

Tribhuvan University

Representation of Feudalism in Man Bahadur Mukhiya's *Ani Deurali Runchha*

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

By

Sarita Lama

Roll No.: 09

T.U. Regd. No.: 6-2-38-219-2010

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

January 2020

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Approval Letter

This thesis entitled “Representation of Feudalism in Man Bahadur Mukhiya’s *Ani Deurali Runchha*” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Sarita Lama has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I would love to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Mahesh Paudyal, Lecturer, Central Department of English, TU, Kritipur, for his insightful guidance in my paper. My sincere thanks go to Professor Annirudra Thapa, Head of Central Department of English, TU for his academic inspiration. Without teachers, friends, colleagues and my family this paper may not assure indeed I am again thankful to them too.

I am grateful to Sarbagya Kafle, Lecturer, Central Department of English, TU, Kritipur, for his idea to carry out research on drama. Without his encouragement this paper wouldn't have been possible. I am indebted to Sabin Katel one of the professional actors of Shilpee Theatre who helped me to reach to Chandra Prasad Pandey Head of Publication of the institution henceforth provided me with script of the play and all the equipments needed to accomplish the paper.

Last but not the least, I would like to remember my mom thank her for warm love, care and inspiration in carrying out my academy.

January 2020

Sarita Lama

Representation of Feudalism in Man Bahadur Mukhiya's *Ani Deurali Runchha*

Abstract

This thesis studies Man Bahadur Mukhiya's Ani Deurali Runchha through the socio-economic perspective. It digs out the major causes of feudalism in 70's of Nepal. Comparison study of feudalism of Nepalese feudalism has been done with insights of American Feudalism, The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe, Feudalism in Russia, Modern Feudalism written by Ruggeriero Ramano and Stainley T. Stein,, Elizabeth A.R. Brown, George Vernadsky, James F.Hudson respectively. This work explores the forms of feudalism in different parts of the world in different span of time. One of the mentioned studies (American Feudalism by Ruggeriero Romano and Stainley T.Stein) argues that the economy of eighteenth century was "a natural economy" associated with feudalism. Where natural economy refers to the differences established after the discrimination established in labor market. The idea of caste, sex, poverty, political position are the major issues raised in Ani Deurali Runchha. Henceforth, paper asserts origination of feudalism might have different reasons behind throughout the world. However the main root is imbalance in socio-economy. Thus, play clears out the intrigue of people by tracing the social, political, psychological and economical aspects of the then society of Nepal.

Key Words: feudal system, feudal lord, peasants, haves and haves not, land, servitude, economy, exploitation, disorder in system.

Introduction

The research tries to explore the exploitation, social- discrimination, caste-discrimination, foreign employment and socio-economic relationship through the help of the portray characters in the play. Ranadwaj Khadka is one of the innocent villagers, belongs to 'haves not' group and also due to his low-economic status is stressed for his youngest daughter Maiya's marriage. He comes to 'haves' Chudanath and Chaturman the lords. They are so cunning and villainous in addition indulge him and lend loan in high interest. Khadka, the old man takes debt of six hundred in thirty-five percent of interest. Therefore, labor system of America which is claimed as feudalism in eighteenth century by Romano. Feudalism as arbitrary and constructive notion in *The Tyranny of a Construct Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe* by Elizabeth A. R. Brown. Political-power again as feudalism in Russia by George Vernadsky and lastly monopoly as modern feudalism recognized as feudalism by James F. Hudson are used as theoretical tools or parameters to analyze the text. Coming back to the play also aim to present 70's of Nepal as the representation of feudal system by differentiating 'haves' and 'haves not', lord and labor, upper-caste and lower, political authority and slaves and finally rich and poor through *Ani Deurali Runchha*.

Mukhiya (b.1947) son of Krishna Bahadur Mukhiya and Chandra Maya Mukhiya born in Dolakha, mountain district of Nepal. Later, he went to Darjeeling. His important writings are *Adhyaroma Bachneharu (1971)*, *Ani Deurali Runchha (1974)*, *Crossma Tanggiyako Jingadi (1976)* and *Feri Itihas Dorinchha (1975)*. Previously, he was the vice principal of Padmakanya Multiple Campus, Bagbazar, Kathmandu. Now he has retired, and he stays at Gaurighat. He is appreciated as one of the fine playwrights of Nepal; highly skilled in the depiction of social reality

through his words.

Setting of the play is in Dolakha. Play begins with the conversation of Birkhe, Ambar and Khullal. Khullal admits that he has nothing to eat at home. Both Birkhe and Khullal are poor porters. They work so hard for their survival. Whereas Ambar is self-conscious youth and nephew of lord Chaturman Karki. That's why he is also addressed as Ambar-Kaji by other villagers. Moreover, he is also the Mit-Bhai of Bahadure Khatri with whom Ranadwaj's youngest daughter Maiya is getting marry.

Conversation of three characters slowly turns into intense chapter. Since, Khullal and Birkhe explain the lifestyle of city Darjeeling and Nepal (Kathmandu as we call today). They are fascinated seeing the luxury of city-dwellers. They add more for employment, for better life after selling whole property and to give golden future to their children they love to migrate city. But the reality is Khullal's land is captured by lords. His whole earnings are paid to them. He also informs to Ambar Kaji not only his but the lord Chudanath Pandey has come across success of capturing other villagers' lands. He accomplishes the task by force, conspiracy and strong record of contract paper.

