Tribhuvan University

Nationalism's Appropriation of Modernity in *Anagarik* and *Maitighar*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U.

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Philosophy in English

By

Bal Bahadur Thapa

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

December, 2011

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

University Campus, Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Bal Bahadur Thapa has completed his thesis entitled "Nationalism's Appropriation of Modernity in *Anagarik* and *Maitighar*" under my supervision. He carried out his research from November, 2009 to December, 2011 and completed it successfully. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for the final *viva voce*.

_____

Dr. Sanjeev Uprety

(Supervisor)

Date: ……...……

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Central Department of English

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled "Nationalism's Appropriation of Modernity in *Anagarik* and *Maitighar*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Bal Bahadur Thapa 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

Acknowledgements

I've no words to express my gratitude to Dr. Sanjeev Uprety, Associate Professor at Central Department of English, my supervisor, my teacher and my mentor. Without him, this research would not have witnessed the form it enjoys at this moment.

I am grateful to Dr. Ammaraj Joshi, Head of the Central Department of English, for all kinds of academic support he offered me with enthusiasm and vigor.

Likewise, I am equally grateful to Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Coordinator of M. Phil. programme, for creating an inspiring ambience for the research at the Department. I am also indebted to all the faculty of M. Phil. programme.

Prof. Prafulla Karr, Director of Centre for Contemporary Theory, Vadodara, India, deserves thanks for offering me a 28 day long research grant for pursuing my research at his esteemed research centre. Thank you Bini, Mary, Nishat, Devendra and Hansaben *Didi* for supporting me throughout my sojourn at your place.

I owe a lot to Indigenous Film Archive (IFA), Anamnagar, Nepal, Mr. Nabin Subba, and Mr. Ram Gurung for their support during the research. Martin Chautari, Kathmandu, also remained helpful to me in terms of resources I needed.

Prakash Subedi, Jeebesh Rayamajhi and Keshab Sigdel, my friends and brothers. To me, you always mean more than what I can babble through these words.

Kedar and Anu, my angels. I love you both.

My sisters, Usha and Nisha, you will always remain in my heart. No matter what I do or who I become. Pranisha, my niece, keep on surprising your *Mama*!

My parents, Dhan Singh Thapa and Sunita Thapa. You are the only gods I have. It's because of you I am now what or who I am.

Thank you.

December, 2012 Bal Bahadur Thapa

Abstract

The present dissertation examines *Maitighar* and *Anagarik*, two Nepali films representing the Nepali society from 60s and late 90s respectively, in terms of the nationalism's appropriation of modernity and its impacts on the marginalized indigenous languages, cultures and religions. After a meticulous study on both the films in the light of various critics on nationalism and modernity, it becomes clear that the monolithic Hill based Hindu state has manipulated different forces of modernity like education, language, development, identity, and communication technology so as to reinforce itself at the cost of the indigenous communities and their voices. Between these two films, *Maitighar* illustrates the way monolithic nationalism based on the religion, language and culture of the ruling ethnic community appropriates modernity so as to sustain and reinforce itself in the long run whereas *Anagarik* illustrates the devastating consequences of such practice of monolithic nationalism in the country like Nepal, which consists of diverse ethnic communities with their own mother tongues, cultures and religious practices. Likewise, it also manifests how these marginalized indigenous communities respond to such imposition of the monolithic nationalism.

Contents

I. A Nexus between Nationalism and Modernity in Nepali Films

[A] certain kind of cinema exists only

because a certain kind of state exists.

Saeed Mirza, quoted in M. Madhava Prasad's *Ideology of the Hindi Film: A Historical Construction*

[T]he visual media are a legitimate way of doing history- of representing, interpreting, thinking about, and making meaning from the traces of the past.

Robert A. Rosenstone, *Revisioning History: Film and Construction of a New Past*

In *Bombay City: An Archive of the City*, Rajani Mazumdar claims that she, in her research on Bollywood films, does not want to relate the popular culture of cinema to ideology or hegemony so as to focus on the cinematic practices and experiences. Mazumdar argues, "Subsuming the popular within a 'hegemonic mode' or 'ideological structure' rules out any critical engagement with issues of experience and cinematic practice . . ." (xxxiv). However, this kind of study does not make much sense as "cinema doesn't exist in a sublime state of innocence, untouched by day-to-day happenings" (Garga 196). Every film bears its own history and culture. In her introduction to *Hindi Action Cinema*, Valentina Vitali, therefore, rightly argues, "The story of the study of cinema has been marked by many attempts at grappling with the question of how material socio-economic arrangements shape cultural production and, through culture, modes of thinking" (xvi). The present dissertation is another example of this kind of the study of cinema. This study on two Nepali films *Maitighar* (The mother's home of a married woman) and *Anagarik* (An unbecoming citizen) has tried to see the link between the state and cinema. The films produced during the *Panchayat* regime upheld and promoted the hill based Khas culture as

Nepali nationalism. Thus the Nepali language, also known as the Khas language, was projected as the only national language to bridge all diverse ethnic communities living in different parts of Nepal. Obviously, diverse ethnic cultures, languages and best practices were ignored in those films. Even after the restoration of democracy in Nepal in 1990, the same trend continued despite the country underwent a sea change in its sociopolitical structure. Raman Ghimire locates the problem in our filmmakers, who can't shirk off conformity. He argues, "Most of the filmmakers were born and brought up under the protection of the *Panchayat* and kept on cultivating their creativity under its instruction" (*Chalchitra Manch* 55). That's why our filmmakers are hesitating to deal with contemporary issues. Instead of exploiting the rich and diverse ethnic cultural heritages, the Nepali filmmakers started following the Bollywood trend since the Bollywood films spiced with exaggerated fight sequences and idyllic dance sequences had overtaken the local films. Consequently, the Khas nationalism entered the Nepali silver screen through the back door: perpetuation and reinforcement of the Khas culture via Indo Aryan culture backed up by Hinduism borrowed from the Bollywood films. Again, ethnic cultures, languages and best practices were marginalized in these films. Thus, the plural nationalisms have been shut out by the monolithic Khas culture. The representation of the monolithic Khas nationalism as the only Nepali nationalism in Nepali films manifests the power dynamics prevailing in the society: the marginalization of ethnic communities at the hands of the Khas people.

The present dissertation has examined *Maitighar* and *Anagarik*, two Nepali films representing the Nepali society from 60s and late 90s respectively, in terms of the nationalism's appropriation of modernity. After a meticulous study on both the films in the light of various discourses on nationalism and modernity, it becomes clear that the monolithic hill based Hindu state has manipulated different forces of modernity like education, language, development,

identity, and communication technology so as to reinforce itself at the cost of the indigenous communities and their voices. Between these two films, *Maitighar* has been presented as a film, which illustrates the way monolithic nationalism based on the religion, language and culture of the ruling ethnic community appropriates modernity so as to sustain and reinforce itself.. *Anagarik*, on the other hand, illustrates the devastating consequences of such practice of monolithic nationalism in the country like Nepal, which consists of diverse ethnic communities with their own mother tongues, cultures and religious practices. Likewise, it also manifests how these marginalized indigenous communities respond to such imposition of the monolithic nationalism.

Since the study is on the relationship between the cinema and the state, it is indispensable to contextualize the selected films within the history of the Nepali cinema. The history of Nepali films is not much long. However, we can see the nationalism's appropriation of this visual medium from the very beginning. Though *Raja Harischandra* (1949) is supposed to have been the first Nepali film, *Aama* (1966) has been officially identified as the first Nepali film. The reason is *Raja Harischandra* was made in India by taking Indian artists. Furthermore, *Aama* was the film produced under the king Maherdra's supervision. That's why Raman Ghimire argues, "*Aama* was born to advertise the then *Panchayati* system. And, the films following *Aama*, too, kept on disseminating this illusion due to its influence" (54). Nabin Subba concurs, "In Nepal, the king Mahendra introduced cinema as propaganda for the fulfillment of his political objective" (59). In this connection, Bishnu Gautam argues, "Though the main objective of film *Aama*, who represents all people's birth giver, Nepal, rather than a mother of an particular individual, was to sing praises of the then system, *Aama* must have contributed somehow to foreground the devotion towards motherland (maternal power) or patriotic spirit through the means of film"

(39). Here, we can see how *Aama* was used to disseminate the propaganda of the state. Kesang Doma Sherpa, in her dissertation "Un/Re Imagining Nepali National Cinema," foregrounds the link between the state and the film in Nepal in the passage below:

> Official film history begins with the highly patriotic film *Aama* (Mother, 1965). Produced by the Ministry of Information, under the aegis of the then King Mahendra, [*Aama*] was a clear nation building tool. *Desh suhaudo panchayati bewastha*- love the *Panchayat* that suits our nation was communicated to a diverse national public divided along regional and ethnic lines. The image of the mother, a universal signifier of national unity, was appropriately used to forward the themes of nationalization. Those who supported the multiparty system were represented onscreen as plain bad villains while those in favor of the *Panchayat* system emerged as undefeated heroes. Characters in the film were dressed in the distinct garbs of the nation- men in *daura suruwal* and *dhaka topi*, women draped in *saree* and *cholo fariya*. In an effort to show this film throughout the country, state personnel were sent from Kathmandu with projectors and generators so that even remote, mountainous electricity-less villages like Solu Khumbu where national laws had not penetrated Sherpa life could receive this national imagination projected onto their farm walls. Two other films made in the 1970's with state backing- *Hijo Aaja, Bholi* (Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow, 1973) and *Parivartan* (Transformation, 1977) contained political messages meant to popularize certain state-sponsored ideas like the 'Back to the Village Campaign.' (4)

In the passage above, Sherpa minces no words to claim that the then king Mahendra got the people to make film under the state's supervision so as to use it for the state's propagandas like education, development, unity in diversity, and the *Panchayati* system suitable to the soil of Nepal. Bishnu Gautam highlights the link between politics and the film in this way:

> The origin of Nepalese movies lay in politics. The first three movies—*Aama*, *Hijo Aaja Bholi* and *Paribartan*-- produced in the Nepalese soil under the initiative of late king Mahendra were all about the partyless *Panchayat* polity. While *Aama* was made solely to popularize the then Panchayati system introduced by the king, *Paribartan* was about the 'Return to Village Campaign,' a political component of the same system. *Hijo Aaja Bholi* was a mix of political and social issues. (5)

From these illustrations, it becomes obvious that the king Mahendra used film to fulfill his nationalist projects. Elaborating this interconnection between development, modernity, nationality and film further, Sherpa argues:

> When the *Panchayat* government headed by an opposing family [the Shah family], the Shahs took over in 1960, it reversed the isolationist policies of the Ranas. There was thus a fervent desire to modernize by whatever means possible, be it through schools, foreign aid, or cinema. For Nepal, development and modernization- rather than residues and scars of imperialism- was the overt link between it and the west. The story of how cinema was introduced to Nepal attests to this quite nicely; King Mahendra had encountered numerous American films on his travels in the 1950s to the United States. On his return journey to Nepal, he

> stopped in India where he requested Hira Singh Khatri, a Nepali living in India, to come to Nepal and make the first Nepali film. (4).

