

Tribhuvan University

Cultural Hegemony and Displacement in *Buhran*

A Thesis Submitted to Central Department of English
In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English

By

Tej Prasad Pokhrel

Roll No.: 43

Symbol No.: ENGL28-19-22-00086

Registration No.: 6-1-320-126-2008

Central Department of English,

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

November 2023

Central Department of English,

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

November 2023

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Tej Prasad Pokhrel has completed his thesis entitled "Ambivalence of Cultural Hegemony and Displacement in *Buhran*" under my supervision. He carried out his research from July 2023 to October 2023. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva.

.....

Dr. Shiva Raj Panta

Supervisor

Date: _____

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social
Sciences Central

Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu
Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Ambivalence of Cultural Hegemony and Displacement in *Buhran*” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Tej Prasad Pokhrel 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

The first credit of this thesis goes to Dr. Shiva Raj Pant, who guided me well to complete it. During thesis writing period, he provided me his precious suggestions and corrected my mistakes for creating a well-structured thesis. I am grateful to him that his undaunted motivation cleared my hesitations and confusions. I was not sure about how to create a coherent idea. His guidance played a crucial role to pave a path for this thesis.

In the same way Professor Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma's ideas about how to write a thesis helped me to frame this thesis. I am grateful to him as well. Similarly, Mr. Dinesh Bhandari provided me sample materials to understand thesis structure. His incalculable dedication made me think about thesis in early. I appreciate his support. I am also grateful to the team of proposal defense that include Assistant Professors Dr. Shiva Raj Pant, and Mr. Badri Acharya. Further, I extend my gratitude to Head of English Department, Professor Dr. Jiblal Sapkota. He supported me to manage my thesis and prepare for viva.

Whole faculty members of TU Central Department of English supported me in a direct or indirect way. My gratitude goes to them. It is my pleasure to mention my family members, friends, especially Anil Paudel who provided me some academic materials, and my relatives whose support, love and sincerity activated me all the time for the completion of this thesis.

November 2023

Tej Prasad pokhrel

Cultural Hegemony and Displacement in *Buhran*

Abstract

This research work tries to explore ambivalence of cultural hegemony faced by the Tharus in the movie Buhran. It tries to dig out Tharus' buried history. Hilly regions' people overflowed as malaria had been eradicated. The Land Reform Act (2021 BS) introduced new law limiting twenty eight Bighas land for per family in the Terai. This act was for landless people however, power holder Parvatiyas influenced it and enhanced their intention. Panchayat Regime made Parvatiya language official language and sponsored Parvatiya culture. This movie revolves around these incidents. How was Tharu culture monitored by Parvatiya culture? What was the cause of their economic deprivation and displacement from Dang? are the key research questions. The protagonist of the movie, Matwa, accepts Patwari's cultural supremacy and his capitalist ideology. He assumes Patwari a financial supporter, scholar and a leader though his family members deny this. Finally, he realizes the domination but cannot sort out its exact cause. This is a qualitative research. It borrows ideas from Stuart Hall, Karl Marx, Louise Althusser, Antonio Gramsci, and EP Thompson to address the issue of the representation of Tharu culture and conflict, domination, hegemony, and subjugation of their history respectively. Besides, James Monaco's film framework helps to analyze the historical representation of Tharu culture in visual form. Findings of this thesis are: Parvatiya culture dominated native Tharu culture, effaced their identity, limited their economic approach and constructing bourgeoisie knowledge, made them accept it as their fate resulting into their exigency for displacement.

Keywords: Culture, Hegemony, Ideology, Tharu, Domination, Displacement

This research work analyses the circumstances in the *Buhran* movie in order to explore displacement faced by ‘Tharu’ (an aboriginal community living in the Western part of Nepal) people during the phase of malaria eradication and land reform act promulgation in the early 1960s and critiques the domination maintained through cultural hegemony by Parvatiya (People living in the hilly region specially North-West part of Nepal) people. Further, it examines and establishes connection between acceptance and resistance. This movie digs out the buried history of Tharu people during Panchayat (a unitary political system introduced by King Mahendra from 1960 in Nepal) system in Nepal. After the end of 104 years Rana Regime, Nepal experienced democracy. However, it couldn’t sustain for long. Panchayat system supported ‘KhasBhasa’ and ‘Khas’ culture. Political preferences and national culture, supportive to Parvatiya, made the Parvatiyas powerful and left Tharus people powerless. Parvatiya’s culture became dominant because of Hinduism. Narayan Khadka contends that King Mahendra introduced Panchayat system to eradicate centuries-old poverty (696). Land Reform Act (2021 BS) was introduced to support landless people. At the time malaria eradication program was enhanced. Further he doubts that it was the period of rapid transformation in legislation to land tenure and revenue collection. Malaria eradication program didn't happen in favor of Tharus rather they became landless that they passed land to immigrants from hill of Nepal (759). Panchayat ideology became one of the stagnating factors for Tharus’ economic growth.

Literature has its own historicity and occasion of its production. The exigence of this movie is after the influx of immigrants from Hill. Immigration brought new culture and this new culture brought by Parvatiyas started to rule there. This movie indicates the historical time of 1960s that is significant for Land Reform Act and the eradication of malaria from Nepal. These two incidents are significant to lead the whole incident onward. After the eradication of Malaria in 1960s in Dang district and ‘Terai’ (southern plain area) belt of

Nepal, Terai experienced pouring migration from hilly region. A tussle was commenced for the prototype of cultural conflict. Native culture lost its charm. *Buhran* is the both name and process. It is 'NayaMuluk' (i.e. newly annexed areas by Junga Bahadur Rana from the treaty with British government in 11 December 1816 that lies in Far Western Nepal: Banke, Bardiya, Kailali and Kanchanpur). It is their struggle. *Buhran* is the process of their migration (Chhara) to new land. It is their urgency of migration from their native land to new virgin land. Economic deprivation and cultural substitution surpassed their sense of nationality. Land reform act of 1964 (2021 BS) proclaimed to inherit limited land up to 28 'Bighas' (1 Bigha = 6,772.63m² in Nepal). This act recognizes Tharu people's land right. However, ignorant and innocent Tharu people were deceived by Parvatiya showing their inability to pay land tax.

Tharu people's economy was based on agriculture. Whole family members involved in agriculture. Land was their major source of income. After the eradication of malaria, Terai (Southern plain land) faced rapid influx of hill people. Hill people started to settle there. This immigration to Tharus' space created tussle. Gradually, Parvatiyas began to govern their space. They were alienated from their own space. They have lacked their spatial identity. They were treated as if they were foreigners in their space because Parvatiyas have annexed their space.

It questions over the validity of official history, in the name of unity, privileged by Hill Culture that gained recognition obscuring the Tharus' cultural identity. Parvatiya people's capitalistic intention was so clear that they wanted to capture land and make the Tharus slaves. For this, they started to specialize their culture. Besides this, economic sources and agricultural productions once owned by the Tharus became part of landlords. This thesis tries to epitomize how they lost their land. As their culture lacked power they could not preserve it. Losing one's culture means losing power. There was no space for their culture.