Since another lord Chaturman Karki is uncle of Ambar Kaji, Birkhe alerts to speak more of him. In contrast, Ambar does not deny the fact that he is cruel and corrupted man and also runs after his property since he has no parents except him. He keeps his hundred percent efforts for bereave of his assets. Ambar advocates more the unity of villagers going against them can change the scenario but nobody pose the guts.

Juna is the eldest daughter of Ranadwaj. Everyone in the village knows the love affair between her and Ambar, including himself. In fact, Khadka made the decision to let couple marry be after the youngest Maiya's marry. To him the couple

is pure, strong and made for each other. This assurance leads Ranadwaj to borrow loan from lords. Cunning masters signed him with debt of six hundred rupees with thirty-five percent of interest which must be paid after the next day to Bhaitika. Otherwise, his home and land has to be given to lords since he has not paid his previous debt too. He agrees the agreement. Because he is vowed by Ambar that he will surely help him in paying debt.

In the date of marriage between Maiya and Bahadure, Chaturman makes conspiracy to replace Juna in Maiya's. He helps Maiya to elope with her lover Shumsher. Nobody could have any clues.

In the day of Bhaitika Ambar arrives to Mit-Bhai Bahadure's home for Bhaitika by his Mit- Bahini Babari's hand. He also comes back from his maternal uncle's home carrying the dream to get marry to Juna and helping out Ranadwaj for clearing the debt. Abruptly, he sees Juna in Sindur and Pote appearances in Bahadure's home. She screams him to address her as sister-in- law. Ambar gets extremely shock and asks numbers of questions Juna denies to answer any of his asks instead insists him to accept her as wife of Bahadure. She shouts him to get out of her eye too.

Ambar with heavy heart turns his way. Juna immediately faints. Deusi team of Chatuman reach there. All of them come to know that Juna is pregnant of four months baby whereas Bahadure shouts at Chaturman that it has only been one and half months of their marry. In this regard, he becomes highly excited to make inform of Juna and Ambar ongoing affair and also encourages him to kill Ambar. He encourages Bahadure to carry out Sirupate Khukuri and kill him in this no law can harm him. Accordingly, Bahadure performs. Ranadwaj empties his life with no lands, home and daughters. Ambar and Juna die of Bahadure. He kills Ambar on the way

and Juna by extreme hit. Whereas lords Chaturman and Chudanath celebrate their cruelty.

As it is already mentioned that paper will concern the idea of feudalism from the different countries like America, Russia, Africa and Nepal itself. Ruggiero Romano and Stanley J. Stein are the modern theorists who have analyzed the theory of feudalism of eighteenth century of America on their text *America Feudalism* where Romano says:

Feudalism is this, that, and the other. I believe, on the contrary, that a feudal economy can much better be defined by what it is not, And it is not; (a) purely (or essentially) monetary economy; (b) an economy with an internal market of any great size; (c) an economy with freedom of entrance to and exit from the labor market, (d) an economy with liberty of access to and withdrawal from the goods market. (123)

His affirmation to feudalism is not basically on the economic factor rather it is the natural system of exchange. It primarily occurs both in goods market and labor market. Hence further, he adds this coexistence of giving and taking either goods or work is compatible from the age of copper.

Another crucial theorist Elizabeth A.R. Brown has to assert that the concept of feudalism is arbitrary. He defends to previous theorists pursuing the setting of feudalism in his writing *The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe*. He keeps his point strong by adding many historians' notions in regard to feudalism basically in Europe. One of them are Richardson and Sayles. He notes, Richardson and Sayles were never fully convinced, despite their initial volleys, that feudalism was in fact no "more than an arbitrary pattern imposed by modern writers upon men long dead and events long past (1067).

Brown supplements another historian Ganshof belief the definition of feudalism as: “the narrow, technical, legal sense of the world” – concentrates on service and maintenance and emphasize the fief, while it excludes entirely the private exercise of public justice and jurisdiction.” (1071) His findings in feudalism at Medieval Europe is moreover an abstraction, constructive and debatable. He argues situation of that particular period should not be generalized by the isms like feudalism and other. To him and other historians Medieval Age was the age of hustle-bustle, state, monarchy, church, power, chaos, and land, military. Thus, Brown draws the attention of his argument as:

The argument advanced to defend using the terms as they have been used in the past are weak, based as they are on vaguely articulated assumptions concerning the concept’s utility as a verbal and intellectual tool, as a teaching device, or as a mode of evaluation- none of which is convincingly established. (1088)

In another study, George Vernadsky states the feature of feudalism in Russia in his text *Feudalism in Russia* it is empirical. Since Russia has immense history of many empires in different eras. Russian has to face feudalism according to the political authority. From about 700B.C. to about 200A.D. Iranian people (the Scythians and Sarmatians) controlled South Russia, The Turks, who came later, continued the control over South Russian. After, Khazar domination had a new powerful commercial empire in the economic history of South Russia. Whereas Eastern Russian society was divided by the power belonged to tribal “kings” or chiefs and to the clan elders and the agricultural population who were in subordinated position.