After discussing this genesis of Nepali film in relation to the state and its project of modernity, Sherpa claims, "Likewise the historical conditions for an emerging visual culture in Nepal were tightly controlled by the mechanisms of state vision. The introduction of an image-life in Nepal can in fact be directly linked to the state's attempts at modernization and nationalization" (4). This is how the film's genesis in Nepal is a result of the projects of nationality and modernity. Sherpa also sheds light on why the Hill based Khas culture has been privileged over others from the very time of unification of Nepal:

> The nation Nepal was consolidated in 1769 by the 'unifier king,' Prithvi Narayan Shah, through political unification by conquest and other means of the 60 odd political units inhabited by different ethnic communities. Shah's 'house of Gorkhas' . . . was a feudal principality in the mid-hill parbatiya region of Nepal with a defined Hindu culture and religion. Following the territorial unification, the Hindu caste system was conveniently used as an overarching framework through which to incorporate politically diverse communities mainly for the purpose of extracting revenues. Many of these ethnic communities were non-Hindu and non-caste based but the caste system provided a legal and social structure into which Nepal's diversity could be organized and subsumed in a single hierarchical-Hindu- order. (6)

In the passage above, it becomes clear that the king Mahendra built upon the existing culture, which was based on hierarchical Hindu caste system, which always privileged the Hill based

Bahuns and Kshetris. The rulers like Prithvi Narayan Shah imposed the very Hindu caste system on the non-Hindu and non-caste based people. This is how the unfair trend of privileging the Khas culture, language and religion over the indigenous ones started. Therefore, *Anagarik* questions the very unification process of Nepal. Usha (Sanjita Gurung), the female protagonist of *Anagarik*, questions the very unification of modern Nepal: “Sir, how meaningful and judicious was this unification campaign?” For the unification process led to the rise of Khas communities at the cost of the indigenous communities.

The king Mahendra made an attempt to sustain it by appropriating various forces of modernity including film. In this regard, Abhi Subedi, in his article published in *The Kathmandu Post*, candidly presents a nexus between the king Mahedra's Panchayati autocratic regime and literature and cultural activities in this way:

> The erstwhile Royal Nepal Academy established by king Mahendra in 1957 became a location of literature and cultural activities that functioned under the tutelage of the autocratic monarch. For that reason their roles were more or less defined. Nationalism and promotion of a Nepali-centric monotheistic culture was the major thrust of the institution. Every genre of literature and letter of arts and music had a nationalist purpose. (7)

Subedi illustrates how the king Mahendra used the Royal Academy for promoting nationalism based on the Nepali centric monotheistic culture. In the same vein, Ghimire argues, "The history of Nepali cinema commenced with an objective of advertising the *Panchayati* system by diverting the people from the political awareness" (57). In the same manner, Warrington argues that "government and film institute policies also consistently suggest an interest in sponsoring

domestic projects that are both commercially viable (often implying international distribution) and that 'express and sustain' a national culture, language and identity" (85). In this connection, Ashish Rajadhyaksha shows how Indira Gandhi appropriated film for the state propaganda purposes: "Under FFC aegis, realism became a national political project. *Bhuvan Shome* represents this dimension of the project. It was a realism devoted to the mapping of the land, producing the nation for the state, capturing the substance of the state's boundaries" (190). Discussing the Nazi attitudes towards the film, Hanz Traub, as cited by B D Garga in *The Art of Cinema*, claims, "Without a doubt, the film as a means of communication has outstanding value for propaganda purposes. Persuasion requires this type of language, which conveys a strong message through simple stories and visual action . . . the moving picture occupies second place among all propaganda means. In the first place stands the living word: the Fuhrer in his speeches . . ." (195). The king Mahendra understood this fact. So, he introduced film to Nepal. However, this kind of imposition of the state propaganda on the film industry led it to the stagnancy the way it happened with the burgeoning Russian cinema when Bolshevists overtook the film industry so as to use it as per their need. Jamie Miller argues that "under Stalinism, the Soviet film industry was brought under the firm grip of an all embracing, centralized state, and administrative system. This system crushed the creative spirit of the 1920s and obliged the film-makers to become complicit in the creation of pro-regime film propaganda and the imposition of an artistically weak socialist realist approach" (*Soviet Cinema*1). While working as the propaganda machine, the film lost its creative spirit. Nabin Subba, in the context of the Nepali film industry, presents this fact in a slightly different way. He argues that the film, at the hands of the propagandists like the king Mahendra, turns into a means of escapist entertainment and thus it loses its creative spirit. He presents the king Mahendra's use of the film as a means of

diverting people's attention from the reality. He claims, "In the film, too, the escapist entertainment was promoted for a long time so that the people from marginalized language, religion, ethnicity, culture and region would not seek their rights. The autocratic and monolithic governing systems always promote the escapist entertainment" (*Chalchitra Manch* 60). And this trend continues to this day.

In terms of quantity, the Nepali film industry has grown mature. However, the Nepali films have not received as much study as they really deserve. Firstly, the Nepali films have not been able to attract the intellectual people. Secondly, in Nepal, unlike in the West, the films have not been comfortably accepted as a part of literature. Nevertheless both the selected films *Maitighar* and *Anagarik* have been interpreted and discussed from various perspectives.

Deepa Gautam, in her article published in *Chalchitra Manch*, questions the portrayal of the women in the earliest Nepali films like *Maitighar*, *Manko Bandh* and *Aama*. She argues, "Though *Aama* (2022 VS), *Maitighar* (2023 VS), and *Manko Bandh* (2030 VS) have been regarded as the representative films to present the image of Nepali women from 20s and 30s, it must be examined how much light or distorted the woman's image was" (39). Gautam does not find the representation of the women in *Maitighar* and *Manko Bandh* reliable and strong since it bends towards existentialism rather than social reality. She argues:

> We can doubt whether the image of the woman is fading away from the people's memory as it is existential and weak in the film *Maitighar*, in which the agony, suffering and oppression of the heroine named as husband eater are mixed with the background score entitled "By welcoming life not with victory but defeat" and in the film *Manko Bandh*, which consists of a story of a woman who controls

> herself even when her childhood friend/ lover brings another beloved from the city. (39-40).

Here, Gautam is concerned with the unreliable and weak representation of the women in Nepali films. Instead of presenting the plights of women as consequences of patriarchal ideologies, the Nepali films generalize their plights as a matter of fate and existence. Likewise, they deny the women their agency. Maybe we, unlike Gautgam, can look into this representation of women from a different perspective. Actually, the film reflects the then patriarchal society, in which the women didn't have any agency at all, and to be born as a daughter would be regarded as shattered and defeated destiny.

Raman Ghimire, however, chooses to focus on the entertainment aspect of *Maitighar*. He argues, "*Maitighar*, which was produced by the private sector almost at the time of *Aama*, was a fantastic film made for the pure entertainment" (*Chalchitra Manch* 54). However, Ghimire misses the crux of the film. He has ignored the songs and the underlying message replete with monolithic nationalism. Instead, he seems to focus on its erotic songs and dances like "Kasle kinchha mero jowan?" (who buys my youth?).

In this connection, Bishnu Gautam presents a never ending debate surrounding the first Nepali film:

> Recently, at an interaction, filmmaker Nir Shah reportedly argued that *Maitighar* was the first Nepali movie. But directors like Chetan Karki and others did not agree. Indeed, *Maitighar* was the first Nepali film produced by the private sector in around 1965. B. S. Thapa had directed this black and white hit. *Maitighar*, one

> of the important junctions in Kathmandu, takes its name after the very movie as the unit of the historic movie was housed around the site some 45 years back. (5)

Gautam shows the possibility of considering *Maitighar* as the first Nepali film amidst the disagreements. And its popularity is evident in the passage above.

Interestingly, *Anagarik* has received more vibrant reviews than *Maitighar*. In his article "A Plight of being a Non-Citizen in one's own Country" published in *Rooprekha*, L. Anjan, trying to foreground the plight of the Lahure family, argues, "An effort has been made to depict how the Lahure family emerged as the indigenous people were forced to leave their society because of the whole state mechanism" (5). It is noticeable that the critic has blamed the state for the plight of this family.

Questioning the significance of the citizenship card in the light of the film, Dhruba Lamsal argues, "All citizens cannot get the level of citizens of that nation only by receiving citizenship card. Forget about the country like Nepal having the centralized state system" (*Nepali Shikhar* 64). Here, Lamsal makes it very clear that the citizenship does not guarantee a citizen her due rights and privileges in the country like Nepal, which boasts of the centralized state system. Pragati Subba, however, focuses on the Maoist insurgency which looms large as the film moves ahead. He avers, "But the terror of the People's War prevails throughout the film . . ." (*Nepal Focus* 40). Ram, the protagonist of the film, is forced to join the Maoist insurgency. He is disillusioned very soon. He has to flee his village to save his life. This is how the film shies away from violence as a means to challenge the monolithic nationalism though it looms large throughout the film.

The indigenous critics like Prakash Thamsuhang were overwhelmed by the emotional experience they underwent while watching the film. He says that “the dialogue made us emotional and rebellious. It made us laugh and cry. We got agonized while watching our realistic agonies on the screen. From that day onwards, the word Anagarik stayed in our mouth. Yes, we are unbecoming citizens” (*Loktantra Nepal* 38). Here, Thamsuhang identifies himself with the unbecoming citizens portrayed in the film.

In his interview with Dipendra Dindukhi, Ram Babu Gurung, the Director of the film, warns, “If the molithic state fails to respect the indigenous people, the country will undergo a great crisis” (*Nawatalash* 25). Gurung does not mince words while explaining the objective of this film. He says, "The film presents satirically how the one-sided policy of the state has pushed the indigenous communities including Gurungs, and thus forced them to migrate to the foreign land” (25). He adds, "The characteristic feature of *Anagarik* is to reprimand the monolithic state in a symbolic way” (25).

Chhatra Karki sheds light on the film's effort to create a space for the marginalized voices in this way: "At present the indigenous communities have been fighting for their identity and space. *Anagarik* has tried to include the voice of these citizens, who have been undergoing the oppression and exploitation for years” (*Samaya* 56). According to Karki, the protagonist “raises the issues of the indigenous people who have been living without rights for thousands of years” (56).

Yubraj Limbu links the previous *Lahure* tradition to the present trend of migrating abroad in an interesting way: “After watching the film it becomes crystal clear that previously, the state, by negotiating with the East India Company, sent them to the foreign land to avoid the

possibility of rebellion; today their children are forced to migrate as they are deprived of consumption of the state's resources" (*Gorkha Sainik Awaj* 46). In both the cases, the indigenous people have suffered at the hands of the monolithic state.

Bal Bahadur Thapa examines the film's representation of the Gurung culture in this way: "Furthermore, the film's endeavor to bring the Gurung cultural practices, and folk music and dance to the limelight manifests its assertion of cultural identity of indigenous communities including the Gurung community. In this way, the film seeks to create a space for the cultural identities of the indigenous communities" (*Pore ta* 75). He further argues, "In all, *Anagarik* is a cultural reaction to the pressures imposed on the indigenous communities like Gurung community by the state" (*Pore ta* 75).