After gaining cultural and political power Parvatiyas started to capture means of production. They were exhausted and compelled to hand the ownership of their land to the Parvatiyas. Its major theme is struggle and displacement. How power dominant groups create hegemony and maintain it to gain economic and political power has been epitomized. In some respect, their voice has been subdued and their loyalty became the weapon for Parvatiyas to put their economic rights aside.

Panchayat system supported Parvatiya's hegemonic discourse that naturalized suppression. Bringing reference from MahendraL awati, Dipesh Kumar Ghimire accepts that after the unification of modern Nepal, Caste Hill Hindu Elite Male (CHHEM) monopolized the political, economic, social and cultural power. Minorities became deprived and high caste hegemony contributed to the emergence of Nepali language speaking class. This recognition of Nepali language led the regional, ethnic and linguistic exclusion (133). Further he says that Hill elites high class called themselves civilized and behaved aboriginal people rudely using derogatory terms (134). This process made Tharu community accept them as educated, civilized and powerful. Government supported 'Khas' (culture that was originated from Karnali region of Nepal) culture and Khas language. Nepali language was confirmed as official language and other languages and cultures were undermined then Parvatiya culture and language got superiority among other cultures. National policy handed power to Parvatiya culture. This made them to think them powerful and civilized by birth.

Considering economics and culture, there is interrelationship between them. One borrows support to sustain from other. One who has economic power that tries to highlight its culture among other cultures. Patwari idolizes his culture through cultural hegemony and gains economic power. This specialization of one culture from other cultures is based on economy and it crates dichotomy between master and slave cultures. Culture helps us to incorporate economic wellbeing. Unlike in feudalism, Tharus are working for Patwari in their

own land. After losing their land, major source of their livelihood, they started to think themselves vulnerable among the Parvatiyas. Through the cultural hegemony, the Parvatiyas started to make them work for their expectations. Slowly, they started to confiscate land from Tharus. Tharus accepted that they could not fight against this domination. Generally, domination became everyday way of their life. To follow the domination imposed by landlords became their duty and loyalty.

Bourgeoisie knowledge developed by Parvatiyas served their interest supporting their culture undermined Tharu culture. This formation of mythical knowledge through power became the strategy for Parvatiyas. They convinced Tharu people that Parvatiya culture would pave the path for the development of human civilization. This myth was loaded with capitalist ideology. This narrative created the concept of fate and made Tharus accept it. As a result Parvatiya culture dominated Tharu culture. Though they, to some extent, understood the cultural demarcation and standardization of Parvatiya culture they could not search for their cultural identity. Parvatiya culture became a touchstone for other cultures. They found themselves affiliated to dominant culture. Tharu culture became sub culture of the dominant culture. Political power put them under the surveillance of Parvatiya culture. In this spectrum hegemony became their fate that they accepted easily by blaming their fortune. They supposed themselves inferior by birth.

Furthermore, the Parvatiyas interpreted Tharus' economic situations in a wrong way. Parvatiyas said that Tharus cannot handle the ownership of their land. Their financial status was below their approach. They made Tharus think themselves poor and incapable to pay land revenue tax and own the land. Instead of paying land tax they are taught to plough the land and grow crops and Patwari would pay the land tax and own the land. This epistemology developed psychological dilemma and sense of financial burden while owning the land. It was better to handle land to Parvatiya rather than abiding land ownership. Burden laden by

Parvatiya became unsolvable. They lost their ownership on land and became financially weaker than before. Just in basic family needs, they had to lend money from Patwari. Patwari provided loan deceptively in the name of economic support and in return, they made once land lord the tenants because they couldn't return their loan back. Ultimately they make them servants (Kamaiya), such workers, frustrated by their exploitation, started to leave Dang.

Hegemony causes one to lose one's identity and accept other as superior by following other's way of life. However, one's way of life is better for oneself not for all. Cultural issues occur in the community and marginal group can't respond them strongly. This process of creating single identity by trespassing one's cultural boundary puts powerless people under the suspicion. As Parvatiyas expanded their geographical and cultural space Tharus' space contracted, their cultural came under control of Parvatiyas' space. Imitation of Parvatiya culture shadowed Tharu culture giving priority to the Parvatiya culture. Matwa, the leader of the community in *Buhran*, recognizes Patwari's language and accept its space. He reduces own cultural space and finds Parvatiya culture as the master culture. Its protagonist tries to abide by the word of his master. Though he is free externally, he is not internally free because of cultural hegemony. He has to abide by the words of Patwari. This psychological formation was successful due to cultural hegemony. He thinks that if he does not follow his landlord who provides loan for him, he will starve to death. Unlike the protagonist, his son and daughter do not accept the domination. The protagonist is perplexed by these two oppositional forces. Still he wants to remain there by accepting the slavery.

Patwarishowes the equality and humanity yet controlling the authority and differentiating its ownership from Tharus. Patwari claims that their God is same to Tharu's God. He tries to show equality but orders Matwa to follow his proposal. Patwari's son's liaising is the cause of Suganya's pregnancy. Patwari convinces Matwa that his son could not make mistake. He means to say that his son and his activities are pure and pious. This means

that Parvatiyas never do mistake but Tharus can do mistakes. Tharus may be wrong but landlords are never wrong. This process idolizes their culture and demonizes other cultures. Matwa thinks that his culture is minor to Parvatiyas' culture and he wants patronizing from them.

Patwari's conservative mind-set demands the bonded labour. Whereas, new generations focus on their freedom of economic rights. Old generation easily accepts the domination and follows the system as it has been established and made common. New understanding seeks for their cultural space. His offspring Batase denies that he knows the hegemony as the major cause of their economic degradation. Counter hegemony occurs at last that Matwa blames Patwari for his displacement. However, he has to leave his native land. This shows cultural hegemony is not only for power and regulation but also for capturing marginal people's human rights. In this way, how hegemony affects their epistemology and how cultural practices shape their economy is its major concern. This is the result of tussle for cultural space.

This demarcation leads landlord on the top of the social hierarchy and puts Tharus on the foot. This recognizes power holders' dictatorship and anarchy. The monopoly of Parvatiya projects their syndicate on social justice. This is how epistemology, myth of civilization, political power and cultural economy play significant role in cultural hegemony and economic deprivation. Neither acceptance nor resistance can sustain one's culture rather empowerment plays vital role. When one is not aware of the significance of own culture, one's culture is dominated by other culture. Then one starts to accept other culture as powerful and own as powerless. Tharu didn't know their cultural aesthetics. Matwa fails to maintain his culture and resigns from his post. Instead of abiding by his culture and their own way of life they depend upon Patwari. Because of the lack of education and economic power, Tharu people couldn't unite themselves to fight against exploitation proposed by Patwari.

