Rhetoric of Public Policy: Ethos, Logos and Pathos in Development Governance

Bidhya Jyoti Ghimire[1]

Abstract

The study explores the definition of public policy as a technocratic function and examines the underlying capacity of rhetoric to persuade the public in the developmental setting. It is common to describe public policy as a technical, logical process of making decisions based on facts. However, academic research indicates that policy is essentially a rhetorical and communicative activity in which narratives and persuasion are crucial to gaining legitimacy. Using the Aristotelian triad of ethos (credibility), logos (logic), and pathos (emotion) as an analytical framework, this study explores the crucial role of rhetoric in public policy and development. With an emphasis on Nepal's changing policy environment, the study uses a qualitative, interpretive design to analyze national development plans, policy documents, and international agreements. The results show that Nepal's development discourse is marked by pathos, using aspirational narratives of national pride and inclusion to navigate political transitions and post-conflict reconstruction, whereas international development organizations heavily rely on logos-dominated technocratic language to project neutrality. The study also looks at how these rhetorical techniques are used to create institutional trust and public consent in times of crisis, like the COVID-19 pandemic and the 2015 earthquake. The study comes to the conclusion that rhetoric is a fundamental component of governance rather than an incidental aspect. In order to close the gap between policy intentions and lived realities in sustainable development, it makes the case for a move toward ethical rhetoric a practice that strikes a balance between technical evidence and open, inclusive, and emotionally responsible communication.

Keywords: Public policy, rhetorical persuasion, development discourse, Aristotle, technocracy, governance.

Introduction

Public policy is frequently presented as a straightforward process, where reason and tech come together in a rational way based on evidence. However, scholarly analysis suggests it is not merely a matter of pure calculation, but one where persuasion and narratives play a decisive role (Dunn, 2018). Public policy is not merely a matter of technical management or the allocation of material resources; it is a mediation of rhetorical and material forces (Asen, 2010). He further argues that public policy functions as a complex assemblage that harnesses the formative and practical force of rhetoric alongside institutional and material assets. Stone (2002) points out clearly that policy redefines the text as an ongoing process, thereby presenting distinct questions of authorship, time, and multiple meanings that differ from those posed by individual or more self-contained discursive acts.

Consequently, policy involves more than the application of logic during legislation; it encompasses a communicative process that interacts with citizens and stakeholders during implementation. the comparison here is that policy is not just applying logic during the legislative steps or planning but it involves communication too, especially in how things get implemented and how that interacts with citizens and stakeholders. In the context of

---

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Rural Development, Tribhuvan University.
  Email: bidhya.1990s@gmail.com

development, like efforts to reduce poverty or promote good governance and social inclusion, rhetoric is everywhere and really matters. Fischer (2003) states that national trends in development through agency decisions feels like the language used in policy by governments and those development actors shapes how we see reality.

By analyzing policy through the Aristotelian triad of ethos, logos, and pathos, we can uncover how certain representations of "the poor," "the underdeveloped," and "the environment" become dominant and shape the ways in which reality is imagined and acted upon. It gives legitimacy to power in this messy political space, with all the discourse and practices around development outcomes. Aristotle's classical rhetorical tradition establishes a theoretical landscape for persuasion analysis, integrating the concepts of ethos, logos, and pathos (Aristotle, 2007). G.A Kennedy in Aristotle (2007) states that Aristotle was one of the first to understand that rhetoric is not a good or bad tool, depending on the user. In his work 'On Rhetoric' he mentioned three things that are a must for persuasion: the logical power of the argument, the speaker's credibility, and the audience's emotional connection. Modern rhetoric has not only accepted these ideas but also added to them by classifying them into categories such as logos (logical appeal), ethos (the speaker's perceived character), and pathos (the stirring of listener emotions) to explain how people are easily influenced.

These rhetorical strategies are integral in modern public policy and development discourses and are contained within and implemented in national plans of development, aid strategies, parliamentary debates, communication and media strategies, and global agreements including the UN's Sustainable Development Goals at the Global Agenda (Hajer, 1995; Cornwall & Brock, 2005). Although such rhetorical strategies are useful in defining common goals and ideas about development and progress, they can also diffuse dilute or mask power asymmetry and political trade-offs and other interests underlying policymaking choices.