There are a number of critics, who have observed *Anagarik* from the perspectives, which certainly do not agree with the one, which prevails in the present study. Bishnu Gautam agrees that *Anagarik* foregrounds the issues of the indigenous people. Meanwhile, he finds something lacking in the film. He is skeptical regarding the position of the indigenous people in this way: "Had he included how tribal cultures and rituals have also been equally responsible for the present state of Janajatis, the film would have been better" (*The Rising Nepal* 5). Gautam's argument is problematic. Basically, the critics, who are in favour of the upper-castes, justify the position of the ruling ethnic communities by debasing the marginalized indigenous communities. He hints at the fact that the indigenous people are not capable of handling their rights and privileges as they have conservative and superstitious best practices, which are pushing them backward. In a way, he fails to understand how the state has marginalized the indigenous people under the cloak of tribal cultures and rituals. We can see Gautam's complicity to the monolithic state. Many viewers, because of its raw portrayal of reality, have been scared of this film the way

Bimal Bhaukaji has been in this way: “Anyway, one, this cinema, as a whole, can't deny the anxiety of bearing the blame of being a separatist” (*Rajdhani* 7). One can easily see that it is an expression of the critic's anxiety only. The film does not resort to separatist politics for the solution to the indigenous people's predicament.

In this manner, both the films have been reviewed by different scholars from different perspectives. However, no serious study has been undertaken on them in terms of modernity and nationalism. In this context, the present dissertation presents *Maitighar* as a film, which illustrates the way monolithic nationalism based on the religion, language and culture of the ruling ethnic community appropriates modernity so as to sustain and reinforce itself whereas *Anagarik* as a film, which illustrates the devastating consequences of such practice of monolithic nationalism in the country like Nepal, which consists of diverse ethnic communities with their own mother tongues, cultures and religious practices. Likewise, it also manifests how these marginalized indigenous communities respond to such imposition of the monolithic nationalism. In this connection, various theorists on modernity and nationalism have been discussed so as to derive their insights for the analysis of the films in question. Basically, this discussion has performed two tasks. Firstly, it delineates a nexus between modernity and nationalism, and thus illustrates how nationalism appropriates modernity. Secondly, this discussion also gives a glimpse of the way the textual analysis moves ahead in the light of the relevant theoretical insights.

As per the context, nationalism could mean any of these things: a process of formation, a sentiment or consciousness of belonging to a nation, a language and symbolism of the nation, a social and political movement on the behalf of the nation, and a doctrine and/or ideology of the nation, both general and particular. Renan, as cited by Harris in *Nationalism: Theories and*

Causes, avers, "A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things, which in truth are but one, constitute this soul or spiritual principle. One lies in the past, one in the present. One is the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories; the other present day consent, the desire to live together, the will to perpetuate the value of the heritage that one has received in an individual form" (7). Renan lays emphasis on the memory and the desire to live together while defining nationalism. Broadly speaking, nationalism, according to Greenfield, "refers to the set of ideas and sentiments which form the conceptual framework of national identity" (*Nationalism and the Mind* 69). Here, Greenfield relates nationalism to national identity. Nationalism, according to Gellner as cited by Alyosius in *Nationalism without a nation in India*, "is the congruence between culture and power" (14). We, according to Smith, can also look at nationalism from subjective and objective perspectives. Stalin, in *The Essential Stalin: Major Theoretical Writings*, argues that "a nation is an historically constructed, stable community of people formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in common culture" (61). This is an objective perspective whereas he labels Anderson's concept as a subjective perspective. Nation, as per Benedict Anderson, "is an imagined political community- and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (*Imagined Communities* 6).

Smith highlights the significance of the ideology of nationalism in these words: "The ideology of nationalism serves to give force and direction to both symbols and movements" (*Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History* 8). Nationalism is "an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity, and identity for a population which some of its members deem to constitute an actual or potential 'nation'" (Smith 9). He makes it very clear that nationalism is an ideology. Harris furthers this argument in these words: "Nationalism is about

political legitimacy awarded to a culturally distinct group" (*Nationalism: Theories and Cases* 189). Likewise, the Nepali nationalism is about the political legitimacy awarded to the hill based upper-caste Khas Hindus. After all, "cultural identity is strengthened by the politics of nationalism . . ." (Aloysius 197). Harris argues that "nationalism is always understood as relating to and/or collective identities or carrying a degree of ideological consequence" (4). This consequence may refer to "merely a sense of awareness of belonging to a certain grouping characterized by the place, the language and the custom which derived from a certain historical experience" (Harris 4). Aloysius extends the significance of ideology further in terms of the sense of continuity of the nation from the time immemorial. He argues, "A crucial aspect of the articulation of any nationalist ideology is the intellectual construction of the nation as a continuity from a hoary past" (*Nationalism without a Nation* 154). It has three purposes: "[O]ne, to give legitimacy to the nation which is made to appear as having always or nearly always existed; two, to indicate the ideological direction the nation is to take in future with its past as the model; and three, to draw the desired line of inclusion and exclusion within society, culture and history" (Aloysius 154). He highlights the politics of so called objective representation of past. Contrarily, "the present power-configuration is the frame-work from within which the past of a culture is reconstructed through elision, selection, relation, addition etc. into a desired or ideal nation" (Aloysius 154-55). He questions the representation of the past as it is heavily filtered and manipulated as per need. Therefore, "the construction of histories and invention of tradition in nationalist contexts are intellectual activities of myth-making in modern times, whose political import far exceeds their factual content" (Aloysius 155). Keith Jenkins, as cited by Warrington in *History goes to Movies*, argues that "in the end, history is theory and theory is ideological and ideology just is material interests. Ideology seeps into every nook and cranny of history" (160).

Warrington asserts, "History is thus a form of politics, because there is no unmediated access to a past that can be used to judge between various accounts of it" (160). The nationalism's attempt to maintain the continuity of the nation from the past is an ideological construct, which serves the interests of the elite nationalists.

However, there are cracks and fissures in nationalism. Acknowledging the wake of the ethnic resurgence as a key factor behind the complication of the definition of nationalism, Aloysius argues, "Nationalism may refer to the doctrine or ideology of an aspiring class, or to the policy orientation of a state, or to praiseworthy sentiment of attachment to one's own nation or state" (10). In this regard, Bhaba, in *Location of Culture*, argues, "We are confronted with the nation split within itself, articulating the heterogeneity of its people" (148). C. Vijayshree, in *Nation in Imagination*, tries to locate this problem in the contradictions nationalism tries to traverse. He argues that "nation and nationalism are enmeshed in bewildering contradictions. These concepts are at once cohesive and divisive: cohesive in the sense that they bring together peoples of one land-unit to live in a bond of solidarity; divisive since they thrive by sustaining difference from and antagonism against the 'other'" (x). According to Aijaz Ahmad, as cited by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, nationalism, therefore, "can also be the ideology of a fictive unity in which the exploiter and the exploited, irreconcilable in practice, can be made to appear as equal members of a society or a polity . . ." (*Nation in Imagination* 40). Challenging the assumed horizontal comradeship in Anderson's nationalism as imagined community, Ahmad argues that "in reality, members of a nation tend to be highly unequal, and anything but comradely, when it comes to distributions of property, power and privilege" (*Nation in Imagination* 40). It is quite conspicuous that nationalism is an ideology of the upper class/caste people to camouflage the

hierarchy and discrimination they impose on the marginalized class/caste people under the cloak of unity.

Since nationalism appropriates modernity so as to sustain itself, it is necessary to dwell upon the nexus between modernity and nationalism. However, we need to discuss modernity before moving into the nexus between modernity and nationalism. Broadly speaking, "modernity refers to the continuous process of exploring new institutional configurations in the world historical context of the Eurasian land mass (subsequently to include the American and other continents) since the fifteenth century" (*Shared Histories* 5). All different civilizations, Chinese, Ottoman, and Indian, share two common features of these processes of modernity: commercial expansion in all these territories and competition among multiple political entities to form state bureaucracy. Looking at modernity, in this way, we don't need to attach it necessarily to Europe as its origin. It shows a possibility of modernities rather than a modernity as Charles Taylor, in his seminal text *Modern Social Imaginaries*, illustrates: "In our day, the problem needs to be posed from a new angle. Is there a single phenomenon here, or do we need to speak of 'multiple modernities,' the plural reflecting the fact that other non-Western cultures have modernized in their own way and can not properly be understood if we try to grasp them in a general theory that was designed originally with the Western case in mind" (1). He adds, "Western society on this view is inseparable from a certain kind of social imaginary, and the differences among today's multiple modernities need to be understood in terms of the divergent social imaginaries involved" (Taylor 2). Instead of using the term modernity, he uses social imaginary for these reasons:

> I adopt the term imaginary (i) because my focus is on the way ordinary people 'imagine' their social surroundings, and this is not often expressed in theoretical

> terms, but is carried in images, stories, and legends. It is also the case that (ii) theory is often the possession of a small minority, whereas what is interesting in the social imaginary is that it is shared by large groups of people, if not the whole society. Which leads to a third difference: (iii) the social imaginary is that common understanding that makes possible common practices and a widely shared sense of legitimacy. (23)

Taylor also critiques people's way of defining modernity in terms of a few institutional changes in the passage below:

> If we define modernity in terms of certain institutional changes such as spread of the modern bureaucratic state, market economies, science, and technologies, it is easy to go on nourishing the illusion that modernity is a single process destined to occur everywhere in the same forms, ultimately bringing convergence and uniformity in our world. Whereas my foundational hunch is that we have to speak of 'multiple modernities,' different ways of erecting and animating the institutional forms that are becoming inescapable . . . . (196)

The Western modernity or any modernity for that matter is not a sweeping phenomenon as believed or argued by many critics and scholars. Instead, lots of negotiations take place. So it tends to be asymmetrical. Moreover, when the West becomes modern in one way, other areas may be modern in their own ways. So, it is not necessary to impose the universalizing standards of modernity. Spivak, in her *Nationalism and Imagination*, rejects the European notion of the beginning of modernity in the late 18th century as claimed by Eric Hobsbawm in this way: "But I don't locate nationalism as he does in the late eighteenth century" (13). Likewise, Islamoglu

aspires "to formulate an understanding of modernity that is historical and contingent, that doesn't confine modern transformations in the governing of social reality to the European experience, or treat the experience of non European regions as derivative" (*Shared Histories* 110). He argues that "the history of modernity is not confined to the moment of the European domination in the nineteenth century; rather it is extended back in time to include the experience of early modernity in European and non-European regions" (114).