Tharu people are losing their cultural heritage in the present context as well. The privileged Parvatiya culture is overwhelmingly expanding across the Tharu space. Their culture and language has been contaminated. Rituals, food, costume and so on are substituted by main stream culture. Culture is the key source for recognition and it assigns us our identity. Cultural hegemony is the matter that subdues other cultures and as if it seems natural. Revolt against domination is unconscious in this matter. It is the notion of unitary single culture. This stand point theory and touch-stone concept compares other cultures with canonical culture. Eventually, this idea defeats other. Cultural hegemony provides power to the central culture and similarly, power maintains hegemony. Marginalized should question the central power and canonical culture. Concerning Tharus' displacement due to cultural hegemony, this thesis takes insights from Italian structural Marxist Antonio Gramsci, French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser, Karl Marx, Stuart Hall and EP Thompson that is directly connected to Tharus' cultural, identity and economic issues. Protagonist and his community members' have to leave their native land. Panchayat system supported Parvatiya culture and their culture has been undermined. Consequently, they left Dang unwillingly. This shows their pathetic condition.

Buhranis significant to justify their migration and displacement. Issue of Tharu culture and displacement are the key topics to discuss in this paper. Aboriginal Tharus were not poor rather they were convinced to lose their land by their consent. Poverty was not the major cause of their displacement. It expects that Matwa goes through cultural hegemony seeking his settlement. Unlike him, when others criticize the situation faced by his daughter, consequently, he has to leave his native land. Both resistance and acceptance create fragmentation to Tharu culture and their unity. After that, they started to break their families. Tharu people have their own language, song and daily activities. Mohan Dangaura, focuses on Tharu dance and their Diaspora expressed in the songs. He says that Dangaura Tharu

ethnicity resides in Dang and Buhran. His research paper discusses spatial memory and its role in their song so far (1). Further he proposes the significance of Tharu culture:

By the same token, the *Maghauta* dance song (performed at Maghi) from the *Buhran*, Tharu film describes the early bathing of a woman when she loses her *tikuli*(fingertip ornament). Besides, her *sendur*("vermilion") also gets expunged by the water. The song performed at *Maghi* bears the tradition of rising early in the morning, taking baths and receiving blessings from the elders of the family. (6)

More than this, he considers that Tharu people were compelled to leave their land because of the pressure imposed by hill caste people. They left their native land unwillingly (10). Taking the reference of a Tharu song, he says that they packed their belongings and left for Buhran. These songs are diasporic and nostalgic of their past memory (10). "They couldn't hope for better life since their life has stuck in the poverty" (11). In brief, the major concern is on Tharu songs and their significance for their diasporic memory and history.

Mohan Dangaura's article on "Spatial Memory and Ecologically Displaced Subjectivity in Western Tharu Folk Songs of Nepal" discusses about Tharu folk songs and dances. These performances are related to their subjectivity and conscience of their past topography. His research focuses on the geographical memoir and their identity. His research uncovers that songs from the movie *Buhran* express the journey of similar displacement (20). Similarly, domination and their reflection has been addressed in this way: "Tharu Kamaiya songs include the Tharu community's suffering during *Buhran*(displacement from inner Dang valley). During the *Buhran*, Tharu's ecological life had to flee from their native place for a better future" (35). *Buhran* was not their choice but their obligation and the exigency created by Parvatiyas. Their songs express their pain and misery. It shows that they were in peace and

harmony before the Parvatiyas enter there. Their life was disturbed and the financial stagnations were created by Parvatiyas for them.

Similarly, power plays important role to handle culture. One who has power and economy their culture gets recognition. Z. Abuelma'atti finds the representation as: "Tharu and Lalita (cited in Kamala and Prasad1997:452) recognize that there are always relationships of power involved when one work is represented for another in translation'. The representation of otherness through translation in the global context as such does not enhance cross cultural understanding, nor does it narrow the gap between cultures" (12). His research admits the process of secondary level representation that is not free from power relationship. They articulated that they have to live under very basic sustenance with minimum production. Even that minimum harvest suffers on loan. The 'Kamaiya' (bonded labour in Nepal before its eradication) does not expect better life as his life is still miserable despite working tirelessly. He is despair. Further, he mourns over the exploitation by their landlords. Thus, he expresses pain of leaving their native place Dang.

As economic and political powers were under the control of Parvatiyas, Parvatiyas treated Tharus as their tool to assist them. Narayan Bahadur Khadka posits, "The film, *Buhran*, clearly shows class struggle when the *patwari* forces all villagers to move to another part of the country" (128). Further he advocates:

A focus group participant recalled how Tharu women's security and self-esteem needs were violated when males dominated and abused them, including the example of the *Pahadiya* landlord who sexually assaulted *Kamlari* while they were working at Landlord's property (focus group). This data was also corroborated by events in the film, *Buhran*, included in archival documents review. (179)

Not only the economic means but also the political power was enhanced by elite class.

Workers have to face molesting from them. They are tortured and treated as elites' source of entertainment. Further Khadka justifies:

Some interview participants recalled instances of women *Kamlari* being raped and assaulted by landlords, an occurrence which is also verified by Dahit in his book that was reviewed by the researcher. An example of such abuse is also depicted in the movie *Buhran* when the son of a *Patwari* landlord sexually abused and impregnated a Tharu girl. Although she is the daughter of a *Matwanin* Dang, the *Patwari* father of the boy- saw her as too lowly for marriage to his son. These examples showed how class differences affect conflict in the villages. (186-187).

The situation of Tharu people is miserable in the movie. This is the realistic portrayal. As Lucas suggests that literature should raise the issue of working class. This movie raises the issue of working class. Likewise, as noted in the document review, the film *Buhran* portrays the role of *Matwa* and *Agahwa* specifically (Khadka 181). The epistemology developed by Parvatiya made them feel weaker than Parvatiyas.

Some scholars regard issue of caste as one of the domineering ideologies in Nepal. Tharus are undermined based on their 'Jat' (caste). In ranking, they are lower than Brahmin. Arjun Guneratne discusses about Tharu identity based on their caste. His discourse is about their distinct culture based on their ethnicity and caste. He claims:

The notion of a common *Jat* identity implies that all members of the group share in some kind of essence that unites them and distinguishes them from all other *Jat*. The concept of *Jat* operates at many levels: thus, the many different endogamous Tharu groups were once separate Jat, but are now considered to be subsections of an overarching Tharu *Jat* (750).

His paper discusses the caste based identity. Issue of caste and inclusion is necessary. However, caste merely doesn't stand as at stake for domination and suppression in this movie. Unlike caste, they are suppressed culturally.