This research aims to show that rhetoric isn't just a side note in policy making but it's central to how policies gain legitimacy. First, it looks at how ethos helps build trust, validity, and moral authority between citizens and policymakers. Next, it examines how logos is used to justify policies with data and technical arguments, revealing the political power hidden in technocratic language. Finally, it considers how pathos shapes policy stories, exploring how emotions and identities are used and weighing the ethical risks of emotional appeals in development policy.

Materials and Methods

This paper utilizes a qualitative, interpretive design grounded in classical rhetoric and critical policy studies, this paper examines how policy achieves legitimacy; the study treats policy as a communicative and political practice rather than a purely technical exercise. The primary data for this research is derived from qualitative secondary sources, including national policy documents and development plans from Nepal, alongside official reports and frameworks from international development organizations. The study also analyzes global policy agreements and authoritative speeches or statements by political leaders, particularly during periods of crisis, as these represent critical junctures for policy communication and persuasion. The analytical process involves an interpretive thematic approach. By comparing the specific context of Nepal with global trends, the research highlights variations in rhetorical emphasis and differences in governance capacity. As the study relies exclusively on publicly available documents, there are no significant ethical risks; however, rigorous care is taken to ensure contextual accuracy and responsible discourse interpretation.

Results and Discussion

The Aristotelian Foundation: Rhetoric as an Art of Civic Discourse

The definition of rhetoric by Aristotle characterized it as the ability to discover the means of persuasion that were available in a certain case, and at that, he made a classification of the

means into three artistic résumés, namely, ethos, logos, and pathos (Aristotle, 2007). Ethos is the kind of discourse that has its source in the good moral character and credibility of the person who speaks; and thus, the speaker's worthiness of trust becomes the most important factor for the acceptance of the discourse. In the discourse of contemporary political power, the public trust and the satisfaction of the people are the most significant indicators of the strong ethical persuasion. A good illustration is that of Indonesia, where the President has been receiving very high approval ratings of over 80 percent, which has drawn the interest of the academic world to the blend of political rhetoric that brings together personal credibility with the Indonesian leadership value of Ing Ngarso Sung Tulodo, which highlights among other things, leading by example and moral authority in public office (Arrianie, 2023). In contrast, logos refers to the logical congruence and manifest truth of an argument, and this is a more common view in modern policy that is also seen in today's politics where, evidence based claims are the main support for decision-making, upholding, and legitimizing political power and policy through presenting measurable success in infrastructure, health, and other development areas throughout time (Aristotle, 2007; Arrianie, 2023).

Pathos is all about controlling the emotional state of the listeners and it greatly influences political communications when the governments want to create or measure public emotions such as contentment, discontent, or trust in their actions through the use of rhetoric (Arrianie, 2023). Aristotle pointed out that rhetoric itself has no moral rightness or wrongness attached to it and can thus be used for both good and evil purposes, e.g., the other extreme being the destruction of public opinion in favor of autocracy, which would have been the case in the American independence movement, where it was mobilized by the pro-revolutionists (Aristotle, 2007). In the realm of development policy, this moral double standard is usually covered by what Escobar calls "the zeal of a reformer," in which case the development specialists view the backward areas as "the missionaries' paradise" in need of their technical assistance and hence they impose their persuasive power even very often unknowingly through what they claim to be "objective" and "scientific" development practices (Escobar, 1995).

Rhetoric as a Core Element of Public Policy

Rhetoric in public policy goes beyond political speeches. It encompasses policy documents, white papers, budget statements, legislative debates, donor reports, and public consultations (Majone, 1989). These texts are not merely descriptive but performable; they actively shape what is considered a "problem," whose voices count, and what solutions appear feasible. Stone (2002) argues that policy making is a struggle over ideas and meanings rather than a purely technical exercise. Through metaphors, symbols, and narratives, policymakers create stories about society that justify particular courses of action. For example, unemployment can be framed as an individual failure of skills or as a structural failure of the economy, leading to very different policy responses. In development policy, rhetorical framing is especially influential. Poverty is often described as a "cycle," an "enemy," or a "trap," while development is portrayed as a "journey," a "path," or a "vision." These metaphors are not neutral; they guide public expectations and political priorities (Fischer, 2003). Therefore, rhetoric is not an optional feature of policy making but a constitutive element of governance itself.