Pointing out a nexus between nationalism and modernity, Liah Greenfield, however, thinks that "nationalism, not industrialization, lies at the basis of modern society and represents its *constituent element*" (*Nationalism and the Mind* 68). She claims that "nationalism makes a society modern" (Greenfield 88). She argues that "the imported idea was everywhere modified in accordance with the local circumstances and reinterpreted in terms of indigenous traditions where they existed" (76). This is how nationalism possesses capacity of negotiation and appropriation. Jain, in his introduction to *India's Popular Culture*: *Iconic Spaces and Fluid Images,* looks at this phenomenon in these words:

> Nations are in the habit of mobilizing visual symbols, performances, and spectacles to establish an identity and sustain their integrity. Though they dig, discover, and harness tradition and history in the process of nation building, they leave a window open for new possibilities to appropriate modernity by reinterpreting its elements to strengthen its particular objective and self/image. (16)

Here, Jain explicitly presents how nationalism appropriates modernity to achieve its objectives. Likewise, Smith looks at the interconnection between nationalism and modernity in this way:

"Nations and nationalism were now seen as necessary and functional for industrial modernity just as the latter became necessarily nationalist" (66). Actually, there is "a belief in the inherently national and nationalist nature of modernity" (Smith 48). Nationalism is an ideology rooted in modernity.

Smith claims that "modernity is structured by ethnic and nationalist principles, and its institutions and citizenship are tied to ethnic and national forms of exclusion" (139). That's why the appropriation of modernity helps nationalism exclude the intended marginalized groups. Harris argues, "All political ideologies claim to speak in the name of 'the people', but none as persuasively as nationalism and democracy which has earned them a pivotal place among the ideologies of modernity" (35). In all, nationalism, according to Gellner as cited by Smith, "is the cultural form assumed by modernity" (67). Therefore, nationalism appropriates modernity in the name of cultural identity.

Now we need to discuss modernity in the context of Nepal so that we could see how the Nepali nationalism has appropriated it. Contrary to the Indian modernity, which was imposed on the Indians by their colonizers, the Nepali modernity came in piecemeal slowly and gradually. So Nepal got lots of time and opportunities to negotiate with the modernizing forces. And, Nepal was in the position to reject the modernity sans negotiation as it was not colonized. Ironically, modernity, however, has been seeping into Nepal through its porous borders with India. *Anagarik* depicts the *Lahure* tradition, a tradition of joining the foreign armies, associated with the indigenous groups like Magars, Gurungs, Limbus, Tamangs and Rais. Sanjeev Uprety claims that the soldiers serving the British army were a part of the force heralding modernity to Nepal from abroad. Sanjeev Uprety, in his seminal write up "Nepali Modernities and Postmodernities," traces out Jung Bahadur Rana's tour to Europe as the beginning point of Nepali modernity: "It is

true that following Jung Bahadur's visit of Europe in 1850, ideas of English style parliamentary democracy, along with the modern techniques and technologies of the Western architecture and painting, had entered Nepal" (234). He rightly points out that the modernity, however, did not appear as a symmetrical force in Nepal. He argues, "The social and economic structure of nation remained largely premodern, the modern discourses of political equality, social justice and democracy were popularized by the leaders of both democratic and leftist parties in this period" (Uprety 234). Nepali soldiers, who fought in different parts of the world under the command of British army, heralded modernity in Nepal. "Nepali soldiers returning home after an exposure to 'modern' ideas," according to Uprety, "played key roles in spreading the ideas, signs and symbols of modernity . . ." (234). *Anagarik* also acknowledges this fact. In the very beginning of the film, we can hear (voice over) and see the following words: “The Sugauli treaty opened up new avenues for recruitment of Nepalese youth in Foreign Army.” The soldiers like Garjaman Gurung (Mithai Gurung) and Lal Bahadur Gurung (Puskar Gurung) are the harbingers of modernity in Nepal. Yubraj Limbu, however, looks at this phenomenon in a different way: “After watching the film it becomes crystal clear that previously, the state, by negotiating with the East India Company, sent them to the foreign land to avoid the possibility of rebellion; today their children are forced to migrate as they are deprived of consumption of the state’s resources” (*Gorkha Sainik Awaj* 46). This is the Hill based upper caste communities' biopolitics, which ensures their survival and sustainability by guaranteeing their control over the resources.

Similarly, Liechty's observation also manifests that Nepali modernity is linked to the transnational, basically the Western, flow of ideas, styles and technologies. According to Liechty, "global modernist narratives such as progress, achievement and growth are very much alive in Kathmandu’s middle class, where they intermingle with and color other, more local but

equally powerful narratives of value, honor, and meanings" (*Suitably Modern* 26). This negotiation between global and local values and ideas shape both the forces. In the context of Nepal, the Nepali nationalist force has been able to subsume modern forces and thus shape them to sustain itself. The concept of citizenship card is a matter of global force. In the case of Nepal, this global force has undergone negotiation in such a way that the monolithic state has managed to hide atrocities and injustices it has inflicted on the indigenous people under the cloak of citizenship card. The indigenous people like Ram have citizenship cards. Yet they are unbecoming citizens. That's why the citizenship card can not guarantee one the privileges and rights a citizen deserves as depicted in *Anagarik*. In this connection, Dhruba Lamsal argues, "All citizens cannot get the label of citizens of that nation only by receiving citizenship card. Forget about the country like Nepal having the centralized state system" (*Nepali Shikhar* 64). Even the modern concept of citizenship has been appropriated. The state provides indigenous people citizenship card and thus believes that its duty towards these people is over. However, the monolithic state has used this citizenship card as a camouflage to hide exploitation and oppression meted out to the indigenous people at the hands of the state.

Genevieve Lakier, however, argues that the Nepali modernity has been defined in terms of economy since poverty was the major problem of the country. She, in her article "The Myth of the State is Real . . .," claims, "In the rush to modernize Nepal, the state's problems became too apparent, although these were no longer couched in civilizational terms but primarily in economic ones. The problem was poverty" (139). Therefore, the economic transformation was perceived as a way of getting the country modernized. In this context, "it was the project of its eradication that guided and legitimated the new" (Lakier 140). Right here, the monolithic nationalism led by the king Mahendra came up with slogans of poverty eradication, development

and democracy. He knew that poverty was greatest challenge Nepal was facing at that time. Therefore, he laid emphasis on development as the most important factor of the Nepali modernity. The king Mahendra made cinema a part of nationalism and modernization. In the context of India, Rachel Dwyer, in *Filming the Gods*, argues that "cinema has been India's great experiment to fashion an Indian modernity" (4). She further argues, "Cinema is part of the wider project of modernization . . ." (Dwyer 163). So has it been in Nepal. However, the cinema, along with other forces of modernity, as this dissertation contends, has been appropriated by the Hill based upper caste communities oriented nationalism leading the marginalized indigenous communities to their extinction in the long run.

In the light of these insights, the present dissertation has analyzed *Maitighar and Anagarik* so as to depict how nationalism has appropriated modernity. Furthermore, the dissertation has also analyzed its hazardous impacts on the language, religion and culture of the marginalized indigenous communities. Between these two films, *Maitighar* illustrates the way monolithic nationalism based on the religion, language and culture of the ruling ethnic communities appropriates modernity so as to sustain and reinforce itself in the long run whereas *Anagarik* illustrates the devastating consequences of such practice of monolithic nationalism in the country like Nepal, which consists of diverse ethnic communities with their own mother tongues, cultures and religious practices.

This dissertation has been divided into three chapters altogether. Among them, the first chapter gives an overview of the whole research. It introduces the issue and hypothesis in the light of the critical discussion undertaken through the review of literature relevant to the films in question. Likewise, it gives an idea about the theoretical insights required for the analysis of the text in the following chapter. In addition, it also gives one a glimpse of the approach to textual

analysis as well. The second chapter consists of the textual analysis undertaken in the light of the relevant theoretical insights. This chapter blends theoretical insights, criticisms on the films and extracts from the film in its effort to prove the hypothesis. The final chapter concludes the whole dissertation delineating findings, significance of the study and ways to the future.

.

II. A Nexus between Nationalism and Modernity in *Anagarik* and *Maitighar*

The Nepali Hill based Khas nationalism has appropriated modernity with the slogans of integrity and development so as to reinforce itself by pushing the indigenous nationalisms to the margins. Jyotika Virdi, in her *The Cinematic Imagination*, defines nationalism in these words: "Nationalism is a mode of thinking that has impacted our social, political, literary and fictional imagination, even our deepest psychological being-our very sense of personality" (27). She points out the hegemonizing effect of nationalism in this way: "This powerful force of nationalist ideology permeates every institution and discourse, and is marshaled to build the 'imagined community'" (Virdi 30).

Nationalism can be considered as people's tendency of identifying themselves with the state. It is a sense of common belongingness among the people living within a particular territory. According to Ross Poole, a nationalist's relationship with the nation "is one of *mimesis*: citizens *recognize* themselves in the State" (276). A language, which is imposed as a linguafranca, becomes useful for this identification. In her attempt to define nationalism, Poole, in her essay "National Identity and Citizenship," relates nationalism to language: "Part of secret of national identity lies in the emergence of vernacular print languages, their spread through large numbers of the population, and their coming to play a privileged role in public and private life. As these languages formed the identities of those who lived in particular region, they provided the foundation for a shared sense of belonging to the same community" (Poole 272). The same has happened with the Nepali language, which, through its promotion and dissemination in its print version, has forced the people to derive their identities on the basis of its use as a linguafranca at the cost of their mother tongues. Poole further argues, "For much of the modern world, the nation has appropriated to itself the linguistic and cultural means

necessary for the articulation of the sense of self of its members" (272). That's how nationalism emerges as an inescapable force. One is forced to identify oneself with the nation to derive a sense of self. One can't escape the ideological nature of language. In this connection, Fairclough, in his *Language and Power*, argues that "the ideological nature of language should be one of the major themes of modern social science" (2). Phanindra Upadhyaya, in his article "Multicultural and Multilingual Issues: Hegemony and Denial in the Constitutions of Nepal since 1990," extends this idea in the passage below:

> It has been witnessed that ethnicity, culture, ideologies, language and power are closely related, and that the hegemony maintained through consent and coercion which Antonio Gramsci describes, is an inter-play between these factors. It is therefore important to recognize the role played by these elements in order to understand how language policies contribute to the domination of people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds by people who hold the reins of power. (116)

Here, Upadhyaya discusses language in relation to power, ideology and culture. Language, along with other factors, plays a vital role in maintaining the hegemony of the powerful group. The powerful people design the ethnic policies, which deny the marginalized indigenous communities their due rights. Upadhyaya claims, "Ethnic policies are thus rhetorically structured for agreement and are replete with denials: denying ethnicity and thus denying language" (118). In his article entitled "Multicultural and Multilingual Issues: Hegemony and Denial in the Constitutions of Nepal since 1990," he illustrates "how a Gramscian hegemony of 'consent and coercion' has time and again operated in the language planning and policy making in Nepal, and how 'denial'

has been the discursive strategy deployed to maintain hegemony by denying linguistic rights to the marginalized populace" (Upadhyaya118).

Not surprisingly, only the elites of that territory, in such a context, do have a privilege to express that sense of belongingness as claimed by Prayag Raj Sharma: “Of course, the sense of a common belongingness was confined to the aristocracy, the nobles, the ruling elites, courtiers, and the more privileged class of people” (*Nationalism and Ethnicity* 476). “Nationalism," Prayag Raj Sharma rightly argues, "has been a preserve of the rich and privileged class in all times and places” (478). Whelpton, too, echoes the similar idea with reference to unification of the modern Nepal: “Although the intensity of identification with the Gorkha state thus varied significantly from group to group, it was sufficiently strong amongst the more privileged groups . . .” (Sharma 44).