Kamaiyas (bonded labourers in Nepal) were set free after 2058. Bonded Labour (Prohibition) Act, 2058 (2002) ensures, "Bonded labour (*Kamaya shram*)" means the labour or service to be rendered for a creditor for the following reasons without wages or with nominal wages. Section one clarifies, "To pay back the debt obtained by him/ her or family and to pay the interest thereof." Their family had to pay the unpayable interest against the loan. Parvatiya landlords cheated them and they were put under 'Kamlahari Pratha' (system of bonded labour). Durga Lal KC illustrates that the novel "Gantabya" explores the story of Tharu Kamaiya and Kamlari. "Tharu boys and girls used to go to landlord's house as a slave in their childhood. Novel depicts the sorrowful childhood of Tharu children" (48). Similarly, he illustrates "Sakhi" that represents miseries of Kamiya and Kamlari (48). Matthew William Maycock asserts, "Tharu leaders with whom I spoke invoked the Kamaiya as an illustration of the exploitation of the Tharu, particularly at the hands of Bahun landlords" (73). This is how Tharus were tortured and exploited in the return of loan. Dennis Conway et al criticizes:

Indeed, the competition between the migrating *paharis* and indigenous *tharus* often led to the latter being forced off their land, either by corrupt land registration practices or by coercion (Pyakuryal, Ojha, and Bhandari). The *Tharus* were rarely considered allies, either to the new *Pahari* communities or the central authorities and elite classes who subordinated them and generally ignored their plight. (3)

This means Tharus' life was contaminated and endangered by Paharis. These people started to dominate them making them mere their servants. Loan became their key weapon to put them under pressure. They couldn't afford the land-tax. So they resigned their land.

Parvatiyas oppressed them in that extent that they had no any enthusiasm for better life. They were struggling for bread and butter only.

Space stands as the source of power. Both cultural and geographical space was captured by Parvatiyas. Lai Ming Lam, finds that after 1950s, eradication of malaria, the Terai land became favourable for hill people then conflict rose regarding the control of land. Most of the Tharus lost their land and custom because of Parvatiya people. Along with the migration aboriginal Tharus faced Hindu and caste system (23). Christie Lam, Saumik Paul & Vengade shvaran Sarma demonstrates that displaced Rana Tharus engaged in farming and labouring and migrated abroad for their better future to overcome poverty (15). Parvatiyas developed such systems to maintain hegemony.

As far as Terai was unsuitable for residents, it was occupied by Tharus. When the malaria was eradicated hill people raised its benefits. Kuchhat Narayan Chaudhary (2006) thesis explores, “After 1950s government rehabilitation programme and eradication of malaria are caused the heavy migration from Hill to Terai. The fertile land of Terai was captured” (14). They were dependent on animal husbandry and crops production. Kuchhat Narayan Chaudhary investigates that after the eradication of malaria in plain land of Nepal, migrant hill people set inequality in the society. Local Tharus faced land loss and displacement (3). In this spectrum immigration of hill people and hill culture created tussle and made Tharus leave Dang.

Scholars have dealt with the issue of power, domination and displacement of Tharu people so far. However, they have not discussed about the issue of cultural hegemony that provided space for Parvatiya culture and their culture dominated Tharus’ recognizing Parvatiya culture and obscuring Tharu culture. Culture provides identity and power. When a culture doesn’t get recognition then it lacks identity and power. Even being majority in

numbers, Tharus were dominated because they assumed Parvatiyas as powerful, intelligent and civilized. Parvatiyas monitored the society on their own way to specialize themselves. State supported Parvatiya culture undermining aboriginal Tharu culture. They lived under the shadow of Parvatiya domination. This domination was not imposed directly rather played and performed tactically. Hegemony in this sense is a deception: A deception through the formation of artificial knowledge.

This is qualitative research and it raises the issue of Tharu culture in *Buhran* movie. It investigates into domination and resistance through the concept of hegemony developed by Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci. To address the issues of representation of Tharu history, it borrows ideas from James Monaco's ideas about cinematographic technique and film theory. This movie establishes connection and interrogation with various dimensions of cultural economy including Karl Marx's class struggle, Richard Hoggart's mass media and dissemination of consciousness and EP Thomson's exclusion of poor class people's history to explore *Buhran*'s social and political aspect. Similarly, Stuart Hall's discussion about misrepresentation of powerless people is significant to analyze this movie. Marxism insists that bourgeoisie economic structure undermines marginal people's issue of participation in economic share that ultimately invites class struggle. Though Matwa's family works as the volunteer labour, they could not get guardianship from Patwari. He enjoys economic rights making them slaves. Antonio Gramsci criticizes the hegemony that subdues economic rights. He points out that culture and economy are interdependent and economy is culturally formed.

Knowledge is created to establish hegemony. Hegemony provides power for the dominant group. This power maintains, makes it continuous and, if necessary, creates new knowledge, to sustain hegemony. Mark CJ Stoddert contends, "Hegemony creates knowledge in the conflicting nature of knowledge through power" (4). He identifies that ideology; hegemony and discourse produce social knowledge in relation with power. Terms produce

and circulate culture and knowledge. According to Marxism, ideology is formed through ruling class for their economic interest (192). "Discourse theory argues against the economism of ideology theory and undermines the privileged standpoint of the working class as a historical actor" (193). Marx is highly concerned on the economy that is based on labour power and wages that forges consent for working class to institutionalize their own exploitation (Stoddart 196). Bourgeoisie knowledge maintains hegemony.

Parvatiya ideology became a dominant factor to establish them. This was believed that they had knowledge and power. Parvatiya started to monitor Tharu supposing that they know everything and they had studied everything. This demarcation of educated and uneducated enabled Parvatiya to be the guide of the society. However, Parvatiya started to mislead them. They started to exploit and torture them. Louis Althusser argues that domination is possible through Ideological State Apparatus. Patwari Baje governs Tharus using this apparatus. He has an approach in politics and government. Then he makes them follow him. In that 'Panchayat' (a unitary political system (introduced by King Mahendra from 1960 in Nepal), government supported 'Khas Bhasa' and made it national language in the name of unity. 'Khas' culture became dominant national culture and got recognition of official culture. The concept of nation state was under the supervision of Parvatiya culture. State supported and promoted Parvatiya culture as the national culture. Susan Hangen says that after the end of Rana regime all the languages and cultures were tried to be integrated in a single national language and culture. The medium of instruction became Nepali language. Education system introduced multi-lingual cultures' integration into a single nationhood. Claiming the Hindu nation, Radio Nepal broadcasted programs in Sanskrit and Nepali language (26). Even Tharus could not understand the Nepali language and they were unaware of change and state policy. Though the state announced the limitation of land rights up to twenty Big has they could not have any approach.

As Marx found that proletariats work for their living only. They get very small amount from their labour. Volunteer labours work for Patwari and he is making money without working. In this way, he becomes rich and gains power through his prosperity. Tharus, working-class people, underwent economic declination day by day. As a result, in his son's marriage Patwari has to borrow money as the loan with Patwari. This is how cultural hegemony made them loyal and mean to Parvatiya people. It establishes relationship of owner and worker between them. Tharus became slaves in their own native land. In this way, dominant class gains the power through the ownership of means of production and working class lacks the access to the means to produce the necessities of survival- including foods, clothing, shelter- for themselves (Stoddart 196). Wages support proletariats to rethink about the domination in a positive way (197).