Ethos in Public Policy and Development: Credibility, Trust, and Legitimacy

Ethos plays a central role in policy acceptance. Citizens are more likely to support policies when they trust the credibility, integrity, and competence of policymakers (Easton, 1975). In development contexts, where state capacity may be uneven, the ethical dimension of policy leadership becomes even more critical. International development institutions such as the World Bank, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and International Monetary Fund (IMF) rely heavily on institutional ethos to influence national policy agendas. Their technical expertise and global reputation provide moral and intellectual authority that shapes domestic policy choices (Keohane, 2001).

Governments often cite these institutions to enhance the perceived legitimacy of their reforms. At the national level, political leadership plays a decisive role in constructing ethos. Charismatic leaders or reformist technocrats can generate public trust and reduce resistance to difficult reforms. However, when leaders are associated with corruption, patronage, or elite capture, even well-designed policies fail due to deficits in ethical legitimacy (Rothstein, 2011). Participatory governance practices also contribute to ethos. Public hearings, stakeholder consultations, and community engagement serve not only procedural functions but also rhetorical ones. They signal that the state respects citizen voices and values inclusiveness (Dryzek, 2000). Even when participation is limited in practice, the rhetorical performance of inclusion often becomes a central feature of policy communication.

Logos in Policy Making: Evidence, Rationality, and Technocracy

Logos is commonly associated with evidence-based policy making. Governments increasingly rely on statistics, indicators, impact evaluations, and cost–benefit analyses to justify public spending and reforms (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). In development planning, numerical targets for poverty reduction, economic growth, education, and health are standard features of policy documents. Indicators serve rhetorical as well as technical purposes. They provide an appearance of objectivity and neutrality, making policies seem scientifically grounded and politically impartial (Charlton, 2002). However, the production and use of data are themselves political processes. Decisions about what to measure, how to measure, and what to publicize involve value judgments that shape policy directions (Merry, 2011). For example, emphasizing GDP growth as the primary indicator of development promotes a narrative that equates economic expansion with social progress, often marginalizing concerns about inequality, environmental degradation, and social justice (Terjesen, 2004). Thus, logos can be used to prioritize certain development models while sidelining alternative perspectives. Moreover, excessive reliance on technical language can weaken democratic participation. When policy debates are dominated by experts and technocrats, ordinary citizens may feel excluded and disempowered (Fischer, 2003). While logos strengthens rational decision-making, it can also reinforce hierarchical power relations unless complemented by inclusive dialogue.

Pathos in Development Discourse: Emotional Politics and Moral Appeals

Pathos operates through emotional appeals that connect policies with people's feelings, identities, and moral values. Policymakers frequently use emotional narratives to mobilize public support for development initiatives (Marcus, 2013). Stories of poor children, distressed farmers, or disaster-affected communities make abstract policy goals tangible and emotionally engaging. National development projects are often framed using patriotic language, portraying infrastructure, energy, and industrial projects as symbols of national dignity and sovereignty. Such emotional framing strengthens public attachment to state-led development agendas and reduces resistance to large-scale investments (Billig, 1995).

However, there are ethical risks associated with the misuse of pathos. Exaggerated crisis narratives can be used to justify extraordinary measures, reduce transparency, and curtail democratic freedoms (Furedi, 2018). In development contexts, emotional portrayals of poverty can unintentionally reinforce stereotypes of helplessness and dependency, undermining the dignity and agency of marginalized communities. Responsible use of pathos requires balancing emotional engagement with respect for human rights and social diversity. Emotional appeals should empower rather than exploit public sentiment.

The Strategic Combination of Ethos, Logos, and Pathos

Effective policy rhetoric usually combines all three rhetorical dimensions. A successful public policy narrative often presents a moral vision (pathos), supported by credible institutions (ethos), and justified by statistical evidence (logos). This integrated approach increases the

persuasive power of policy communication (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). For instance, climate change policy is commonly framed through scientific evidence (logos), endorsed by international institutions (ethos), and communicated through emotional stories of vulnerable communities (pathos). Similar patterns can be observed in poverty reduction, health, and education policies across developing and developed countries. Imbalances, however, can lead to policy failures. Heavy reliance on emotional appeal without evidence can result in populist but unsustainable policies. Conversely, purely technocratic approaches without ethical and emotional grounding may face public resistance and lack of ownership (Majone, 1989).