The formation of the Nepali nation state relied on social hierarchy rather than a common cultural identity. Gellner and Burghart argue that "social hierarchy rather than commonality was its organizing feature" (qtd. in Maddox 206). The imposition or the official recognition of the caste system through Muluki Ain was a way of subsuming diversity within the Parbatia Hindu culture in the process of formation of nation state. The system of allocating privileges and punishment as per the caste of the people as provisioned by Muluki Ain has been regarded as an example of modernity. However, this legitimization of the hierarchical caste system through Muluki Ain led to the destruction of cultural diversity. This trend, in a bit different form, continued during the Panchayat era as observed by Phanindra Upadhyay in these words: "The monolithic ideology of the past, no doubt, was reinforced by the ‘Panchayat’ ideology and the rhetoric of nationalism and the inevitability of the crown were passed on to the people in such a way that no doors for any other options seemed open" (113). Unfortunately, the king Mahendra

presented his monolithic *Panchayati* system as a version of democracy appropriate for the country like Nepal. He appropriated democracy, one of the components of modernity, in order to sustain the Nepali nationalism. Isn't it ironical that he associated an authoritarian regime like Panchayat system to democracy? He "presented his 'Panchayat democracy' under 'the active leadership of the king' as an indigenous alternative to Western (and Indian) parliamentarianism" (Whelpton 47). One the one hand, he made people believe he had adopted democracy and thus he was modern, and he, on the other hand, managed to retain his power as a king by sustaining monolithic nationalism.

In this connection, Harka Gurung, in his essay published in *Nationalism and Ethnicity*, straightforwardly presents how the dominant castes have defined Nepali history and culture and thus developed a monolithic national culture: "The formulation of Nepalese history and the interpretation of Nepalese culture has been very much the construct of the dominant castes. Thus, Nepalese socio-cultural discussion has remained a monologue with no voices from below" (496). This kind of nationalism is bound to be quite fragile. We can see the fragility of the monolithic nationalism from this observation of Gurung: "Basically, the political identity of Nepal evolved through accretion round a kernel of Parbatiya high-caste conquistadors. The people of the Tarai and mountain frontier lands remain the least integrated due to this emphasis on a national identity based on the hill castes" (529-530). After all, this nationalism is based on hierarchy rather than the reciprocal cultural respect. The similar situation can be observed in the case of Panchayat era as well: "The ideology of the Panchayat and immediately preceding periods was homogenization according to Parbatia Hindu culture with some modernizing imperatives" (Gurung 502). In his article published in *Studies in Nepali History and Society*, Maddox,

deriving from Burghart, Onta and Whelpton, exposes how the Nepali nationalist ideology appropriated modernity at the cost of cultural diversity:

> Nepali was promoted and developed as a national language in the early 1900's. What was Gorkhali the dominant language of the ruling elite, widely spoken by the hill-castes, was transformed into Nepali, the modernist language of nation building. From the 1950's Nepali language and ethnicity was heavily promoted as the basis for national development, despite Nepal's linguistic and cultural diversity. (207)

The Nepali literature and literary icons like Bhanubhakta were upheld as modern literature and modern writers and poets respectively. And they "were promoted, celebrating the 'linguistic unification' of the country" (Maddox 207). Thus Nepali, a regional vernacular, was attributed the status of a national language as a part of nation building process regardless of its hazardous impacts on the other vernaculars and their practitioners. Maddox analyses the impact of the imposition of one language as the national language on the education system. Basically, monolingual communities "were disadvantaged by an educational system that undervalued their mother tongue and indigenous culture" (Maddox 208). Mukta Tamang's claim, too, reflects the similar idea: "Instead, the Gorkha language speakers imposed their own language by labeling other language uncivilized language in hostile and intolerant way" (*Himal* 38).

The Nepali nationalists' bid of "building a strong and unified state, the policy of monolingual nationalism seems to have contributed to continued levels of educational inequality and social exclusion in Nepal" (Maddox 208). Because of the rise of the Nepali language as the language of power and jobs, the indigenous people think that "their languages and traditions have

no practical value, and are, they often feel, a disadvantage in the highly competitive scramble for employment and survival" (Gellner 20). The indigenous people "are being influenced by nationalist ideology and the perception that Nepali, Hindi and English are the languages of power, jobs and opportunity" (Maddox 219). "In education, monolingual nationalism", as argued by Maddox, "has promoted an ineffective pedagogy based on linguistic immersion that fails to recognize, promote and build on multilingualism as a resource for learning" (220).

Against the backdrop of these theoretical insights along with the ones developed in the previous chapter, *Maitighar* and *Anagarik* have been analyzed in this chapter. Before analyzing each film, a short synopsis has been provided. The analysis of *Maitighar* aspires to establish how nationalism appropriates modernity so as to sustain itself whereas the analysis of *Anagarik* illustrates the hazardous consequences of such practice and the response of the marginalized communities to it. In this way, the two films complement each other for achieving the dissertation's objective.

Maitighar starts with a patriotic prayer. Then we encounter a scene at the office of the prison, where Maya, our protagonist, has been imprisoned for 12 years for committing a murder. From the conversation between the prison officer and the psychiatrist, we come to learn that her prison term is over. She is free. However, Maya does not want to go away. So, the psychiatrist has been called to examine her. And, the psychiatrist enters Maya's dingy cell. At first, Maya does not want to talk to the psychiatrist. After a while, she gives in. And the film goes back to the time when Maya was a young girl as she reminisces those days now. We see Maya as a young girl singing a patriotic song with her friends against the backdrop of an idyllic rural scene from Pokhara. Meanwhile, Mohan, the hero, reaches there. He is attracted by Maya's song and her beauty. At the end of the song, he talks to Maya and their journey of love starts, and it ends

up in their marriage. After marriage, Mohan goes to UK for his further studies. Maya gives birth to their child Ravi. After a couple of years, Mohan returns home. Mohan's father throws a big party on the former's birthday. On that very day, Mohan, with a friend, goes hunting against the will of his parents. All the guests arrive. When the party is at its peak, the friend returns with Mohan's dead body. Maya's poor days start from that day onwards. She is abused and mocked by her family members and neighbours. One day, as her father-in-law, mother-in-law and her son are about to go to observe a *bhajan*, Maya asks them to take her with them. But the father-in-law refuses to take. When they leave for the *bhajan* leaving her alone, Maya leaves the house. She reaches a village around Dang well known for its *Badi* community, a community well known for its prostitution. As two villagers try to seduce her, she runs away and finally reaches the house of Phoolmaya, a *Badi* woman, who runs a brothel. Phoolmaya tries to force Maya to entertain her customers but Maya resists. Phoolmaya gives Maya an ultimatum of three days. If she refused her proposal, she would make Kalo Sarki, a muscular man from the lower caste, to rape Maya. Maya decides to commit suicide. But she is already pregnant with a two month child. Finally, with the help of Gofle, the pimp of Phoolmaya's brothel, they reach an agreement. As per the agreement, Maya has to earn money for Phoolmaya by singing and dancing. In return, Maya won't be forced to have sex with her customers. Maya earns a lot of money for Phoolmaya. She also reads out *Vedas* for her and Gofle Dai. Meanwhile, she gives birth to her child. She raises her daughter at the brothel. When she is six years old, Maya gets Rekha admitted at a boarding school in Kathmandu. Later on, Rekha pursues her BA at Tri-Chandra College in Kathmandu. And she visits her daughter very often. But nobody knows about her daughter's true identity as a *Badini*'s daughter. Meanwhile, she comes to learn that her son, who is pursuing his studies at ASCOL in Kathmandu, is about to drop out from the college because of financial crisis. With the

help of Gofle Dai, she manages to help her son to become a lawyer as well. When she is relishing her moments of joy, something unthinkable happens with the entry of Jagat Man Subba, a rich merchant, in her life. He is possessive towards her. He wants to have intercourse with her at any cost. She resists. He is frustrated and angry. In a fit of anger, he asks his henchmen to track her wherever she goes. Finally, he comes to know about her daughter. He threatens her to expose the identity of Rekha if she denies him her sexual favor. Rather than losing her sanctity as a widow, she poisons him to death. She is put on a trial, where her son is a lawyer on the behalf of the government. She is sent to the prison for committing murder. Ironically, this is the moment when Ravi Bikram comes to know about his mother and sister. His sister also gets her boyfriend as her husband. After fulfilling all these duties, she bids them a farewell.

Maya dies of heart attack after finishing her life story. As the film ends, we see her son, daughter and son-in-law at Pashupati Aryaghat cremating her dead body.

In the film, we can see the appropriation of modernity for the sake of reinforcing the monolithic nationalism on several layers. Basically, these modern forces enter the film from India. It is surprising to see the use of the jeep considering the setting of the film. Likewise, there is a notion of honeymoon. After the marriage between hero and heroine, we encounter the well lit and decorated house and bedroom. This scene has been picked from the Indian culture. The film gives us the hint that the Nepalis should go abroad for education so they could contribute to the development of Nepal once they get back. Mohan, after his marriage, goes to *Belayat* (United Kingdom) for his higher studies. Sadly, the nation does not get any contribution from him as the cinema chooses to create a thrilling twist at his cost. Anyway, this hint at the United Kingdom as a source of education and modernity is quite a telling one. Then there is Mohan's birthday party. It is also picked from the Indian films. Interestingly, the use of the film, a gift of modern

technology, for achieving the nationalistic goals, is also another example. Ashesh Malla argues that "cinema is a wonderful gift of the modern scientific technology . . ." (27). The very use of film for the sake of propaganda is an appropriation of modernity. The king Mahendra had understood this fact very well: "[P]opular cinema is to the underprivileged masses what schools are to privileged minorities" (Robert 59). That's why he introduced cinema despite all the odds. Nepal was not technologically equipped for producing films. Moreover, there were not many cinema actors. In this connection, the use of the Indian artists like Mala Sinha, Sunil Dutt and Rajendra Nath, and the singers like Asha Bhonsle, and Manna Dey manifests the nationalism's appropriation of modernity. Sunil Dutt, one of the veteran Bollywood actors of 60s, also appears in a cameo role. He delivers the Chief Guest's speech in Hindi. Likewise, the film introduces psychiatry to the Nepali silver screen. A psychiatrist is sent to examine Maya, the protagonist, who does not want to leave the prison even after the term is over. It is also a modern force *Maithighar* borrowed from Hindi films.

To a great extent, the Indian culture, technology, resource persons and films work as sources of modernity for Nepali culture and Nepali cinema. And, interestingly, to achieve its goal, the film heavily relies on the forces of modernity. The Nepali modernity is not just the modernity under the influence of the West. Very often our modernity, especially in terms of the visual culture, is a negotiated modernity that blends influences from the West and India with the indigenous languages and customs. This trend continues to this day despite Yubaraj Lama, as quoted by Bishnu Gautam, in his article "Why Nepali Movies Are Getting Weaker?," expresses his frustration in this way: "From *Maitighar* to till now we have been producing films on the same storylines and the audiences want a change in the stories" (5). Here, Lama considers

Maitighar as a pioneer film. Sadly, the Nepali cinema, according to Lama, could not bring variation in its stories and, thus is losing the audience.