According to Marx, a person's values and beliefs are a reflection of that person's economic interests. Ideology mirrors economic interest. For him, economy is the base structure of other super structures. However, Gramsci argues that a stable state never rules by force alone but relies on a combination of coercion and consent (1136). Any group that aspires to rule must work to gain the people's consent (1136-37). According to Bertell Ollman, Marx's major issue is social and economic life under capitalism. Social relation is also related to the social and economic condition through which recognition of class interests can occur (2-3). Erik Olin Wright states, "In practice this has meant developing questions capable of tapping what is sometimes called the relational dimensions of inequality, particularly property relations, authority relations, and market relations" (5). Michael Levin distinguishes that working class commitment to socialism generates appropriate political consciousness (499).

Unlike Marx, Gramsci focuses on interrelation between culture and economy. In addition with Marxism, he finds two way communications between these elements. Economy

determines culture and on the same way culture also affects economy. Ideology creates hegemony and power maintains ideology. Chris Gibson and Lily Kong assert that cultural economy plays key role to transfer total economic activities as a whole economic process (549). We can see the cultural identity as a role model that signifies Tharus economic status in the movie. As they lack cultural power, they couldn't uplift their economic status. Culture itself is not harmful for other cultures. When one culture is distinguished with added value or ideology from others it is specified. This marking quality differentiates one from others. In this trajectory, one culture gets power and starts to dominate others. Hegemonic culture becomes ruling and others become being ruled. Mainstream culture gets recognition undermining other cultures pushing them aside. Mainstream culture becomes supportive for its economic growth and paralyzes dominated cultures economic activities.

In *Prison Notebooks*, ruling groups do not merely impose their ideology rather they seek consent among them (569). Gramsci's idea of hegemony revolves around culture, power and capitalism (568). Culture, power and economy are interconnected subject matter. This creates confusion among the members of dominated groups. They are perplexed about what to choose and what to reject. Hegemony is sustained as far as consciously elites put forward their economic interest in an embedded form of social welfare. As long as they go through this they are benefited. Poor people follow the system unknowingly. Working class comes to know their hidden intention and begins to rebel. Ray H. Elling doubts, "It follows that hegemony depends on much more than consciousness of economic interests on the part of the ruling class and unconsciousness of such interests on the part of the submerged classes" (4).

TJ Jackson Lears acknowledges that the dominant group form an overview of epistemology to appeal dominated and others to disguise their ideas as for the sake of society (571). Dominant group refashions continuous philosophy selectively and develops new attitude that forms "historical bloc" to consolidate cultural and economic ideology (571).

Personal sentimental life becomes part of social economy (570). For Gramsci, hegemony is not straight forward rather contradictory that includes resistance and resignation. This differs person wise. Dominant groups don't get complete success because dominated groups are divided and ambiguous (570). Ghan shyam Shah argues, "All castes and religious organizations propagate that their members have common interests and that they should work together for the protection of their interests" (1136).

Its director Ajit Lamichhane shows the pathetic condition of Tharu people. Tharus lack their spatial power. They are alienated from their own space. Their space has been governed by Parvatiya's space. They have lacked their spatial identity. They are treated as if they are foreigners in their space because Parvatiyas have annexed their space. His agency comes from Parvatiya culture. They are represented as a creature having no consciousness about politics and economics. They are just indulgent in feeding and ploughing. They are larger in number but smaller in terms of their space. They cannot sustain their land. They prefer working as a bonded labour rather than owning the land. It seems they, by their choice, want to abandon land.

However, cultural hegemony became key reason for Tharus' economic deprivation and displacement and similarly, this became key strategy to govern over Tharus for Patwari Baje. In deeper level, they are threatened and compelled to relinquish their land. Parvatiya creates such situation that they have to accept domination. Their economic resources were snatched by Patwari. In case of need, they had no money. They could not pay loan and at the same time, tax becomes another burden for them. Tharu's honesty and loyalty towards Parvatiya helped Parvatiyas to dominate and direct them according to their selfish motif. This loyalty and vulnerability had been created but not inherent. Matwa's other family members reject this agitation but could not succeed because of ambivalence of cultural hegemony. They reject consciously but accept unconsciously. Cultural hegemony has been normalized and made the

habit. So they cannot ignore easily. They follow unwillingly. Their daily life has been shaped by this hegemonic phenomenon. Tharus' culture has been undermined and made them think their culture is uncivilized and barbaric. Similarly, it has been thought that Tharus can do nothing except serving landlords.

Hall argues that in cultural turn meaning is not simply found rather constructed and produced ultimately, it is social constructionist approach. Culture is constitutive process to create meaning in a cultural sphere (5-6). Cultural discourse creates knowledge, discursive formation define meaning that is thought to be true (6). Discursive approach is based on historical specificity or the regime of representation. (6). "Representation means using language to say something meaningful about, or to represent, the world meaningfully, to other people" (15). We share a conceptual map and codes for the thing but its meaning differs according to system of representation or the constructionist approach (17-18). Stuart Hall argues, "Primarily, culture is concerned with the production and the exchange of meanings – the 'giving and taking of meaning'- between the members of a society or group" (2). Further he identifies, "It is by our use of things, and what we say, think and feel about them -how we represent them- that we give them a meaning. In part, we give objects, people and events meaning by the frameworks of interpretation which we bring to them. In part, we give things meaning by how we use them, or integrate them into our everyday practices" (3). Parvatiyas created framework of interpretation about their culture and Tharus'. Their conceptual framework for Tharu culture undermined their existence. Referring Barths, he acknowledges myths as second order semiological system (181). Their artificial framework worked as a natural framework for Tharu culture to generalize their notion regarding it as inferior to Parvatiya culture.

Representation bears the ideology; dominant ideas. Interest of capitalists is represented in a disguised form. Externally, these hidden ideas seem natural but in a deep

level they are formulated and regulated through the media. Representation takes place in a media. Medias are under the guidance of capitalists. Parvatiya epistemology, loaded by their ideology, in surficial level, seemed natural and humanistic. However, in deeper level, they had bourgeoisie ideology that wanted to valorize their culture among other cultures. Their greed to surpass Tharu identity in order to capture Tharu space was imbedded in an epistemological form that targeted Tharu culture as an initial strategy and later on their ultimate goal became clear to conquer Tharu space through consent. This agreement became successful after the succession of the creation of epistemology regarding culture. It marginalized, once dominant, Tharu culture in Terai.