Rhetoric, Power, and Development Governance

Rhetoric is deeply connected with power. Those who control the dominant narratives often shape policy outcomes (Hajer, 1995). In many developing countries, development rhetoric is influenced by global institutions, donor agencies, and political elites, sometimes marginalizing local knowledge and community voices (Escobar, 1995). Donor-driven rhetoric frequently promotes concepts such as "capacity building," "good governance," and "market efficiency," which may not fully reflect local realities. Governments often adopt donor language to secure funding while adapting implementation to local political priorities. This creates gaps between policy rhetoric and practice, reducing public trust. At the same time, rhetoric can be a tool for resistance. Civil society organizations, social movements, and indigenous groups frequently use alternative narratives to challenge dominant development models and demand rights-based approaches (Dryzek, 2000).

Ethical Challenges in Policy Rhetoric

The ethical use of rhetoric in policy making is essential for democratic governance. Manipulative rhetoric that distorts facts, exploits fear, or misrepresents authority undermines public trust and weakens institutional legitimacy (Habermas, 1984). Ethical policy rhetoric should be transparent, accurate, and inclusive. Policymakers should acknowledge uncertainties, competing interests, and potential negative impacts rather than presenting overly simplified success narratives. Strengthening media literacy and civic education can empower citizens to critically evaluate policy discourse and hold leaders accountable.

Implications for Public Policy and Development Practice

Recognizing the power of rhetoric has practical implications for development practice. Policymakers should invest in transparent communication strategies that combine credible leadership, reliable evidence, and respectful emotional engagement. Participatory narrative-building, where communities help shape policy stories, can enhance ownership and sustainability. Development agencies should be cautious of imposing external rhetorical frameworks that do not align with local cultural and political contexts. Context-sensitive communication can bridge the gap between policy intentions and lived realities. For researchers, rhetorical analysis provides a valuable methodological approach to uncover hidden power structures, ideological assumptions, and governance challenges embedded in policy language (Fischer, 2003).

Comparative Analysis: Nepal and Global Development Rhetoric

Comparatively, Nepal's development rhetoric tends to be more aspirational and symbolic, relying heavily on pathos by appealing to national pride, historical struggle, and collective hope (Kumar, 2019). This is partly due to Nepal's political transition from monarchy to federal democratic republic, where narratives of inclusion, identity, and transformation occupy central rhetorical space (Lawoti, 2008). In contrast, global institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund predominantly rely on logos-dominated rhetoric (Keohane, 2001). Their reports emphasize indicators, benchmarks, performance rankings, and technical efficiency (Merry, 2011; Charlton, 2002). The rhetorical legitimacy of these institutions is built

through technocratic language and global expertise (ethos), rather than emotional connection with local communities (Majone, 1989).

For instance, while Nepal frames poverty reduction as a moral and national obligation (National Reconstruction Authority, Government of Nepal, 2016), global development agencies often frame it as an economic inefficiency or governance failure that can be corrected through institutional reforms and market-based strategies (Terjesen, 2004; Escobar, 1995). This difference creates tensions between national emotional narratives and global technocratic frameworks (Cornwall & Brock, 2005). A clear example can be observed in Nepal's federalism policy discourse. The government rhetorically presents federalism as a pathway to inclusion and empowerment (pathos and ethos) (Lawoti, 2008; Rothstein, 2011), whereas international observers and donors often assess it through performance indicators related to service delivery efficiency (logos) (World Bank, 2021). This mismatch often results in gaps between policy design, donor expectations, and community experiences (Fischer, 2003).