Against this background, we see Kathmandu grappling to be modern in *Maitighar*. We see the soldiers, who look like the British soldiers in their outfit. We see the colleges like Tri-Chandra and ASCOL, the centres for educating people. The film dwells upon the need of education in a great deal. According to Sherpa, "Embedded in the ideology of modernization is the notion of social progress of the national society through education. Primary schools were established in the outlying provinces and villages outside Kathmandu in which the sole language of instruction was to be Nepali" (3). Here, the state's nationalist politics of creating a monolithic culture belonging to the ruling ethnic community becomes obvious. Maya sacrifices a lot for the sake of her children's education. She gets herself updated about her son's education though Ravi does not know the whereabouts of his mother. When she comes to learn that he is about to give up his education due to the shortage of money, she, with the help of Gofle Dai, manages to provide him Rs. 5000/- to help him pursue his career as a lawyer. When Maya cries after visiting her son Ravi Bikram, Gofle Dai, trying to console her, says, "Your son is becoming a lawyer with money you've earned through hard work. Is it a matter to be happy or sad?" Likewise, she has sent Rekha, her daughter, to Kathmandu for the higher studies and goes to see her now and again. Rather than letting Jagatman Subba ruin the career of her daughter, she poisons him to death.

Interestingly, Jagatman Subba, a person hailing from the indigenous Limbu community, has been portrayed as a villain. Obviously, the Nepali speaking hill people belonging to Chhetri caste have been presented as the people, who play main roles including Maya, Mohan and Mohan's family despite the film does not delineate it concretely. Moreover, Maya, herself, has

been portrayed as a person interested in books. She reads novels and religious books. In one scene, she even reads out lines from the *Bhagvat Geeta* to Phoolmaya and Gofle Dai. This is how the importance of education for development of the nation has been foregrounded. In this regard, Advani argues, "The recognition that the education system is integral to the fashioning of the national imagination" (*Schooling the National Imagination* 2-3). Discussing the curriculum introduced right after the Independence in India, she argues, "The educational agenda, that is consequently outlined, projects the nation as monolithic and unitary, not as an entity which is made up of diverse elements and different groups with their own vision of the world" (Advani 57). The same thing happened in Nepal after the king Mahendra dissolved multiparty system and introduced the autocratic Panchayati system. The film is a palimpsest of this fact.

The film invokes nation as a goddess, a mother. The title itself suggests country as the mother's house- or motherland. The underlying meanings of the portrayal of Maya as the mother nation, the use of a widow as a pure woman almost like a goddess, Maya's sacrifice for the sake of the husband and children paralleling to the Nepali citizen's sacrifice towards the nation, use of the film to invoke patriotism, use of psychiatry, and the songs replete with patriotism make it amply clear that *Maitighar* upholds nationalism from beginning to the end.

Here, it is interesting to observe the portrayal of the woman in the film. Obviously, the society depicted in the film is patriarchal one, where a woman is appreciated as a caretaker, beloved, wife and goddess. In all these roles, the woman is objectified and commodified. In the film, Maya's body's issue becomes very sensitive one as if everything depends on the sanctity she maintains as a woman, particularly as a widow. Following the patriarchal tradition of putting the woman on the trial regarding her sanctity and devotion towards her husband, Maya has been portrayed as a woman, who becomes ready to sing and dance but not to sell her body. Maya

becomes a widow with a son. Chastity is expected from her. All the same, she is also taken as ill omen since the people consider her a husband eater. She is mocked by villagers. Her paradise turns into the hell in no time. She leaves home and reaches a village around Dang. Two men follow her. While dodging them, she reaches the house of a *Badini*. The policemen, the symbol of the state, support her to get rid of rogues. But soon she comes to learn that she has jumped into the oven from the frying pan as Phoolmaya, the brothel owner, forces Maya to entertain her customers with her beautiful body. Maya still maintains her chastity.

Since the patriarchy is high, the purity of the woman is portrayed in a very sensitive way. Referring to Phoolmaya's threat to let Kalo Sarki rape her if she does not accept the *Badini*'s proposal, Maya says to herself, "My chastity is getting tested after three days." The film highlights the agony of Maya by juxtaposing her to her room's floor with patches and cracks blended with the plates of stale food untouched by Maya for seven days. With a tracking shot, the camera zooms over the cracks, patches and plates of stale food before it stops with a medium shot of Maya in her pensive mood. Actually, as an individual woman, she wants to have control over her body. If need be, she is ready to commit suicide. But Gofle Dai's advice to take singing and dancing rather than getting raped by Kalo Sarki leads her to further confusion. At first, she is alarmed. She can't think of singing and dancing so as to make money for Phoolmaya. But Gofle Dai persuades her in these words: "It is not a sin to earn money by singing and dancing. Had it been a sin, all the people singing and dancing on the radio and film would have been sinners." He also advises her to survive. He says to her, "Sacrifice. But by living not by dying."

As Gofle Dai leaves, Maya finds herself in dilemma. The film portrays this dilemma in a beautiful way by using the technique of superimposition. Maya is portrayed as a person having a split personality. One Maya is an individual woman having her agency. But this Maya is

challenged by her persona built up with the patriarchal ideologies. This persona is superimposed on the wall of the room and it looks like the mirror image of Maya herself. After a brief but intense conflict, the persona ideologized with patriarchal values overwhelms Maya as an individual woman. Therefore, the persona claims that Maya has already died with the death of her husband. The persona challenges Maya: "Aren't you already dead? Didn't your existence end with the death of your husband's death? Does it make any difference whether you live as a dancer or Sati Sabitri?" This ideologized persona does not allow her to commit suicide as it claims that she does not have any right over her own life: "You don't have any right to commit suicide. You don't have any right over your own life. Only Ratu and the child in your womb have the right over your life. You have got to make a sacrifice for their sake." The patriarchal ideologies in the form of Gofle Dai's advice and her own ideologized persona force her to compromise with her own agency. That's why she decides to sing and dance in front of the villagers rather than committing suicide or getting herself raped. Anyway, she keeps her chastity intact and gets herself ready for sacrifice. In this way, her chastity is presented as the willed chastity.

In this regard, Manamohan Basu, as cited by Tanika Sarkar in *Hindu Wife, Hindu Nation*, argues that "this so-called subjection of our women produces this sacred jewel of chastity which still glows radiantly throughout the civilized world despite centuries of political subjection" (60). The woman's chastity, in the Hindu world, becomes a source of spirituality and morality. Therefore, Sati is regarded as the pinnacle of the asceticism demanded from the women. Sarkar argues, "The Sati was an adored nationalist symbol, her figure representing the moment of climax in expositions of Hindu nationalism" (42). The nation needs ascetic widowhood as much as the patriarchal household does: "If the household was the embryonic nation, then the woman

was the true patriotic subject" (Sarkar 43). In *Maitighar*, Maya embodies these characteristics. Discussing Partha Chatterjee's notion of the outer world and inner world, Advani elaborates:

> Man could adopt the ways of westernized modernity, could dress, eat or behave according to its tenets as long as there existed a notion of traditional 'Indian' values which were safeguarded within the home and by the women. The match between the home/world dichotomy and the identification of social roles by gender provided an ideological justification for the selective appropriation of western modernity in the nineteenth century. (123-24)

In *Maitighar*, the males can go to UK for education, drive cars, become lawyers, and wear suits. In a way, they can flirt with modernity. For they have their female counterparts like Maya to take care of their culture at home. So, the women need to think of all the best practices, religion, and sanctity. As per the Hinduism they practise, it's women, who have got to stick to all the rules the way Maya does in *Maitighar*. She has got to maintain sanctity as a widow and remain loyal to her dead husband. She carries the burden of nationalism. This is how nationalism negotiates with modernity so as to retain and sustain itself. The film's foregrounding of private space of women along the lines of traditional values manifests nationalism's assertion while getting itself refashioned along the line of modernity.

Nationalism has its wily ways of plying between both the modern and old. According to Banu Subramaniam, as cited by Priya Kumar in *Limiting Secularism: The Ethics of Co-existence in Indian Literature and Film*, nationalism, as an 'archaic modernity', "captures the paradoxical politics and the powerful appeal of this movement, which simultaneously upholds capitalism, technology, and Western science as elements of a modern *Hindu* nation along with epic visions

of a glorious and hoary Hindu past" (i-ii). In this way, nationalism appropriates modernity by blending it with the glorious past, and thus reinforces and sustains itself. Here, Maya becomes the crossroad of this negotiation. She maintains all the asceticism of widowhood to maintain the tradition from the past. Maya sacrifices everything she has for the sake of her children's education. Actually, Maya, as a widow, has survived so as to serve the development and the modernization of the nation.

Despite Maya leaves her family and society, the patriarchy looms large in the form of the memory of her dead husband. She does not become ready to sell her flesh. In her desperation, she tries to commit suicide. But she is pregnant with another child, another cause to win the sympathy as mother rather than a sex siren though she sings erotic songs and dances in them. This is another factor which does not let her commit suicide. Instead, with the support of Gofle Dai, a pimp, she becomes ready to earn money for *Badini* by dancing and singing. She is commodified. Her body is foregrounded. It doesn't matter whether she sleeps with men or just dances and sings to them. When Maya does not become ready to serve her customers, Phoolmaya, says to Gofle, "Then, shall we send this God's gift away without using it?" Gofle replies, "In my opinion, we should make her sing and dance only. If we do so, we can earn a lot." This is how Maya has turned into a money minting machine. During Maya's first public singing and dancing, the image of Phoolmaya counting bills has been superimposed on the Maya's dancing image. This juxtaposition tells us volumes about the commodification of Maya.

Furthermore, the song itself is quite suggestive to her commodification as it says, "I'll sell love./I'll sell joy./ Who will buy?/ I'll sell my heart's beats./ . . . . I'll sell tears./I'll sell blood./Who will buy? I'll sell my loving world." Obviously, Maya, a pregnant woman, is presented as a sex object in front of the male audience. Her erotic image is superimposed on the images of the men

under the spell of her flesh, song and dance. In this way, she, by compromising with her agency, survives just to be useful to the state, to take care of the education of her children. Though she lives for making sacrifice after sacrifice, the othering towards her persists. She is looked down as *Badini* despite she reads and recites *Geeta* to Phoolmaya and her pimp. All the same, she persists. In a way, her loyalty to the dead husband is her loyalty to the state. Actually, she has been kept alive for the sake of contribution and sacrifice she can make for the nation's development. For these things, she is allowed to pursue the shady things like singing and dancing. Nevertheless, she is judged all the same despite the patriarchal society marching towards modernity fulfills its objectives from her.

Maitighar also plays a stint of nationalism by highlighting the conflict between an individual's emotions and his duty towards the nation. As years pass, her life somehow gets settled at Phoolmaya's brothel. Her daughter pursues higher studies at Tri-chandra College whereas the son at ASCOL. She visits her daughter very often. But the entrance of a wealthy businessman in her life overturns everything in her life. The man is very possessive about her and wants to get laid with her at any cost. As she denies him the sexual favour, he orders his men to follow her so as to know about her. Then he threatens to let the world know about her daughter. She plays the role of a seductress so as to trick him to death. Maya becomes the goddess Kali after poisoning Jagat Man Subba. She is imprisoned for poisoning the man to death, and her own son stands against her as a government lawyer. He can do nothing despite he comes to learn that the convict is his mother. His emotions have no place in front of his national duty.