Christopher P. Campbell declares that, Stuart Hall uses the terms, "preferred reading" and "politics of signification", those are related to re-presentation having multiple meaning when they come to represent the marginal identity. Dominant meaning is ascribed to those materials and images to accomplish the interest of elite and powerful class (Campbell 11-12). Here, encoding is set by producers and decoding is necessary to find out the hidden intention of the producers (Campbell 12). He assumes hegemony, "Antonio Gramsci used the concept of *hegemony*—the subtle, unseen political, social, and economic ideology that reflects the interests of the wealthy and powerful—to describe the way in which media representations function" (84). Hall accepts that identity is not historically fixed and cinematic discourse should represent identity as a process and constituted within representation not outside the representation (68). He concludes that history is positioned to essentialised past and it is subject to play of culture and power (70).

In modern age, camera has become the perspective lens to express human feelings and emotions. Lenses focus the picture. It works as focal point. Single shot can be examined through various dimensions. We watch movie for entertainment and movie arouses sense of empathy. It expresses the human relation, social reality and historical incidents. The rural side

scene suggests their ignorance, honesty and loyalty. Scene from landlord's house exhibits the locus of power. His big house, sufficient space and cleanliness of the premises shows the landlord as a tactful and rigorous person. In this movie major characters like Matwa, Patwari, Patwari's son and Suganya etcetera are focused as they are perform major incidents. Similarly, Tharu community and its surroundings are kept in large frame. The scene in Patwari's house has been focused. This focusing denotes the specialization. He has power and lenses focus him. Lenses widen while capturing the scenes and displacement of Tharu community whereas lenses shrink while showing the landlords areas. This shows Tharus are larger in number than landlord.

Buhran falls under the genre of tragedy movie. Colour, lighting, frame and music altogether show the social reality of the 1960s as well as futuristic expected society. Similarly, white and yellow colour indicates the historicity of the film as the incidents relate to 2020 BS. Camera captures dim light that shows their pathetic condition. Sad music also express their pain and misery. Their folk songs are also in mild tone. This mildness shows their innocence. The tone and voice can be examined between two rivals. Landlord seems to be very cunning and he conspires to chase them. His voice is commanding whereas Matwa's voice remains submissive, loyal and vulnerable. Yellow and white colours represent the subdued history of the Tharu community. Patwari's tone seems royal but Tharus' ambiguous. It shows the historicity of the movie. Audiences are manipulated in both way. One may think that they were uneducated and ignorance and others may find that their culture didn't guided them to do any conspiracy against humanity.

While reading *How to Read a Film* by James Monaco, film and popular media epitomize the reality of their life. He compares textual representation with visual representation, "In stark contrast, the recording arts provide a much more direct line of communication between the subject and the observer" (26). In case of *Buhran*, we find that

they were not culturally poor but were dominated and made them accept. They worked in field in a group. This communal effort shows that they were workaholic. In spite of this, landlords created the message that was they were minor by birth because of their culture. Further, film works as a language; sign. It signifies the meaning in a direct way. It shows the reality straight forward. Monaco thinks, “But in film, the signifier and the signified are almost identical: the sign of cinema is a short-circuit sign” (158). Film is able to express the real picture of the then Tharu people who were chased because of cultural hegemony. Cora Zoé Övermann mentions, “As a visual medium, film provides clues towards space both through its settings as well as through character movements in relation to their environment and one another. Space does not exist as neutral territory—rather, it is shaped by human relations and experiences” (22). According to James Monaco, film expresses aesthetic of everyday life combining both ideology and economics (68).

Recognition is necessary to get cultural identity. When the financial burden and poverty increases, family members start to quarrel. This financial scarcity is the result of Patwari’s oppression. He is the major obstacle for their financial stagnation. Conflict arises because of poverty. They want to split. Who is responsible for their split? Financial burden is sure but the financial problem has been created by Patwari. They lose their land. On one hand they have scarcity of farming land and on other hand they have to pay tax. Why did they accept such burdensome system? Why didn’t they rebel against such oppression and exploitation? It is because state sponsored Parvatiya culture and made it official. They lost cultural recognition and began to assume Parvatiya culture as the master culture. This hegemonic discourse is responsible for their economic degradation and displacement.

In the beginning of this movie, there is a great space for Tharu culture. Tharus lifestyle is based on agriculture. They are suffering from many diseases and applying their homemade medication. They believe on their god and Matwa is their leader. They have their

food and live in a large family. They are busy in farming. A man is sick. Matwa chants and follows their way of medication. This shows their own way of life. The man dies and they follow their funeral procession. This shows their struggle with malaria and other diseases. They were fighting against such life taking diseases. After the eradication of malaria, Parvatiyas immigrate here. Patwari's relatives come there to visit him. Patwari orders Tharus to bring his relatives from hill. They do accordingly.

When the hill people accessed their step on this land and started to settle there then Tharu culture began to face challenges. This process triggered risk of losing their cultural value. Their language, costume, food and ritual came under the supervision of Parvatiya people. They began to evaluate their culture as inferior and Tharus believed Parvatiyas superior than them. Instead of speaking Tharu language during conversation between landlord and Matwa he discusses in Parvatiya's language either (01:04:32 to 01:06:05). This proves that Matwa follows Parvatiya culture and language without any consideration. This imitation contaminated their culture. The act for land reformation was on behalf of Tharu people, however, it became another weapon for Parvatiyas to deceive them. Patwari convinces that there is same God for Tharus' and his (00:55:12 to 00:56:04). He reveals this in order to allocate rest of the land to the temple and capture it later. Landlords managed these pieces of land in their favor. Bureaucrats were under the influence of Parvatiyas (00:47:04 to 00:47:45). They worked according to their will.

When working class gets some support for its living, it begins to applause the system. Matwa's son marriage a girl. To arrange the marriage, Matwa borrows some amount from Patwari. He finds Patwari as an economic supporter who provides him loan in case of need (01:10:43 to 01:10:52). Matwa requests his sons and daughter in laws to go for volunteer labour (01:10:15 to 01:11:15). They rejected the order. This means they rejected the hegemony. Matwa tries to convince his son saying that the amount for his marriage has been

borrowed from Patwari. His son knows that Patwari charges high interest for their loan (01:10:14 to 01:11:15). However, Patwari makes them accept Parvatiya culture as higher than Tharu culture. They naturally accepted that Patwari is superior to Tharus. It has been naturalized. Matwa assumes Patwari as a senior and leader. He works for him without any complaint. Patwari orders him to bring his relatives. He accepts.

Promulgation of land reform act created exigency for Tharus' displacement. Parvatiyas started to laden new economic burden. "The main thing is that when land reformation act was applied new landowners started to divide corns. Government also started to collect money" (01:31:45 to 01:31:54). No longer could they forbear and neither rebel against Parvatiya culture's supremacy. "Men in this place are also strong as wild animal" (01:33:39 to 01:33:49). Tharus were facing anonymous disease and malaria but, above all, Parvatiya culture became powerful disease. Patwari listens the news about land reform act from Radio Nepal. According to the news it has been limited the ownership of land up to 28 Bighas for a family. Patwari gets angry. He doesn't want to hand out even single piece of land to Tharus. His relatives say that he could manage everything according to his interest (00:46:40-00:47:45). He flatters with Matwa. Patwari argues that their and Tharus' God is same and wants to build a temple in the village (00:55:30 to 00:56:04). Matwa follows hegemony strictly but his family members do not. This creates anarchy at their home. Slowly, he faces problems in his family life. Because of the divided mind-set they could not be united. Family members start to quarrel and fight. Matwa was in confusion either follow Parvatiya's order or his family's interest. Hegemony creates fragmentation between followers and opponents. They want to separate from the compound family to single family. On the occasion of Maghi festival, they separate. Ultimately, he resigns from his post.