G. Vernadsky writes the society of Khazar as;

It seems that there was a deep cleavage between upper and the lower classes in

the Khazar state. Wealthy Khazar lords owned slaves and used bonded laborers. On the other hand, there apparently was no far-reaching dismemberment of the political power, and the central government of the Khazars must have enjoyed considerable authority. (308)

Society of Russia additionally was based on the authority provided by the enormous population. Vernadsky also agrees the characteristics of feudalism mentioned by Otto Hintze as military aspects, the economic and social aspect and the establishment of the noble warriors as local rulers and their self-assertions with regard to the supreme state authority. (303) Analytical study of Vernadsky himself finds feudalism into three most essential types: (1) Political feudalism (2) Economic feudalism (3) the feudal nexus. (304 - 305) Lastly, he addresses, Russian feudalism as the society having feudal structure as: (I) The lower feudal group which have following sub-structures of (1) the seignior, (2) his villeins, (3) his vassals and (4) the villeins of the vassals, (II) the mutual relations between feudal groups and lastly (III) is the feudal state. (305)

Finally, theorist James F. Hudson pulls out the feudalism from another dimension in his text *Modern Feudalism*. He argues feudalism is nothing but the extreme consequence of one's selfishness and oppression. (277) He extends the idea more as it is monopoly rule which has huge stimulation to the process of making the rich richer and poor poorer. (289) He clarifies the modern feudalism as:

But our Modern Feudalism is most apparent in the creation of great and irresponsible rulers of industry, whose power, like that of the feudal barons, burdens, the people, and even overshadows the government which gave it existence. The only important distinction is that in the old day of force the power of feudalism was measured by thousands of warriors in the days of modern plutocracy, power is measured by millions of money. (290)

Therefore, Hudson argument on feudalism is one having millions of money can construct the world of anarchy where again he or she bounds the classes, work-cycle, labor, enslave. Thus, the concept of feudalism so-far does arrive in different forms in different span of time in the world.

Ani Deurali Runchha is repeatedly performed play in Nepalese paly history. In 1977, 78 and 80 it was presented in Kathmandu. Birgunj, Biratnagar, Pokhara are other places. Kalebung, Gangtok, Calcutta, Khadakpur are major historical places where play could express the message of pictures seen in 70's of Nepal. Most importantly, again after thirty- four years play was shown in 2074 B.S. in Kathmandu.

Both the writer and critic himself Man Bahadur Mukhiya writes in Saturday 3rd of Asadh 2074 in paper *Koseli*: "Visit by foot with my dad and brother in 1972 gave chances to stair Dolakha. Beautiful Mountain had its own hidden story of suffering and starvation. And that unconscious remained in my mind for long which ultimately helped me to write *Ani Deurali Runchha*." (2) (Ajhai Deurali Runchha?) (My translation) He accomplishes the notion of establishment of play is from real observation. Play is not based on imagery elements but it is realistic play. Because its setting is real, characters are from the social real, incidents are more accepted.

Social researcher, writer and critic Mukhiya adds in the same paper that in thirty-four years, Bagmati has ruined its beauties, engineers have exploited the greenery of valley. And even the generations have changed their thoughts. For them play might be accelerating the fairytale rather. Discarding the new generations' such opinion he implies play consists of rural- culture, music, tradition which actually carries the real Nepalese identity. Projection of play in generation to generation revives Nepalese in reminding their originality. It promotes to empathy of owners and aspire Nepalese spread throughout the world to unification.

His adding idea on behalf of play in *Koseli* again as: “Inclusive culture of feudal lord and innocent people, suppressed group and their compulsion for acceptance of following the rule, their scarcity and definite fates of being economically poor are the major issues raised in the play.” (2) (Ajhai Deurali Runchha?) (My translation) He explains ‘Deurali’ is the denotation of country itself. Everyone loves to stay at Deurali. It is the place to feel calm, exchange love, share ideas, it is the space for beautiful chit-chat. Thus, the area is for meeting, togetherness and the symbol of unity.

Mukhiya explicit the notion that many do not like to go abroad. If they go they worship for betterment to Deurali. But his multiple, spontaneous thoughts raises the question do really Deurali won’t cry? This rhetorical question is not merely for him but for whole Nepalese to think and analyze Nepal’s upcoming society. He carries out the song in play as:

Mero sworma jhupadi ra durbar ko katha

Sunai hidechhu ladai ra pirati ko katha

Saranggima gaudai hidda malai magne vanchhan

Nepalile nepalilai nachine jhai gardachhan. (2) (Ajhai Deurali Runchha?)

In the same hand, another critic Kumar Ale has to say regard to play in Thursday, June 1, 2017 in *Kantipur*. “Play as the social reality, without any distortion explains the disaster of love, home, life, loss of property of the villagers by the selfishness and anarchy of lords.” (4) (Deuralima Tin Dasak) (My translation) He clears the play is of depiction of truth by adding the view of director of the play Jiban Baral: “This play is relevant and long lasting, its issue does not die for years indeed it is immortal and relevant to each time.” (4) (Deuralima Tin Dasak) (My translation)

Ale sinks his view of social reality again in same paper by writing the each

characters, story, pain, sufferings, struggle can be matched to any of audiences either seeing or reading the play. Its story is constructed in the network of real situations. It can be felt or any Nepalese have the experiences owned. It is something like our neighbor, ourselves are carried to the characters to give the voice in large sound. He glorifies the Nepalese society and culture since Mukhiya beautifully presents marriage ceremony Deusi- Bhailo in harmonious way. He adds another feature of Nepalese to secure harmony and celebrate the festival holding each community's hand.