Rhetorical strategies in public policy are visible across both developing and developed contexts (Stone, 2002; Fischer, 2003). In Nepal, policy rhetoric has played a central role in shaping development discourse since the 1950s (Kumar, 2019). National development plans, such as the periodic Five-Year Plans, have consistently used emotionally powerful and morally persuasive language, including terms such as "samriddha Nepal" (Prosperous Nepal), "loktantrik samridhi" (democratic prosperity), and "samaveshi bikas" (inclusive development) (National Reconstruction Authority, Government of Nepal, 2016). Ensure the connection between the specific Nepali terms and the rhetorical categories is explicit. For example: institutional credibility is ethos where 'Prosperous Nepal' evokes pathos, and evidence-based planning emphasizes logos. These terms function rhetorically to create hope as pathos, reinforce institutional credibility is ethos, and justify policy choices through numerical targets is logos (Aristotle, 2007; Hajer, 1995).

For example, Nepal's Fifteenth Five-Year Plan rhetorically frames economic prosperity as a national destiny, emphasizing emotional unity and patriotism while simultaneously using statistical targets such as GDP growth rates, poverty reduction percentages, and infrastructure expansion figures (National Reconstruction Authority, Government of Nepal, 2016). The government's repeated reference to "evidence-based planning" demonstrates the use of logos, while invoking the authority of the National Planning Commission reinforces ethos (Dunn, 2018; Majone, 1989). In contrast, global examples from developed countries illustrate different rhetorical balances (Fischer, 2003).

In the United States, for instance, social welfare and healthcare reforms have historically relied heavily on pathos-driven narratives. Political leaders frequently use stories of vulnerable families and struggling workers to emotionally justify program expansions or budget cuts (Marcus, 2013). However, these policies are also heavily debated using logos through data on economic cost, public debt, and statistical projections (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). The European Union's sustainability and climate policy discourse provides another example (Hajer, 1995). EU climate strategies frequently rely on scientific expertise (logos) from institutions such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) while invoking ethical responsibility towards future generations (ethos) and fear of environmental catastrophe (pathos) (Dryzek, 2000; Furedi, 2018). Compared to Nepal, the EU context demonstrates stronger institutionalized evidence systems but similar rhetorical blending of emotional and ethical appeals (Charlton, 2002). A major contrast can be seen in how rhetoric operates in emerging economies versus mature democracies (Cornwall & Brock, 2005). In Nepal and other South Asian countries, rhetorical emphasis is often placed on national unity, political stability, and post-conflict development narratives (Escobar, 1995). In many Western countries, rhetorical focus is more likely to emphasize rights-based discourses, individual freedoms, and fiscal responsibility (Habermas, 1984). However, in both contexts, rhetoric functions as a powerful tool to manufacture public consent and political legitimacy (Easton, 1975).

Rhetoric during Crisis: Nepal and International Comparisons

Times of crisis intensify rhetorical practices (Furedi, 2018). Nepal's response to the 2015 earthquake illustrates how rhetoric shapes policy responses. Government leaders used highly emotional language focused on national unity, resilience, and collective rebuilding (National Reconstruction Authority, Government of Nepal, 2016). The slogan "Build Back Better" was not only a technical policy principle but also a rhetorical tool to inspire hope and justify large-scale reconstruction budgets (Hajer, 1995).

Similarly, during the COVID-19 pandemic, Nepal's policy responses relied heavily on emotional appeals about national safety, moral responsibility, and social solidarity, while simultaneously presenting infection and mortality statistics to maintain logical justification (WHO, 2021). Globally, similar patterns were visible. In New Zealand, political leadership emphasized empathy and collective responsibility, using ethos built on trust and transparent communication (Dryzek, 2000). In the United States, pandemic rhetoric became highly polarized, showing how rhetoric can divide rather than unite public opinion (Marcus, 2013). Compared to these countries, Nepal's rhetorical response was more centralized and symbolic but less supported by strong institutionalized evidence systems, reflecting structural differences in governance capacity (World Bank, 2021).

The Future of Rhetoric in Public Policy and Development

The future of rhetoric in policy making is likely to become even more complex due to digital transformation, social media, and the growing influence of global information networks (Castells, 2011). Policymakers increasingly communicate through social platforms, where emotional and symbolic language spreads faster than technical evidence (Fischer, 2003). This trend suggests that pathos may become more dominant in future policy discourse (Marcus, 2013).