Patwari's son follows Suganya, Matwa's daughter. He says that all are equal by heart but deceives (00:34:50 to 00:34:59). This is another strategy to get consent. He cheats her as

a lover. He quenches his sexual passion. Later on he doesn't abide by his statement. She is impregnated by him. Villagers begin to humiliate her. Village girls blame Suganya being pregnant without marriage liaising with the son of Patwari. "Just that of Ram Babu. Do you know him?" (01:18:03 to 01:18:18). They know that Ram Babu the son of Patwari Baje is responsible. However, they blame, "The rascal girl! Is she pregnant?" (01:17:52-01:18:56). Suganya can't claim reason of her pregnancy because she finds him superior and of upper class. This sense of lower and upper class pulls her downward to face the injustice without any complain. Matwa knows the matter.

Patwari orders Matwa to visit him. Matwa goes to visit Patwari. Matwa reveals that his daughter has been impregnated by Patwari's son. Patwari asks his son, "Tell me the ovum to whom it belong which is now with Suganya" (01:21:13-01:21:40). He knows that his son is guilty but saves him. Injustice is privileged there because of Patwari. Patwari confirms that he and his family members can do mistakes never. His son impregnated Suganya but he says that they are always right. They were assumed as civilized and moral persons. Patwari chides Matwa, "How are you able to say such unbelievable conduct?" (01-23:45-01:24:02). They became superior to Tharus. He has the god like position. His way of life becomes remarkable and Tharus' becomes inferior, vague and absurd. He seems to find the exploitation of Parvatiya. However, he finds himself a defeated warrior before Patwari. He had to accept all treaties slanted before him by Patwari.

Tussle divides them. Instead of speaking against Patwari, villagers blame Matwa. He finds the situation shameful. They become weaker than before. Hegemony plays role of divide and rule. Patwari tries to win consent but when he fails then he tries to use his second weapon; political power. "What did you take for me? I have such a power to show you how I can keep you in custody" (1:24:20-1:24:40). He threats and Matwa fears. Matwa assumes him more powerful and intelligent than himself. There is injustice at all. At the end of this

movie we find that Matwa also realizes the hegemony for no avail. “My Brothers were separated and latter I became alone. Our forefathers said Pahadis never help” (01:32:30-1:32:58). He leaves his native land. He understands the suppression of Patwari but cannot step forward against him. Hegemony already has created feeling of powerlessness and inferiority in Matwa’s mind.

Patwari develops epistemology that keeps him in superior position and Tharus to the inferior position. Either they are afraid of him or they idolize him. It seems as if Tharus are born to serve Parvatiyas. He orders Atware to get ready the horse for his ride. It seems, as if Dang is under his rule. In numbers, he is single but in power he outfits all Tharu villagers. Why is this so? This is possible only after the people find him powerful and superior. It is not sure that he is powerful or not but it is sure that people worship him as a powerful person. This is how he crates information and distributes.

This movie ends with the displacement of Tharus from Dang to Buhran. Movie shows beginning at the end. “There is no enough land now. I also would like to migrate in Buhran” (01:32:05-01:32:25). It means it is new beginning. On one hand it may be new beginning for social justice. Further, it is the beginning of their life in new land. “That isn’t sufficient to offer tax to landlord” (00:26:25 to 00:26:33). They leave the village desolate it. They become destitute. It is very painful departure of Tharu community. Patwari wails, “My mother’s corpse is here. I don’t know my fates or my deeds” (1:35:25-1:35: 50). This tragic end of the movie shows the tragic condition of Tharus in Dang owing to Parvatiyas. Their miserable condition was because of cultural hegemony. Their displacement was caused by ambivalence of cultural hegemony.

This paper finds cultural hegemony as the major cause that contributed to make them destitute. They were deprived of financial power owing to cultural hegemony. They lost their

voice as they were psychologically dominated. Hegemony worked as a tool to exhaust them and pursue Parvatiyas. They handed their land, means of economic foundation, to Parvatiyas because their knowledge was formed by hegemonic formulation. They could fight against Parvatiya culture as a counter hegemony but failed. Tharu ethnic and aboriginal as a group and group as a class, they lacked class consciousness. They couldn't be united because they didn't have class consciousness. Sense of class was dominated and thrown under shadow because of cultural hegemony. The results of this paper are that cultural hegemony undermined marginal people's rights and economic scarcity is the result of cultural obscurity. To bring marginal into mainstream cultural identity, it is necessary to fight against cultural hegemony. People get identity because of cultural power. In this prospect, culture provides power and identity. So it is thought that one should project one's culture and state should elevate marginal cultures.

In conclusion, *Buhran* shows that Tharus were tortured and displaced owing to cultural hegemony. They served cultural hegemony because they accepted Parvatiya as powerful, intelligent and civilized. Patwari formed such knowledge to undermine Tharu culture. To undermine one's culture is to put one below. Patwari became superior. Epistemology created by Parvatiya was naturalized but it was not natural. However, Matwa followed it as natural. This creation of Parvatiya myth, undermined their identity. They became weaker than the landlord. Parvatiya got recognition and Tharus were made ambiguous. They struggled to overcome such hegemony but couldn't succeed.

Similarly, space accumulates power. The state supported Parvatiya culture and undermined Tharu ethnic culture. Aboriginal Tharus lost their identity. Culture provides space. Lack of cultural identity, Tharus lost both their physical and spatial space. Along with the transformation of their space, power was transferred to Patwari and Tharus became powerless on their own land. Cultural hegemony supported Parvatiya to capture Tharu space.

It idolized the Patwari and demonized the Tharus. Patwari used hegemony to sustain his power. By this power, he snatched Tharus land. As Tharus were dependent on land, after losing land, they became bankrupt. In order to conduct their life they had to lend money from Parvatiya. They couldn't payback the high interest rate to the landlord. They became serf. They, once landlord, became servants. In order to maintain their life they sent their son and daughter as Kamaiya and Kamlahari respectively.