Endly, critic Shuvechha Ghimire in 2017 in *The Kathmandu Post* notes: “*Ani Deurali Runchha* is an exceptionally popular drama by Man Bahadur Mukhiya and tells a story of love, rejection, expectation and life struggle brought about by caste and class differences.” (5) (Dramatization on social strife) she focuses the play as the literary task revolves around two economic classes. It is all about the discriminative practices of Nepali society that occurs between have and have not. She also continues this exploitative practices still existence at a rural village. She illustrates her own example in the same work: “My great- grandfather was from a Mukhiya finally in Baglung and during my childhood. I observed just exploitation against people belonging to the lower economic class. The characteristics are different but the tendency remains the same.” (5)

Feminist Ghimire also figures out the condition of Nepalese women in play through the character Kanchi –she draws a stereotypical woman who is severely limits to household chores. She also notes that within the society back then women put their own gender below the other. Domestic violence done by male and gambling habit is appreciated as male task is injustice. She claims still women's misery exists to our day-to-day live.

She on the same hand admits that play is –‘go to back to nature’. Its topic

itself contains the Deurali means mountain. Inevitable dependency of people to nature is properly analyzed by Ghimire in the play. She adds characters are deprived to Deurali, trees, river, fish, pond, vanjhyang, for their daily activities. She analyzes Deurali contains the life struggle porters, Khullal, Birkhe. Song of Gayine the love of Juna and Ambar and tragedy of their too, Deurali, witnesses.

From the above literary reviews from the critics like: Mukhiya, Ale and Ghimire I have come to the point that they have merely draws the thematic issue that is feudalism and its tendency in the 70's society of Nepal to the relevancy of today by different angles. But the problem on doing that is we doing injustice to the play. It is because we all know the fact that the literature is such tool of the society which can change the pictures. It is definite truth that play articulates the feudal by picking the real characters of society. But telling it Mukhiya escapes from his responsibility to raise the revolutionary thought in that particular time. My concern is with Mukhiya not raising the action to conflict by inclination of character like Ambar. He could have sketches more like Ambar character this is indeed the negligence of Mukhiya on the play.

My departure to other critics is play merely depicts the social truth but do not dare to show the revolutionary side. In such, Mukhiya celebrates his lots of shows of play from India to Nepal. This arouse the question that either he is only concern with the commercial success? It can be analyzed that Mukhiya attempt to draw the picture but not to go against and show the way to conflict means he is afraid to the then government. Because in the same topic there are lots of Nepalese films made like: 'Bandhaki, 'Yuddha, 'Simana' where protagonist conflicts and shows the victory over tyranny rule.

My childhood in Sindhuli during 90's there was the regime of King Shah. My

grandfather was at politically high position named as 'Panchayat'. Though Panchayat system was highly ruled before late king Birendra, the legacy in rural village was still the same. There was large number of population control over him. As far as I remember there used to be lots of poor people around home serving my grandpa, obeying whatever he ordered without any question, lastly they were poor to poorer. They did not get the quality life after serving him too. Today, I realize that was the similar tendency of exploitation.

Departing the Mukhiya's analyze being a normal girl, I went back to my home Sindhuli. Again, I found seventeen years, poor girl as a maid in my home. I slowly encouraged her to have an education. After few months I heard she quit to work in my home and started education. My focal point is we have the slogan 'a pen is more powerful than a sword'. If my few words can take a village innocent maid to a well-educated woman. A literary task with remarkable writer can really makes huge impact.

Again, I disagree the only concept of socio-economy perspective by Ale to the play. Rather play is the projection of political disorder of the then society. There was feudal structure in the society. Authority was layered from king to Mukhiya. Political-position was major thing later economy was captured by that political authority. There was a King, Rana. Political parties, vdc's authorized people to Mukhiya. Thus, play could have socio-politically criticized by Ale along with socio- economic perspective.

Likewise, lords were Chudanath and Chaturman who politically pose the position hierarchy and start to dominant rest. Rest had no option except following them because no education was facilitated. People were struggling, suffering with no voice. Later, by late 80's revolution occurred which brought freedom on speaking, writing, media and on. Since democracy originated education was also facilitated

normal people. Here appears a question *Ani Deurali Runchha* was repeatedly shown from 70's to 80's to till date. Why Mukhiya deny to distort some plots of the drama?

Today's world have come to outspoken. Medias are there, ideas are there, freedom is there. If small thing arouse in a society abruptly crowd are there in the road. Either it is in USA or the developing country like Nepal exploitation is no more suppressed. In this concern, how can Ghimire and Ale term the relevancy as synonyms to play? Play is surely immortal but its message might draw the psyche of people to be submissive or to wait the right time and enjoy the tragedy of the play.

Play unfolds the trap system among the villagers run by lords. As Romano addresses in *American Feudalism* that: "once having entered into the work cycle under a lord, they seldom escaped. The system that created their dependence was simple: indebtness." (126) his thought of confined system is found similar to Sante and Ranadwaj. It is because they are once entered to the cycle of debt, work, suppression, exploitation of a lord cannot come out of it.