Dasgupta observes this kind of phenomenon in the Hindi films, too. Discussing the portrayal of heroes in Hindi films, Dasgupta, in her essay "Commercial Cinema and Sociology,"

argues that "emotions have been severely compromised with public and severe duty . . . . Hindi cinema has always sacrificed family ties for official duty or national ideology" (*Encyclopaedia of Hindi Cinema* 376). In *Maitighar*, Ravi Bikram, as an ideal government lawyer, a civil servant, fights the case against his own mother. His devotion towards nation is also put on trial. Maya passes her time happily in the prison. For she has fulfilled all of her responsibilities. She manages to find a boy to her daughter as well. While leaving for the prison, she, trying to pacify her children, asserts, "I am very happy. All of the responsibilities of my life are over today. My son has become such a big lawyer today. Should I not be happy? I have handed over this daughter to her brother. Should I not be happy?" Nevertheless, she remains an outsider. She might be worshipped for her sacrifice and contribution but not accepted by the Hindu patriarchal society. That's why she does not want to face the society. She dies in the prison. There is no room for her outside the prison.

In this very connection, the relationship between Gofle *Dai* and Maya is also interesting. Gofle *Dai*, a pimp, announces that he will protect Maya's sanctity at any cost as she has called him her *Dai*, her brother: "You have called me brother from your heart. Just confide in me. I'll fulfill the duty of a brother. Nobody will be able to touch your body till I live. Nobody will be able to cast an evil glance at you." In a way, his devotion towards her delineates a citizen's devotion towards the welfare and the development of the motherland. Surprisingly, Maya, to Gofle, becomes a symbol of the country. The pious relationship between brother and sister is invoked so that even a pimp like Gofle becomes ready to protect the purity of Maya, his newfound sister. In a way, he also becomes ready to serve the nation embodied by Maya. That's why he is selfless towards her. So, this is also another stint of nationalism in *Maitighar*. Indeed, Maya has been portrayed as a patriotic character molded after a goddess. Deriving ideas from

Pradeep Bhattarai, Dolma argues that "Nepali commercial films are derived from Indian Bollywood 'formula' films which are themselves derived from Hindu religious mythology, with characters molded in the form of Hindu gods and goddesses" (12). Here, Maya embodies the nation as well as the goddess. That's why Gofle, as the representative of the Nepali people, worships her.

The analysis of the patriotic songs makes it evident that the film has almost been used as a nationalistic propaganda rooted in modernity. Here, too, the presence of the king Mahendra, as a composer of the songs, looms large. The songs carry the weight of the whole film. Talking about the title songs of Raj Kapoor's films, Aziz, in his *Light of the Universe*, argues, "Indeed, the title songs were brief 'gestalts' of the movies" (46). The same thing can be said about *Maitighar*'s songs. Highlighting the significance of the film song, Aziz argues that "it is the story which is 'extraneous' to the film in that the song tells the real 'story' (indeed it is the 'story') of the movie. And, the 'story' of the song is political" (84). And, the songs of *Maitighar* are also political. The film starts with a very patriotic prayer:

> The land where I was fortunate to get birth
>
> Whose touch opened my eyes in this world
>
> I wish land like you good luck
>
> I offer you millions of prayers.

In this prayer, the speaker expresses her gratitude to the motherland for getting an opportunity to get birth on this land, which has led her towards enlightenment. It invokes the nation as a mother,

a goddess. And, there is an expression of gratefulness towards this nation so that the people could think of paying it back through sacrifice.

The title itself suggests country as the woman's mother's house- or motherland. In the song entitled "Maitighar, maitighar, maitighar", the protagonist's birthplace Pokhara eventually turns into Nepal. Pokhara, a place well known for its natural beauty, is a microcosm of Nepal. It praises the beauty of Nepal, the motherland, in these words:

> The very spring tries to stay here under its spell
>
> This is my lovely mother's home, mother's home
>
> The whole earth smells of perfume if a flower blossoms
>
> The whole world shines if a light burns
>
> Happiness and joy smile here forever
>
> The moon plays hide and seek here throughout the night
>
> My mountain has touched the sky
>
> My Nepal entices the paradise
>
> My love sprouts even on the cliffs
>
> My song whispers even in the falls
>
> This country is a peaceful garden of nature
>
> The rainbow descends down where leaving the paradise

Tickling the lap of the bud

Play the first rays of sun with the arrival of morning.

In the song above, the beauty of the motherland has been praised. The spring, itself, wants to stay here forever. It is decked with sweet smelling flowers blossoming in the hills and valleys. Likewise, the film paints an idyllic scene untouched by pain, poverty, and anxiety. It is bathed in joy, happiness and peace. Meanwhile, the song does not forget the glory Nepal has earned out of its mountains like Mt. Everest. This song directly praises the natural beauty, innocence, honesty, solidarity and love among the people. The way this song has been filmed also tells one volumes about its intention to convey the nationalist message of unity in diversity much required for the status quo and the so called integrity of the nation. The song sweeps over the significant indigenous cultures and costumes from all the Terai, Hill and the Mountain. It's just a way of paying a lip service to the marginalized indigenous communities. It's also a part of interpellation strategy. Interestingly, the Nepali film has presented Nepal itself in an exotic way. And, this exoticization has its politics, politics of feeding the people with escapist entertainment and diverting their attention from political nationalism by interpellating them to subsume themselves to the monolithic nationalism. It is the nationalist politics of unity in diversity. According to Alyosius, "Unity and diversity," however, ". . . are not apolitical terms. Unity represents the dominant and uniformizing culture-ideological and mythical Brahminic factors and is thus oppressive" (186). He adds, "Diversity, on the other hand, stands for the movement away from these uniformizing factors, the tendencies of the resistance of the subaltern and the locally rooted castes and communities in general . . ." (Alyosius 187). In the present film, the way the Hill based upper castes are trying to impose their nationalist ideology on the indigenous people has to be seen as nationalism vanquishing the nation itself.

Finally, the first song the students at Tri-Chandra College sing during the cultural programme, too, directly projects the glory, pride and fame of Nepal and Nepali people:

> Long live our beautiful country
>
> Long live our mother Nepal
>
> Our flag adorned with sun and moon
>
> This country is great

Again, the nation has been foregrounded as the mother. The greatness of Nepal and its symbol, the flag, has been praised. Then, it follows the narration: "Buddha was born in the soil of this very land; Sitaji was the daughter to this country; the history of this country has received names of numerous brave men and women, who sacrificed their life for the sake of this country." All the major national icons like Buddha, Sita, the Mt. Everest and the brave martyrs are invoked. Basically, the past is evoked to brush up present. It is also political as argued by Anderson in these words: "If nation-states are widely conceded to be 'new' and historical the nations to which they give political expression always loom out of an innumerable past . . ." (21). According to Spivak, "nationalism is the product of a collective imagination constructed through rememoration" (*Nationalism* 40). Discussing the effort of the French cinema to erase the popular struggle of 1968, Foucault, in his interview with Pascal Bonitzer and Serge Tobiana of *Cahiers du Cinema*, argues, "There's a real battle going on. And what's at stake is what might be roughly called *popular memory*. It's absolutely true that ordinary people . . . have a way of registering history, of remembering it, living it, using it" (161). Foucault adds, "But the fact is that a whole series of apparatuses has been established to block this development of popular memory . . ." (*Cahiers* 161). Books taught at school, TV and cinema are other apparatuses devised to block

and manipulate popular memory. The popular memory, as per Foucault, is rather significant in this kind of struggle because "if you hold people's memory, you hold their dynamism. And, you also hold their experience, their knowledge of previous struggles" (*Cahiers* 162). This is how you hold power over people. Foucault reiterates, "This memory has to be seized, governed, controlled, told what to remember" (*Cahiers* 162). But Nepali nationalism lays emphasis on collective imagination by allying itself with the imagination of the upper caste Hindu people from the hills. By invoking the golden past and the national icons, the film tries to do emotional blackmail with the people by diverting their attention from the real sociopolitical issues. Deriving ideas from van Dijk, Upadhyaya "shows how the symbiosis between mass media and politics helps in creating a rhetorically structured discourse that seems to foster equality by denying ethnic reality" (118). *Maitighar*, itself, is an example of this fact. The relationship between the *Panchayati* politics spearheaded by the king Mahendra and the films like *Maitighar* and *Aama* produced under his supervision helps to create a discourse of nationalism based on equality by denying the caste discrimination and its consequences.

In the song, the Nepalis are called on to make sacrifice through unity for maintaining such a glorious history set by these national icons regardless of diversities:

Let's all retain its pride

Joining hands together

Ours is the highest peak

We are famous in the world

We have never lowered our head

We are common folk of the country

Ignoring the illiteracy, poverty and oppression and exploitation of the marginalized people all over the country, the song, by invoking the glorious past, tries to paint the image of Nepal as a land of peace and beauty. This last part of the song appeals all the Nepalese people to get united for maintaining the pride of the nation. We, therefore, can observe a nationalistic rhetoric embedded in this song. Deriving ideas from Baldauf Jr. and Kaplan, Upadhyaya, in this connection, argues, "Through such rhetoric of 'nation building' the minority groups are forced to succumb to 'ideologies and myths' . . . and the majority groups succeed in their strategic rhetoric of denial. In the name of 'democracy, equal rights, and tolerance', racism is denied and is projected as if it is a matter of distance, both historically and geographically" (118). In the case of the present film, the indigenous languages, cultures and customs have been denied their proper recognition under the excuse of democratic *Panchayati* system and national pride. Likewise, the caste discrimination and its hazardous impacts on the indigenous cultures, customs and languages have been subtly denied. The basic strategy used by those in power like the king Mahendra, therefore, is "the strategy of positive self-presentation" (van Dijk 317). The system established by the king Mahendra and his hill based upper caste cronies has been projected as quite democratic and inclusive. Upadhyaya notices the similar thing even in the present Nepali politics. Discussing the tendency of the politicians in the parliament, he argues, "The system followed by them is projected to be the most democratic and inclusive of all" (Upadhyaya118). This is how they are trying to deny the indigenous communities their due rights. Whenever the indigenous leaders try to raise their voice for the federalism based on the caste identity, the hill based senior leaders of the major political parties point out the disintegration of the nation. And, they try to camouflage their casteism with the rhetoric of national integrity and unity.