In Nepal, this transformation is already visible. Political communication now heavily relies on digital media, slogans, visual symbols, and short emotional messages (Von Einsiedel, Malone, & Pradhan, 2012). While this increases public engagement, it also increases the risk of misinformation, oversimplification, and populist policy making (Furedi, 2018). Globally, artificial intelligence, big data, and real-time analytics may strengthen logos-based governance by enabling more precise evidence generation (Merry, 2011). However, the framing of these data will remain rhetorical. The risk of "data manipulation through selective storytelling" may increase as governments become more skilled at packaging selective evidence to shape public perception (Charlton, 2002).

In the future, ethical rhetoric in policy making will become a key governance challenge (Habermas, 1984). Governments and international organizations will need to balance transparency, emotional responsibility, and technical accuracy. Capacity-building in communication ethics, public deliberation, and critical media literacy will be essential to ensure that rhetoric strengthens rather than weakens democratic governance (Dryzek, 2000). In development practice, the future will likely see increased emphasis on participatory rhetoric, where local communities actively shape policy narratives rather than being passive recipients of state or donor language (Escobar, 1995; Cornwall & Brock, 2005). This could transform rhetoric from a top-down instrument of control into a bottom-up tool for empowerment (Fischer, 2003).

Rhetoric is not a peripheral element of public policy; it is a foundational mechanism through which development agendas are framed, justified, and contested (Stone, 2002; Majone, 1989). The interplay of ethos, logos, and pathos shapes not only how policies are communicated but also how they are understood, accepted, or resisted by society (Aristotle, 2007). In Nepal, rhetorical policy practices have been deeply shaped by political transition, post-conflict governance, and aspirations for inclusive and prosperous development (Kumar, 2019; National

Reconstruction Authority, Government of Nepal, 2016). Emotional appeals to national unity, credibility claims through state institutions, and increasing use of statistical targets illustrate the active presence of classical rhetoric in Nepal's development policy landscape (Hajer, 1995; Easton, 1975).

Comparatively, global policy contexts reflect similar rhetorical structures but with different emphases (Fischer, 2003). Developed countries and multilateral institutions tend to rely more heavily on technocratic logos and institutional ethos (Keohane, 2001; Merry, 2011), while countries like Nepal utilize more emotionally driven pathos to mobilize public trust and political legitimacy (Lawoti, 2008; Von Einsiedel et, al., 2012). These differences highlight how rhetorical strategies are shaped by political history, institutional capacity, and socio-economic conditions (Escobar, 1995; Cornwall & Brock, 2005).

Looking ahead, the future of rhetoric in public policy and development will be shaped by digital communication, artificial intelligence, and growing citizen awareness (Castells, 2011). Rhetoric will likely become faster, more visual, and more emotionally intense, increasing both democratic possibilities and risks of manipulation (Furedi, 2018). The challenge for future governance systems, including Nepal's, will be to cultivate ethical, transparent, and inclusive rhetorical practices that respect truth, empower citizens, and balance emotion with reason (Habermas, 1984; Dryzek, 2000). When used responsibly, rhetoric can strengthen democratic governance, enhance policy legitimacy, and promote sustainable development (Terjesen, 2004; Stone, 2002). When misused, it can deepen inequality, weaken institutions, and undermine public trust (Rothstein, 2011). Therefore, the future of effective public policy and development depends not only on technical solutions but also on the ethical management of rhetoric as a central element of governance (Fischer, 2003).

Conclusion

The research has indicated that rhetoric is not just a side or decorative aspect of the public policy of development but rather a ruling power that determines the ways the policies are framed, legitimized, and argued against. By means of the Aristotelian triad of ethos, logos, and pathos, the policymakers create credibility, justify authority, and seek public consent in both national and global contexts. The study points out that technocratic claims of neutrality are often hiding the language's persuasive power especially in the development discourse where evidence, moral authority, and emotional narratives are cleverly mixed together. In Nepal, the development rhetoric has been greatly impacted by political change, post-conflict hopes, and the necessity of gaining trust in new governance structures leading to a heavy dependence on emotionally appealing and symbolically rich stories. On the other hand, global institutions always appear to favor the use of technical logos and the institutional ethos, which exposes different rhetorical balances conditioned by history, politics, and institutions.

As a result, the journey to develop a more fruitful and just policy is not through rhetoric-less but through the ethical and transparent practice of rhetoric. The discourse around the policies and their implementation should be reflective in the case of the policymakers and the development practitioners. These professionals need to be aware of their rhetorical tools and how that language can also be a reality and give power a legitimate approach. This implies a conscious move from the use of rhetoric only as a persuasive means to the adoption of rhetoric as a communication channel for truly democratic discussion.