In the text, Sante is one of the poor villagers who comes to lord for financial hel His wife is ill and for both treatment and for foodstuffs he comes to lord. He also shares his misery to Ranadwaj that his gold and silver is already captured by lord Chudanath. (14) Romano's concept of dependence is more clearly observe in the dialogue of lord Chudanath screaming to Sante on his asking money: "I cannot lend you more. You have not given your earlier debt yet also have fifteen hundred of credit including both principal and interest. You have left to give maize, first pay them back." (18) Therefore, this is nothing but the system of creating dependence by creating illusion in innocent and finally looting them and turning them to enslave.

Ranadwaj too matches the scenario of dependence as Romano argues. He is also in trap of indebt. Lord Chudanath says: "You have altogether three thousands

debt including your previous principal and interest.” (20) he is enforced to go and spray hand in front of lord cause of poverty. In feudal society innocents are hegemonies in such way that they devalue self. This tendency of low- self-esteem pulls Ranadwaj to lord and starts to say: “If I cannot pay your all debts then my all property including home, cattle are yours. You can lock my door.” (20) this is simply the process where innocent first oblige to get debt for any acquire of foodstuff, cloth, alcohol from lord and later lock them in their jaws.

Paper analyzes way of exploitation. One of the point able marks is the recording system. Villagers like: Ranadwaj, Sante, Khullal, Birkhe are in jaws of lords Chudanath and Chaturman due to their agreement records. This eventually is not only the record of the contract but the system of adding slaves. This is what Romano has to also say on *American Feudalism*: “double-entry bookkeeping which recorded nothing more than slaves”. (126) similarly, in text the lords are frequently recalling the previous and present agreements by the process of creating slave by the help of agreement.

Additionally, research also analyzes the value system. As Romano has opinion on “value” as: “the building, the plants, the irrigation works, the tools and especially the mass of workers who are tied to it.”(131) we can find similar “value” in the text where value means the land, domestic animals like goats, cows, buffaloes, the fields work, and the villagers themselves because they are the labor who can make lord rich to richer. Sante says his home is captured by lord. (5) He also says that his gold and silver has also been to Chudanath’s home. (14) Chudanath adds more that value is in money, maize by explaining Sante has not yet paid back his previous debt of maize and money. (18) Ranadwaj also valorizes his cattle: cows, buffaloes and property like: home and lands to lord in his vow incompleteness. Thus, paper presents what was

“value” in 70’s of Nepal.

We can also find the sovereign of lords by involving themselves in political and economic understanding. Elizabeth A.R. Brown further adds “feudalism (ce qu’on appelle laje’odalito) should be understood to have two aspects, the political-involving the dissolution of a coherent network of dependencies embracing all lands and through them their holders.” (1073) in the text, Ambar proves the political understanding of Chaturman through his dialogue stating: “last year government had provided the budget of five thousands for bridge construction at Tamakoshi but cunning Chaturman uncle kept tree’s load instead of it.” (6) This approves the statement of Brown coming true. Feudalism cannot be expected without the political and economic knowledge.

Lord Chudanath and Chaturman are local rulers. They have self-assertion with state authority Vernadsky addresses the notion of such local rulers with regard to supreme state authority as the structure of feudalism in *Feudalism in Russia*. (303) the fact to villagers going and highly bowing two characters and obeying their order thinking them as god, protector, giver makes them (lords Chudanath and Chaturman) automatically powerful. (17) Since, inevitably they get high authority due to tied mass population under them. Therefore, this is the hegemony system where mass is psychologically captured. Thus, feudalism is also the matter of psychology between powerful and powerless bodies.

We all know that primarily, feudalism basis in agriculture, land and peasants. The first remark stuck in our head is agricultural setting, landscape of peasants having low wages, exploitation to them and more. Therefore, text relies on village and agricultural setting along with mass of farmers. The concept is inclined by Vernadsky more:

“It still might be recognized that the basis of a primary feudal society is dependent, chiefly upon agriculture, the methods of control and use of the land result in the formation of two main social groups: a landed aristocracy and peasants.” (305) First narration clears the setting of the play as it is the story of rural-labors. Play is the cry of their struggling life of lots of ploughmen, it starts with assertion of pain of peasants and eventually ends with findings of their cry. It is because of landed aristocrats. (75) Thus, paper notes the superimposition of aristocrats over the village community.

Layered system is another great reason for exploitation in feudal society. Vernadsky has to state there is hierarchy from upmost to low. This series is adding factor for manipulating low-level to run under high. He addresses: “on the other, the interrelations among the elementary feudal units in the establishment of a network of feudal units connected among themselves more or less tightly.” (305) in the text too, all the villagers and lords have interdependence and interrelations as he says. Actually each are interconnected are the network of feudal units.

This is because of feudal society that is layered society we can bear in mind that society has to face different ruling forces. Vernadsky pays our attention on his *Feudalism in Russia* that there was already the main administration and law for social political changes in the society, having that druzhina erupted as the ruling class especially they were landowning aristocrats of Medieval Russia. (309) similarly, it is the case in the text, there is already the governmental offices, administration and laws neighboring population on behalf of lords. Ambar clarifies the statements more: “I request all of you to sue the scenario of village and go against of Jimuwal. We cannot accept the Jimuwal system anymore.” (6) Jimuwal relates the druzhina as in Russia by Medieval of I t. Jimuwal is lord Chudanath himself who owns lands and is

landowning aristocrat. Hence, research points out that despite having offices, laws, administration, Jimuwal, the ruling class was politically authorized it is possible due to feudalism that is structure system itself.

