rituals and traditions in public. In turn, the Lhotshampas protested these actions; by the early 1990s, many were forcibly removed or left voluntarily, resulting in more than 80,000 to 100,000 Lhotshampas leaving Bhutan to live in refugee camps in eastern Nepal (Hutt, 2003).

Democratization as Legitimacy Restoration

The refugee crisis caused significant damage to Bhutan's international standing. Allegations of abuse and calls for the repatriation of refugees by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and many international human rights organizations severely damaged Bhutan's once-pristine image as a happy Himalayan kingdom--or, as Western media often described it, 'the last Shangri-La.' This damage, combined with the fact that the refugee crisis complicated Bhutan's relationships with both India, and the international donor community, on which Bhutan depended for development funding, created a serious legitimacy deficit for the government of Bhutan.

The democratization process therefore performed an essential legitimacy-restoring function for Bhutan. Through visible commitments to constitutional governance, parliamentary elections, an independent judiciary, and a free press, Bhutan was able to redefine itself in the eyes of the international community as a reform-minded state that supported modern norms of governance and human rights. The creation of the Constitution and its provisions guaranteeing equal protection under the law for all citizens, freedom of expression, and judicial independence established a framework within which Bhutan could better respond to international criticism regarding the refugee issue without abandoning its own position on the matter.

However, reducing the transition to democracy solely to a public relations campaign would be too cynical. The internal security aspect also played a critical role. The 2003 military operation by the Royal Bhutan Army to clear jungle bases in southern Bhutan used by the Indian insurgent groups ULFA and NDFB demonstrated the army's ability to operate physically on behalf of the King and his government. Having successfully protected the physical borders of the state through military means, the King then turned to protecting its political foundation through constitutional reform. The two operations were thus complementary aspects of one larger state-building project.

THE INCREMENTAL PATH TO 2008: DECENTRALIZATION AS DEMOCRATIC APPRENTICESHIP

One of the defining characteristics of the Bhutanese democratic transformation is its gradual nature. The elections of 2008 did not represent a sudden break from the past, but rather the culmination of an ongoing process of decentralized institutional development that began in earnest during the 1980s. The gradualness of the transformation was due in large measure to the Fourth King's distinctive theory of how political change occurs: he believed that institutions needed sufficient time to 'take hold' and demonstrate local capacity for autonomy and self-governance before being entrusted with the full responsibility of democratic self-government.

It is helpful to trace some of the major events along this path of incremental progress toward democracy. In 1981, the government formally established the District Development Committee (Dzongkhag Yargay Tshogdu) at each district level. Through these committees, substantial authority for administration and long-term planning was delegated to the districts. Therefore, for the first time in Bhutanese history, there existed a structure of local representation with decision-making power. In 1991, another layer of local governance was formalized through the Block Development Committees (Gewog Yargay Tshogchhung). With

their formation, decision-making authority was moved even closer to the people--down to the sub-district or block level. The result of these two sets of reforms was a generation of local officials and elected representatives who had hands-on experience within a system of governance before the implementation of the national parliamentary system in 2008 (Ura, 2004).

However, arguably the most significant institutional reform before 2008 took place in 1998. At that time, the Fourth King voluntarily ceded his direct executive authority to a cabinet of ministers chosen by members of the National Assembly. Along with this transfer of authority, members of the National Assembly were granted the right to impeach or dismiss the monarch by a two-thirds majority. Thus, as a matter of constitutional law, the continuation of the monarchy became dependent upon continued legislative support.

As such, while this event has sometimes been overlooked in histories of the 2008 transition, it deserves greater attention. The Fourth King demonstrated that he understood the success of any transition would ultimately depend on both its end state and its process. By demonstrating, nearly ten years before the constitutional elections that created a new national parliament, that he was serious about giving up absolute authority permanently and subjecting his own actions to the collective will of the people, the Fourth King generated the necessary moral capital to transform what could otherwise have been viewed as a gift from above into a genuine act of concession to the people.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL DRAFTING PROCESS AND THE 2008 ELECTIONS

In 2001, the Fourth King appointed a thirty-nine-member committee to draft a constitution for the Kingdom. The process was characterized by a degree of public consultation unprecedented in Bhutanese political history. Draft copies of the Constitution were distributed to every household in the country, and the King and Crown Prince Jigme Khesar Namgyel Wangchuck undertook a series of district consultations--visiting all twenty dzongkhags--in which they presented the draft text, answered questions, and, in some cases, modified provisions in response to public feedback.

The resulting Constitution, adopted in 2008, is a document of considerable sophistication that encodes the central tensions of the transition with remarkable precision. It establishes a bicameral Parliament consisting of a National Assembly and a National Council, a Supreme Court, an independent Election Commission, and an Anti-Corruption Commission. It guarantees fundamental rights, including freedom of speech, assembly, and religion. At the same time, it maintains the monarchy as the apex of the constitutional order: the King is designated 'Protector of all Religions,' Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, and formal Head of State.