In the same way, Tharus could not bear the torture and atrocity of Parvatiya. Suganya was impregnated by Patwari's son. However, Tharus could not speak against Patwari. They unwillingly followed cultural hegemony. Patwari threatens Matwa that he could put Matwa in custody. As a result, he has to leave Dang. There is both resistance and acceptance of cultural hegemony. Though they accepted it initially later on they rejected it. They could not decide about what to do with this hegemony. They simply accept it, however, they hate it at the same time. They could not defeat Patwari and left Dang. Why they could not defeat Patwari is that the cultural hegemony has infused knowledge that they assumed themselves weaker than Patwari. One who was able to live with malarial environment cannot be weaker than Parvatiya. Someone can say that they were poor but who owned the land those couldn't be poor. The means of economy was dependent upon land and they had land. Their cultural space was contaminated and somehow captured by Parvatiya culture. As they were convinced to idolize Parvatiya they became weaker and lost their economic right. They lost their land because of cultural hegemony. This research does not blame that all Parvatiya people in general confiscated Tharus' land but based on this movie, Parvatiya culture dominated and made them accept the domination. In this perplexed situation they could not be united and dare to fight against hegemony. Consequently, they surrendered before Patwari and left Dang.

Works Cited

Antonio Gramsci. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B Leitch. *Norton and Company*, 2001.

Bonded Labour Act, 2058.

Buhran, directed by Ajit Lamichhane, *BudhaSubba Digital*, 2016. Youtube:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V7RieqArzEk&t=46s>.

Campbell, Christopher P. "Representation: Stuart Hall and the Politics of Signification." *The Routledge Companion to Media and Race*, 2017. Routledge: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/oa-edit/10.4324/9781315778228-1/representation-christopher-campbell>.

Chaudhary, Kuchhat Narayan. "From Bonded to Industrial Labour: Precarity, Maoism, and ethnicity in a modern industrial factory in western Nepal." *Crossmark, Modern Asian Studies Cambridge University Press*, pp. 1- 21, 2018. DOI: 10.1017/S0026749X17000415.

Chris Gibson and Lily Kong. "Cultural Economy: A Critical Review." *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 29, no. 5, 2005, pp. 541-561. DOI: 10.1191/0309132505ph567oa.

Christie Lam et al. "Reversal of fortune? The long-term effect of conservation-led displacement in Nepal." *Routledge*, no. 21, 2016. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2016.1149158>.

Creating the New Nepal; The Ethnic Dimension, Policy studies 34, East-West Centre Washington. 2007. www.eastwestcenterwashington.org/publications.

Dangaura, Mohan. "The Memory of Performance: From Contents to Contexts of Selected

Tharu Folk Dances." *SCHOLARS: Journal of Arts & Humanities*, vol. 4, no. 1,

February 2022, pp. 11-28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/sjah.v4i1.43050>.

---. "Spatial Memory and Ecologically Displaced Subjectivity in Western Tharu Folk Songs of Nepal." *Literary Studies*, vol. 35, March 2022, pp. 57-67. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.3126/litstud.v35i01.43675>.

Dennis Conway et al. "Population–environment relations at the forested frontier of Nepal:

Tharu and Pahari survival strategies in Bardiya." Pergamon, *Applied Geography*,

Elsevier, no. 20, 2000, pp. 221–242. www.elsevier.com/locate/apgeog.

Elling, Ray H. "Political Economy, Cultural Hegemony, and Mixes of Traditional and Modern Medicine." Part A: *Medical Psychology and Medical Sociology*, Pergamon

Press Great Britain, *Soc. Sci. Med.*, vol. 15A, 1981, pp.89-99. DOI:

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-7123\(81\)90028-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-7123(81)90028-6).

Ghimire, Dipesh Kumar. "Federalization is a Tool of Conflict Resolution: A Case Study of Nepal." *Journal of National Development*, vol. 31, no. 1, Summer, 2018.

http://www.ignited.in/File_upload/92764_87617613.pdf.

Gramsci, Antonio. "The Formation of the Intellectuals." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B Leitch. *Norton and Company*, 2001.

Guneratne, Arjun. "Modernization, the State, and the Construction of a Tharu Identity in

Nepal." *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Association for Asian Studies, vol. 57, no. 3,

1998, pp. 749-773 . JSTOR: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2658740>

- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Cinematic Representation." *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media*, no. 36, 1989, pp. 68-81, 1989. JSTOR:
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/44111666>.
- K C, Durga Lal. "Delineation of Slavery in Selected Literature of Nepal." *Haimprabha*, vol. 1, no. 22, 2023, pp. 26-56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/haimaprabha.v1i22.56537>.
- Khadka, Narayan Bahadur. "TharuBarghar-Mukhiya Indigenous Model: A Case Study of Tharu Community of Nepal." Nova Southeastern UP. 2016.
https://nsuworks.nova.edu/shss_dcar_etd.
- . "Nepal's Stagnant Economy: The Panchayat Legacy." *Asian Survey*, vol. 31, no. 8, August 1991, pp. 694-711. JSTOR, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2645224>.
- Lam, Lai Ming. "Land, Livelihood and Rana Tharu Identity Transformations in Far Western Nepal." *Himalaya*, the Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies, vol. 31, no. 1, 2012.
<https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/himalaya/vol31/iss1/10>.
- Lears, TJ Jackson. "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities." *The American Historical Review*, vol. 90, no. 3, 1985, pp. 567-593. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1860957>.
- Levin, Michael. "Marx and Working-class Consciousness." *Imprint Academic Ltd.*, History of Political Thought, JSTOR, vol. 1, Autumn 1980, no. 3, pp. 499-515.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26211821>.
- Maycock, Matthew William. "Masculinity, Modernity and Bonded Labour: Continuity and Change amongst the Kamaiya of Kailali District, far-west Nepal." *ResearchGate*, 2012. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265466667>.

Monaco, James. *How to Read a Film: The Art, Technology, Language, History, and Theory of Film and Media*, edited by Curtis Church. Third edition, Oxford UP, 2000.

Ollman, Bertell. "Toward Class Consciousness Next Time: Marx and the Working Class." *Politics and Society*, Pittsburgh UP, fall 1972. pas.sagepub.com.

Övermann, Cora. "Of Blackboards and Bathrooms: Space as Metaphor for Power Relations in Hidden Figures." *REDEN, Revista Española de Estudios Norteamericanos*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2016. DOI: 10.37536/reden.2023.4.2041.

Shah, Ghanshyam. "Identity, Communal Consciousness and Politics." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 29, no. 19, 1994, pp. 1133-1140. JSTOR, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4401169>.

"Studies to Critical Pedagogy." *Postcolonial Directions in Education*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2015, pp. 116-139. <https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/handle/123456789/19941>.

Stoddart, Mark CJ. "Ideology, Hegemony, Discourse: A Critical Review of Theories of Knowledge and Power." *Social Thought and Research*, vol. 28, 2007, pp. 191-225. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23252126>.

Tang Peipi et al. "The Spatial Size Metaphor of Power Concepts: A Perspective from Embodied Cognition." *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, vol. 47, no. 04, 2015, pp. 514-521. <https://journal.psych.ac.cn/acps/EN/Y2015/V47/I4/514>.

Wright, Erik Olin. "The Comparative Project on Class Structure and Class Consciousness: An Overview." *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 1, no. 32, 1989, pp. 3-22. asj.sagepub.com.