In the structure based society it is fact that more than the head their personal assistants are inactive. Similar, trend is emerge of boyars which Vernadsky has to say. He adds more of boyar as:

The boyar aristocracy assumed greater importance. But oven there with one known exception as referred to above, the boyars were excluded from enjoying princely power. At that period a boyar could become an influential agent of the princely administration, but he was not a ruler by himself. He was an assistant to the prince, but not his vassal in a political sense. There was no formal reciprocal contract which would bind a prince and a boyar. The boyar was free to shift from one prince to another. (310)

Likewise, though whole villagers are under of Chaturman but he is not the Jimuwal himself in fact he is as boyar as mentioned by Vernadsky. He is an agent and personal assistant of lord Chudanath who conspire whole treaty. He is the one according to whom Chudanath runs. He actually is the mediator and keeps the whole records safely. (6) Therefore, paper observes in feudalism of Nepal the landowning is done by the conspirators, Jimuwal and his personal assistant.

It is the loan which makes a man to a slave. George Vernardsky says:

The man receiving a loan had to work for his creditor until the loan was paid back. According, to the new type of agreement, his work covered only the interest on the loan and not the principal. It is obvious that under such arrangements the debtor had to work for life and never was able to repay the principal unless he received a new loan from another creditor. This was known

as Kabala slavedom which developed in Eastern Russia under the apparent influence of Uiglar law. (318)

Like the Uigar law, Jimuwal Chudanath and his personal assistant Chaturman created the rule of providing a loan. They are purchased by high interest. Villagers like: Sante, Khullal, Ranadwaj are not able to return principal due to heavy interest and finally has to work for life. This chain of principal and interest inevitably created them as slave lastly. Thus, paper points the Vernadsky's identifying of loan as the main root cause for debtor turning to slave for creditor.

Failure of the then Shah regime made the success of feudalism in Nepal's socio-political history. The political authority rule over another population. Likewise Vernadsky has to address the votchina regime in Russia as:

The votchina regime is characterized by the growth of the manorial power of the lord of the estate over the laboring population working on the estate or market settled around it. Such power could be enforced by immunity privileges. The votchina estate may be owned by a political ruler (prince) or by private persons, or else by the church. (322)

Jimuwal, lord Chudanath is no in high governmental power but emerged as political ruler and the private persons. Such political superimposition made feudal society to exploit society. Because fragmentation brought the 'divide and rule' system throughout Nepal.

Money has ultimately devalue the humanitarian worth. People are actually bought and sold by money. As James F. Hudson argues modern feudalism is moreover concentrated to millions of money. Texts refines the same statements by lending six hundred rupees in thirty five interest by lord Chudanath to Ranadwaj. Due to this money Ranadwaj is bought by lord. This is the same process to remaining

villagers for buying them in money value. Therefore, today's feudalism is determined by as feudalism but real it is to manipulate larger scale of population.

Similarly, African theorist who explains feudalism in two trends is Jack Goody. He extracts the concepts of feudalism in his text *Feudalism in Africa?* as, 'there are two main trends, one relating to political structure, the other to economic conditions.' (3) Deeply study of African feudalism has been done by the comparative study with landowning and their fiefs whereas Medieval English feudalism concentrated with military fiefs. He has come to the point of African feudalism as the feudal society moreover concentrated with both political influences and economic. *Ani Deurali Runccha* play itself is also fully the representation of both political aspect and economic of 70's of Nepal, which ultimately answer the what feudalism exactly was.

Feudalism is the division system. It proceeds the system of divide and rule.

Goody explains:

Changes in the division of labor were accompanied by different forms of property ('the stage reached in the division of labor... determines the relations of individuals to one another with respect to the materials, instruments and product of labor) the first form is tribal property the second the communal and State property of antiquity: the third form is feudal or estates property. (4)

Similar trend is seen in the socio-play *Ani Deurali Runccha*. Where division of labor is divided from the low level to high. Gayine is one of the lowest division in the village who sings the songs for upper-caste society. He serves by singing. (14-16) Female characters like: Juna, Kanchhi, Pamfa, Maya serve to male characters in their household chores. Their daily works are for advantage of their either father or husband. (8-10) Pamfa explicit the female's life more as: "After the marry female's

life is like an imprisoned parrot's life." (10) Other villagers like Sante, Khullal, Ranadwaj, though belong to upper-caste again due to lack of political and economic power they serve to lords Chudanath and Chaturman. Thus, Chudanath and Chaturman are no less than state in the play. Therefore, clear division of labor is another big source to create fraction community in feudal society.

Comparison study of feudalism in Africa and Nepal comes to the dissimilarity. Goody extends: "among the Ganda and Soga on the other hand, society was divided into land lords and peasants, the former being subordinate territorial chiefs chosen by the king, who had control of unoccupied land." (6-7) this is not the scenario in any remote or city area of 70's of Nepal. Jimuwal were not chosen by King in context of Nepal. Rather they were self-owned and shown some sort of power counterpart population followed them. Similar trend is the reflection in play. Because lords Chudanath and Chaturman were self-made no government had authorized them to the high position. Indeed it was their own created politics to loot the mass population. One of the examples is Chaturman exaggerates lord Chudanath on his dialogue: "Should not you bow your head to lord's toe? Hey, Bhujel be alert keep your load down and show huge respect to lord." (17) Therefore, lord in regard of Nepal is self-created.