Particularly notable is Article 2.6, which mandates the retirement of the monarch at the age of sixty-five. This provision--reportedly insisted upon by the Fourth King himself against the preferences of some of his advisers--is the clearest expression of his commitment to transitioning from personal rule to institutional rule. By constitutionalizing the end of royal reign, the King ensured that no future monarch could use the same logic of benevolent paternalism to resist democratic accountability indefinitely.

The 2008 Elections: Outcome and Interpretation

The elections of March 24, 2008, resulted in a decisive victory for the Druk Phuensum Tshogpa (DPT), or Bhutan Peace and Prosperity Party, led by Jigmi Yoser Thinley, which won forty-five of the forty-seven seats in the National Assembly. The People's Democratic Party (PDP), led by Sangay Ngedup, won the remaining two seats. The scale of the DPT's victory reflected less the popularity of any particular policy platform than the dominance of its network of established civil servants and local elites, many of whom had built their positions during the decade of decentralization.

The lopsided result immediately raised questions about the quality of democratic competition that had been inaugurated. A National Assembly in which the opposition holds two of forty-seven seats is a legislature in which the checks-and-balances functions of opposition politics are severely constrained. The first Bhutanese parliamentary term was accordingly characterized more by the consolidation of executive authority than by the robust legislative debate that democratic theory would ideally prescribe.

CONCLUSION: THE ARCHITECTURE OF 'DEFENSIVE DEMOCRATIZATION'

The question with which this paper began--why did Bhutan transition to democracy? --admits of no single answer. The transition was, as argued here, the product of at least three interlocking imperatives: a philosophical commitment to institutionalizing GNH beyond the contingency of individual royal virtue; a geopolitical calculus shaped by the fates of Sikkim and Nepal; and a domestic legitimacy crisis arising from the Lhotshampa refugee situation.

What unifies these three imperatives is the concept of sovereignty. In each case, the threat being addressed was ultimately a threat to the survival and integrity of the Bhutanese state--whether from internal fragmentation, external intervention, or international isolation. Democracy, in the Fourth King's calculus, was the most reliable instrument for meeting all three threats simultaneously. By transforming the state from a monarchy-centric to a constitution-centric order, he created an institutional foundation for Bhutanese sovereignty that could survive the death of any individual king.

The Bhutanese case thus invites us to reconsider some of the foundational assumptions of democratic transition theory. Most theoretical frameworks in this field treat democracy as an outcome demanded by social forces--workers, the middle class, civil society organizations--and conceded, often reluctantly, by incumbent elites. In Bhutan, this logic was inverted: the incumbent elite demanded democracy from a citizenry that had not requested it, on the grounds that democratic institutions were the only ones robust enough to protect the core values of the state in an uncertain future.

What can be said with confidence is that Bhutan achieved something genuinely unusual: a peaceful, orderly, and institutionally coherent transition from absolute to constitutional monarchy, conducted without violence, without significant elite defection, and without the loss of the developmental philosophy that had defined the Bhutanese state for four decades.

Whether this achievement proves durable--whether the formal institutions of democracy will be progressively filled with the substantive content of popular participation, robust opposition, and genuine accountability--will depend on forces that the Bhutanese Kings could initiate but could not fully control: the evolving expectations of a young, educated, and increasingly connected Bhutanese citizenry. The gift of the throne has been given. Whether the people choose to fully receive it, and to make it their own, is a question that only the next generation can answer.

REFERENCES

- Bogaards, M. (2009). How to classify hybrid regimes? Defective democracy and electoral authoritarianism. *Democratization, 16*(2), 399-423.
- Constitution of the Kingdom of Bhutan. (2008). *Royal Government of Bhutan.*
- Gandhi, J., & Przeworski, A. (2006). Cooperation, cooptation, and rebellion under dictatorships. *Economics & Politics, 18*(1), 1-26.
- Huntington, S. P. (1991). *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century.* University of Oklahoma Press.

- Hutt, M. (2003). *Unbecoming citizens: Culture, nationhood, and the flight of refugees from Bhutan.* Oxford University Press.
- Linz, J., & Stepan, A. (1996). *Problems of democratic transition and consolidation.* Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mancall, M. (2004). The Constitution of Bhutan: Principles and process. *Journal of Bhutan Studies, 10*, 1-24.
- Mathou, T. (2000). Bhutan's political system and foreign policy. *Journal of Bhutan Studies, 2*(2), 139-183.
- O'Donnell, G., & Schmitter, P. C. (1986). *Transitions from authoritarian rule: Tentative conclusions about uncertain democracies.* Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rose, L. E. (1977). *The politics of Bhutan.* Cornell University Press.
- Thapa, D. (2004). *A kingdom under siege: Nepal's Maoist insurgency.* The Printhouse.
- Thinley, J. Y. (1998). Values and development: Gross National Happiness. In *Proceedings of the Millennium Meeting for Asia and the Pacific.* United Nations.
- Ura, K. (2004). *The Bhutanese development story.* Centre for Bhutan Studies.
- Wangchuck, T. (2000). Change in the land of the thunder dragon: Governance reforms in Bhutan. *South Asian Survey, 7*(1), 43-62.