The future should be focused on the development of supportive narratives together with the local people, open discussions about the uncertainties and the different values, and the provision of strong leadership, and the engagement of the emotionally respectful discourse plus the robust evidence integration. The rhetorical aspects of the policy can be clarified, and citizens could then be empowered to be more critical in their engagement, to demand accountability from the

institutions, and finally to support the development agendas that not only are effectively communicated but also really inclusive, fair, and sustainable which is the case.

References

Aristotle. (2007). On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse (G. A. Kennedy, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

Arrianie, L. (2023). Government political rhetoric and communication in the practice of government implementation. Journal of Law Politic and Humanities, 3(3), 319–329. https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v3i2.

Asen, R. (2010). Reflections on the role of rhetoric in public policy. Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 13(1), 121–143. https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.0.0142.

Billig, M. (1995). Banal nationalism. London, England: Sage Publication.

Castells, M. (2011). Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the internet age. Polity Press.

Charlton, B. (2002). The Audit Society: Rituals of verification by M. Power [Review of the book]. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 4(3), 249–253. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2753.1998.00009.x

Cornwall, A., & Brock, K. (2005). What do buzzwords do for development policy? Third World Quarterly, 26(7), 1043–1060. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590500235603.

Dryzek, J. S. (2000). Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations. Oxford University Press.

Dunn, W. N. (2018). Public policy analysis (6th ed.). Routledge.

Easton, D. (1975). A Re-Assessment of the Concept of Political Support. British Journal of Political Science, 5(4), 435–457. http://www.jstor.org/stable/193437.

Escobar, A. (1995). Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World. Princeton University Press.

Fischer, F. (2003). Reframing public policy: Discursive politics and deliberative practices. Oxford University Press.

Furedi, F. (2018). How fear works: Culture of fear in the twenty-first century. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Habermas, J. (1984). The Theory of Communicative Action. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hajer, M. A. (1997). The politics of environmental discourse: Ecological modernization and the policy process. Clarendon Press.

Keohane, R. O. (2001). Governance in a partially globalized world. American Political Science Review, 95(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055401000016.

Kumar, D. (2019). Politics in federal Nepal. In D. Thapa (Ed.), The politics of change: Reflections on contemporary Nepal (pp. 1–29). Himal Books for Social Science Baha and The Asia Foundation.

Lawoti, M. (2008). Exclusionary democratization in Nepal, 1990–2002. Democratization, 15(2), 363–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510340701846434.

Majone, G. (1989). Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process. https://www.amazon.com/Evidence-Argument-Persuasion-Policy-Process/dp/0300052596.

Marcus, G. (2013). Political psychology: Neuroscience, genetics, and politics. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195370645.001.0001.

Merry, S. E. (2011). Measuring the world: Indicators, human rights, and global governance: With CA comment [Review of the book measuring the world: Indicators, human rights, and global governance, by J. M. Conley]. Current Anthropology, 52(S3), S83–S95. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/657241

National Reconstruction Authority, Government of Nepal. (2016). Nepal earthquake 2015: Post disaster recovery framework, 2016–2020. https://www.nra.gov.np.

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.

Rothstein, B. (2011). The quality of government: Corruption, social trust, and inequality in international perspective. University of Chicago Press.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference (2nd ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company.

Stone, D. A. (2002). Policy paradox: The art of political decision making (Rev. ed.). W. W. Norton & Company.

Terjesen, S. (2004). A. Sen's Development as freedom [Review of the book Development as Freedom, by A. Sen]. Graduate Journal of Social Science, 1(2), 344–347.

Von Einsiedel, S., Malone, D. M., & Pradhan, S. (Eds.). (2012). Nepal in transition: From people's war to fragile peace. Cambridge University Press.

World Bank. (2021). Federalism and public expenditure for human development in Nepal: An emerging agenda. The World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org.

World Health Organization. (2021). COVID-19 strategic preparedness and response plan: Operational planning guideline, 1 February 2021 to 31 January 2022, https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-strategic-preparedness-and-response-plan-operational-planning-guideline.