J. Goody explains more that reason on numerous divisions of labor and origination of feudalism is by economic approach. It is because of economy which unfolds the feudal institution in Africa:

The discussion which I have outlined in this rather summary way has a direct bearing not only on the question raised in the title to this paper but also to some wider problems that face historians and other students of African societies. But to these points I will return after briefly considering what I have

called, for want of a better label, the economic approach to feudalism; that is, the approach which defines feudal institutions primarily with reference to economic features in particular the mode of land holding. (9)

Therefore, text's major element which directly can be observed is its economic aspect. Villagers first indulge in loan and in return of it no debt is cleared eventually, their land holding by lords is absolutely the aspect of economy. Hence, Goody's concept of feudalism from economic point of view in Africa especially the culture of land holding matches the feudalism explaining in the play. Thus paper telescope the paly by valorizing land as major source of economy in the then society.

As already mentioned that feudal system contains layered system. Goody again affirms the situation of pre-colonial Africa as:

And lastly, it should be borne in mind that in pre-colonial conditions in Africa land was sometimes of little economic importance; for relatively low population densities (as compared, say, with Europe and Asia) meant that, in many regions, land was not a very secure resource and hence its tenure could hardly provide the basis of differentiation for the 'class' system. (10)

Similar trend can be bear in mind of Nepalese economic-history. Before late king Mahendra land was not preciously given high priority. Later trend was set to the land as high mark for economic aspect. Mukhiya also accepts this fact and asserts lords Chudanath and Chaturman like characters in the play precisely focus on villagers' land as the biggest property. Therefore, the numbers of heads arouse the numbers of economic 'class'.

Goody, on the way extends the term feudalism in context of Africa as: "Terms of the concept of 'feudalism' implies neither a rejection of comparative work that includes European society, nor yet the contribution the European medieval can make

to the study of African institutions.” (11) Means every countries have their own feudalism history and hence, Africa too does. Likewise, by matching the view of Goody, Nepalese feudalism also differs from other feudal society like: Africa, Europe, USA, and Russia. Nepalese never had to face military rule as Europe did. In Nepalese feudalism no lands were rented by mass population actually, they were overruled by political authorities and by different cunning treaties either it is by strong agreement or by deceiving their lands were seized. Similar illustration is the play *Ani Deurali Runchha*. Play confronts the answer of how and what the feudalism of Nepal belong to.

In the same way, another English critics J.C. Holt states on his text *Feudalism Revisited* as: ‘English Feudalism is empirical; the society it presents is a direct product of the evidence; it is direct product of the evidence; it is intentionally a product, limited view’ (339). Holt defends the concept of A.R. Brown here as he argues English Feudalism as arbitrary, Henceforth, by following the Holt argument as feudalism as empirical. We can tally the situation of Sante from the text as:

Sante: (Slowly keeping the plow) I did not go uncle. I waited for three days but no fish I got ultimately I cannot get anything in that hardshi In long process fish is trapped but they have to be divided to lords Chudanath and Chaturman. The actual thing is I have to work hard but cannot get anything in return. (13) (My translation)

This is nothing but the show-off of power. Where peasants work hard and do not get anything in return. They are compelled to work and serve and live under policy created by Jimuwal. It means exploitation is aroused by the empirical insight. Those having power intentionally make them benefited from the mass of people. Therefore, feudalism in the play is observed by contrasting powerful and powerless and it is

definitely the empirical by nature.

Coming back to Nepalese feudalism history, theorist Prakash Narayan states in his text *Feudal Development as Gleaned Through Inscriptions in Early Medieval Nepal (C.A.D 400- 1200)* that the concepts of feudalism first as debatable term. But later by observation of social environment it came to different conclusion. One of the conclusions he explains as: “In this system the landlords extract surplus through social, religious or political method, which are called extra-economic.” (209) similarly, in the text too, Jimuwal Chudanath has his own land, property and is a shopkeeper by profession but seeks for extra-economy by bereaving villagers property. Birkhe justifies lord Chudanath already has his business as: “Chudanath has his own sho He stays whole day there.” (6) Further Ambar too adds his uncle Chaturman has enough property but runs after his property. (6) Therefore, this sort of earning extra-economy became one of the reasons for the inclination of feudalism in 70’s of Nepal.

Modern society of Nepal has come across no feudal society passing through many movements. One of the movements is communist movement which digs out the faction of Nepalese society. Movement has confess the development of factionalism has emerged from the socio- psychological factor. In this regard, critics, writer Naryan Khadka states in *Factionalism in the Communist Movement in Nepal* as:

The Nepali society is complex and based on hierarchy determined by caste, economic status, education etc. The Communist leadership is mostly provided by two castes, the Brahmin (the priest group) and the Newars (the traders). Communists in principle do not believe in religious or sectarian creeds; however, certain caste groups have always been exploited by the upper caste group. (73)

If we go through the play we can analyze that Khadka's finding of certain caste-group exploited lower caste group. Since, Chudanath is from Brahmin group and Chaturman from Chhetri. Those two upper-caste have been exploited lower-caste Gayine more than other caste community. (17) Therefore, paper finds the concept of master is from 'high class ethnic group' and 'backward communities are workers' which is proven by the play itself.

Though Mukhiya has left to create revolutionary action in the play Khadka marks the action against extreme exploitation from eastern of Nepal. He states, "Jhapa Movement" which followed the strategy of organizing peasants and killing local landlords. However, the movements was ruthlessly suppressed by the government and several of its leaders were arrested" (61).

Since, Ambar in the play confines that his uncle had put loads instead of bridge. We can assume that government was indirectly in support of Jimuwal. They were so powerful that they would distort the rule in their territory and buy the governmental offices by money. That is why it might be the assumption that play oppose to project the unity of peasants to go against of their loads. Thus, paper shows the domination of lords to peasants which is in favor of governmental offices.

Baburam Bhattarai the ex-prime minister of Nepal states the workers and economic policy in '*Baburam Bhattarai: For a 'New Nepal'*' post, "Our unions are the strongest in Nepal, we came into this [peace] process two years ago. In almost all the factories and workplaces, we have organized the workers, and our trade union is the strongest in the country" (12).

Mukhiya's play is from 70's of Nepal. Inevitably he lacked from creating the union force in play. But coming to the modern era of Nepal regard to such villagers' like characters have been protected from exploitation. Thus, contrasting the scene of

socio-based play *Ani Deurali Runchha* in 70's of Nepal and the policy created by communist leader B. Bhattarai for workers paper illustrate the socio-economic history.

Further, B. Bhattarai asserts the society of Nepal from the past to till is agro-based:

Mostly ours is a peasant-based economy because two-thirds of the workforce is engaged in agriculture. So in that sense our most important sector is the agro-nomic sector. And most of them are poor peasants. You see the patterns of land holding. It is called owner-peasant. Those who own less than 0.5 hectare of land, around 70 percent of the peasants own less than 1 hectare, and 50 percent own less than 0.5 hectare. So there is a very small land ownershi The totally landless peasants are about 10-15 percent of the total. We are trying to organize the peasants into peasant associations, and within the peasant associations we try to organize the poor peasants and landless peasants separately. Also, there have been some movements, the seizing of land from the feudal landlords and the redistribution among the peasants. That has happened. (13)

On this mark, play has division of peasants as Bhattarai states on classification of peasants. Since whole the play is the typical story of village setting with agro-based survival. Peasants of land holding are fewer than landless peasants. But astonishing fact if minority is ruling the major peasants. Jimuwal Chudanath and Chaturman definitely hold the excessive lands by seizing other peasants' lands. Thus, land holding process is none another than the system feudalism itself. The ism became so strong media in the play to grab the land to the property of Jimuwal. Ranadwaj is one of the seized peasants for lords Chudanath and Chaturman. (78) Hence, paper joins

the notion of Bhattarai in context of Nepal as one of the countries highly based in agricultural-economy and this is the major fact for fragmentation of society either.

As the conclude notion, paper argues feudalism is not merely the subject of economy, but it is the comprehension of socio- psychological, socio- political, socio-economic, socio-historical. It provides the answer why Chudanath has the power over villagers? It is because of socio-political structure of the then Nepal. Where system of self- owning position over masses was easily accepted. It also provides the answer for why there is 'haves' and 'haves not' grou It is because power- holder would automatically get superimposition to villagers. Whereas villagers would easily feel low-self-esteem. This is more to psychological fact.

Furthermore, not only by mentioned ideas, paper also drags money, lands, homes, cattle, gold, silver and the workers for fields themselves from the text, as economy, slave, subordinate, the elements for showing power value in 70's of Nepal. Due to lord Chudanath and his personal assistant Chaturman's selfishness and conspiracy over looting those values Juna and Ambar like innocents have to pay their life to death. We already have the notion that play is the media to represent some the real characters form society. But the analytical point is there might be hundreds of pair like them, peasants like Ranadwaj and porter like: Sante, Khullal and Birkhe, villagers like: Bhujel and Gayine who have lost their life, property, family in feudal-struggle. Thus, paper alerts feudal society is one of the serious concerns not only Nepalese geography but in whole human civilization.

Works Cited

- A.R. Brown, Elizabeth. *The Tyranny of a Construct Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe*. Oxford University Press on behalf of the American Historical Association, 2019.
- Ale, Kumar. “Deuralima Tin Dasak” *Kantipur*, 1 June, 2017.
- Des Chene, Mary and Mikesell, Stephen. *Baburam Bhattarai: For a ‘New Nepal’*. Economic and Political Weekly, 2019.
- F. Hudson, James. *Modern Feudalism*. University of Northern Iowa, 2019.
- Ghimire, Suvechha. “Dramatization in social strife” *The Kathmandu Post*, 2017.
- Goody, Jack. *Feudalism in Africa?* Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Holt, J.C. *Feudalism in Revisited*. Wiley on behalf of the Economic History Society, 2019.
- Khadka, Narayan. *Factionalism in the Communist, Movement in Nepal*. Pacific Affairs, University of British Columbia, 2019.
- Mukhiya, Man Bahadur. *Ani Deurali Runchha*, Shilpee Theatre, 2017.
- Mukhiya, Man Bahadur. “Ajhai Deurali Runchha?” *Koseli*, 17 June 2017.
- Narayan, Prakash. *Feudal Developments As Gleaned Through Inscriptions in Early Medieval Nepal (C.A.D. 400- 1200)*. Indian History Congress, 2019.
- Romano, Ruggiero and J. Stein, Stanley. *American Feudalism*. Duke University Press, 2019.

Vernadsky, George. *Feudalism in Russia*. The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Medieval Academy of America, 2019.