To get back to the song, again, Mitsuhiro's observation of idyllic village presented in the last scene of *Seven Samurais* matches with *Maitighar*'s representation of idyllic Pokhara. Mitsuhiro, in his article "A Search for National Community," argues: "Because rice is often regarded as a Japanese national symbol, it is not difficult to see the village in the last scene as an image of the Japanese nation. Of course, such an image of national identity is always an ideological construct, and *Seven Samurais* presents the village-nation as an organic unity by suppressing the principles of realism" (505). He further argues, "By concealing the continuing possibility of violence and destruction, *Seven Samurai* shows a romanticized image of the nation as an organic community, which probably exists as a utopian construct" (Mitsuhiro 505). The exotic representation of Pokahara as the microcosm of Nepal has also repressed the social evils like poverty, caste discrimination, and illiteracy prevailing in the Nepali society so as to idealize the nation, an ideological construct of the Hill based upper caste people.

Following this song, many songs and dances are featured. They evoke the ethnic cultures of the nation. Such practice pays a lip service to the stereotypically represented indigenous communities only to give the false impression that there is a horizontal relationship between the ruling ethnic group and these marginalized indigenous communities. It only helps the monolithic nationalism create the impression of unity and diversity at the cost of the marginalized communities. In this connection, Alyosius, in *Nationalism without a Nation in India,* argues, "Nationalist political mobilization is at once vertical and horizontal and integrative and divisive. The attempt here is to bring together the individuals within one culture on the basis of equal power sharing on the one hand and to effectively exclude the non-members of the culture from such a sharing, on the other" (224). Alyosius delineates the threat of such cultural nationalism at the cost of political nationalism: "The articulation of cultural nationalism revolves around first,

the beliefs concerning the distinctness, integrity, uniqueness and superiority of one's culture and second, the claim that such a culture is the proper and legitimate repository of collective and determinative power" (131).

The clever king Mahendra imposed cultural nationalism by avoiding political nationalism. Political nationalism "is a destabilization of the old order of power configuration within society, in favour of the hitherto excluded masses" (Alyosius 147). Obviously, the cultural nationalists like the king Mahendra didn't entertain political nationalism. In the film, a lot of space has been given to cultural nationalism based on the culture, language and religion of the Hill based Khas Chhetris and Bahuns. Regarding the projection of the cultural identity, Sherpa argues, "In Nepal, the creation of an official national cultural identity has been an explicit project of the Hindu state" (3). From the very beginning, the male characters appear in *Daura Suruwal* and female characters in *Gunyo Choli*, the designated national costumes. Sometimes, the characters appear in other indigenous attires. But it is a kind of lip service only. Moreover, the *bhajans* and other songs persistently evoke Hindu gods and goddesses like Ram, Krishna, Pashupati and others. Rachel Dwyer, in this connection, argues that "cinema remains one of the main ways, along with practices and rituals of the state, that upper-caste Hinduism penetrates India" (140). The king Mahendra understood this fact. That's why he introduced cinema in Nepal. Here, *Maitighar*, too, becomes the monolithic nationalism's way of hegemonizing the marginalized indigenous communities so as to force them to accept the culture, religion and language of the ruling ethnic community.

In this connection, Higson argues that the cinema, an extension of the print capitalism, tends to be prescriptive rather than descriptive. According to Higson, "the process of identification is thus invariably a hegemonising, mythologizing process, involving both the

production and assignation of a certain set of meanings, the attempt to contain or prevent a proliferation of other meanings" (qtd. in Sherpa 20). Here, Jamie Miller's remark is also equally relevant: "Cinema presented the Bolsheviks with a potentially powerful weapon, as it was not only an exciting new technology; it was accessible and appealing to the masses as an art form that they could engage in" (*Soviet Cinema* 13). This is how the ruling group seeks to win the legitimacy for ruling over the rest of the communities through cinema. Nabin Subba's observation on the Nepali films is rather contextual in this connection:

> Regarding the language, religion and culture of the ruling community as the basis of national unity, not only did the king Mahendra poured the state's power in the cinema for its preservation and promotion but also ordered to shape the nature and texture of the Nepali cinema as per Hinduism and *Khas* culture by hiring the trainees of the Hindi film in the making of the language of the Nepali film for creating Hindu feudal aesthetics in the nature and texture of the film in order to establish it in the long run. (*Chalchitra Manch* 60)

Maitighar's emphasis on the culture, costume, language and religion belonging to the Hill based Hindu Khas community is evident. It has been possible because of the policy Mahendra had developed for sustaining the culture, language and religion of the ruling community. In this connection, Sherpa, in her "Un/Re Imagining Nepali National Cinema," argues, "The *Panchayat* period (1960-1990) witnessed a concerted effort to modernize Nepali society by implementing the ideals of the nation-state through a common Hindu-Sanskrit language and culture" (3). As a result, the culture, language and religion of the ruling community was privileged in the film as observed by Subba in these words: "The Hindu religion, the *Khas* as the name to Nepali language and the national costume, and the Hill based upper-caste people were privileged in the

film medium, too" (*Chalchitra Manch* 59). Here, we see how the narrative of this film has been shaped by the contemporary *Panchayati* system. Ashish Rajadhyaksha, in his "The Bollywoodization of the Indian Cinema: Cultural Nationalization of in a Global Arena," illustrates how the national-political constructions shape the narrative and spectatorial perspectives:

> Film theory has repeatedly demonstrated the crucial role that nationalist-political constructions play in determining narrative and spectatorial practices: Even in the instance of the American film, it has been demonstrated that it was only around 1939 when the notion of 'American unity', informed by the prewar situation that both necessitated and enabled national cohesion' and that saw the 'unified, national subject- the paradigmatic American viewer'- being put in the pace, did Hollywood actually deploy several of the technical and narrative conventions for which it is today reknowned and for which *Gone with the Wind* (1939) remains so crucial an event in American film history. (*Pleasure and the Nation* 30)

The same thing can be said about *Aama* and *Maitighar* since they were produced under the supervision of the king Mahendra, who had introduced very aggressive nationalist *Panchayati* autocratic system by dismantling the multiparty system. Due to this material reality, the narrative of *Maitighar* is interspersed with patriotic songs. The very symbols and images point towards the nation.

Moreover, it becomes clear that *Maitighar*, in terms of its erotic songs and dances, and its melodrama, try to lull the people by diverting them towards escapist entertainment as can be noticed in Bhagra's following observation: "Popular cinema, therefore, functions like a myth, and

the identification of the public with the characters is a way to escape from the hard realities of life" (75). *Maitighar*, too, does not rouse marginalized people for their rights. Instead, it, through the poison of escapist entertainment, interpellates the marginalized people to subsume themselves to language, culture and religion of the ruling ethnic community. In his article "Bhabi Nepalma Chalchitrako Sworup," Nabin Subba, in this regard, avers:

> In the film, too, the escapist entertainment was promoted for a long time so that the people from marginalized language, religion, ethnicity, culture and region would not seek their rights. The autocratic and monolithic governing systems always promote the escapist entertainment. For this purpose, they lay emphasis on formula and stereotype in the name of entertainment and professionalism. (*Chalchitra Manch* 60)

And, we see how this kind of cultural hegemony imposed by monolithic nationalism reduces the indigenous cultures and good practices into stereotypes, and eventually leads to their disintegration as illustrated in *Anagarik*.

Anagarik starts as Lal Bahadur Gurung, a retired Nepali British soldier, comes back to his home village in Rumjatar located in the eastern part of Nepal. While his children Usha and Ram are growing in the village, Lal Bahadur spends all of his time and money on drinks, a typical phenomenon among the indigenous retired soldiers. The Maoist insurgency looms large in the village. One day, Usha gets killed by a pressure cooker bomb planted by the insurgents targeting at the soldiers. Ram's mother, too, falls prey to a mysterious disease and dies as the Shaman (the witch doctor) fails to defeat the evil spirit eating her up. Ram, as a labourious student, passes the SLC in the first division. Despite his grandpa's persistent urge to join the British army, Ram goes

to Kathmandu for his further studies. He joins a private college. He makes a few friends over there. He falls in love with Usha, a Gurung girl from Tanahu, a district located in the western part of Nepal. When Ram and his friends, at the request of Usha, go to visit her village, he comes to learn that her family is about to get her married to a British soldier. Disheartened and frustrated, Ram gets back to Kathmandu. At the completion of graduation, he travels all over the city in search of a job in vain. He is teased by the upper caste officers including his former classmates, instead. As it is not possible to live in the city without job, he returns to his village mired in insurgency. He is forced to join the Maoist movement. One night, when the Maoist cadres beat the Chairperson of the Village Development Committee, Ram asks them not to use force. In return, his friends turn upon him. Somehow he manages to escape their clutch and he returns to Kathmandu to save his life next morning. Finally, as he sees no possibility within country, he decides to go to Hong Kong. The film ends with his departure to Hong Kong.

Obviously, *Anagarik* weaves a tale of the deterioration of an indigenous culture resulted by the imposition of modernity and other language on the Gurung community. Maddox's following observation clarifies how the nexus between Nepali language, as a national language, and modernity has a devastating impact on the indigenous communities: "As communities move from an oral culture, with literacy restricted to particular social elites, to one of the mass literacy and schooling, there is inevitably a cost in terms of decline in oral traditions and linguistic diversity. In Nepal, such a cost has been exacerbated by a hierarchical social order, and a particularly monolingual orientation to modernity" (206). *Anagarik* captures this reality in a candid way. In the film, the Gurungs of both Rumjatar and Tanahu, representing both the eastern and western parts of Nepal respectively, have already forgotten their mother tongue due to the imposition of Nepali language as the only national language. With the deterioration of their

language, their culture has also deteriorated. Except a few dregs of the Gurung culture like Rodhi and weakened Shamanism, we do not see much clear picture of true Gurung culture. It's not because the director has ignored the typical Gurung culture. Instead, he has captured the deteriorating Gurung culture because of the deterioration of the Gurung language. Mukta Tamang points out this problem in these words: "Since language bears ethnic community's history and tradition, their cultural identity is in crisis with the deterioration of language" (*Himal* 38). In the film, Usha (Sanjita Gurung), the female protagonist of *Anagarik*, questions the very unification of modern Nepal: “Sir, how meaningful and judicious was this unification campaign?” For the unification process led to the rise of rise of Khas communities at the cost of the indigenous communities. The teacher, a Brahmin one, tries to dodge her question in this way: "The question of yours is a political one." Justifying Prithvi Narayan Shah's unification of Nepal, the teacher argues, "If Prithvi Narayan Shah had not unified the country, any other bold king of another state would have surely done it." It's quite natural on the part of the Brahmin teacher that he does not understand what it means to be an unbecoming citizen in one's own country. He thinks that the people would not have been non citizens even in the absence of the country called Nepal despite many indigenous people have become unbecoming citizens even in the presence of the country called Nepal. That's why he makes a very lame argument: "We can further imagine this country called Nepal might not have existed. But certainly, we would not have been non citizens." Instead of trying to understand the reality, he resorts to some kind of fantasy. Even in the absence of Nepal, he claims, "Each of us would have had a country, a flag, a language and culture, . . . and this earth."

Along the similar line, Spivak, in her essay "Nationalism and the Imagination," argues, "Language helps to develop nationalism because the mother tongue negotiates the public and the

private" (8). That's why the Nepali nationalism is pushing hard to sustain the only Nepali language as the national language. The monolithic nationalism bears paranoia towards the minority language rights since they, as per Bryan Maddox, "are widely perceived as a threat to national integrity, and a source of ethnic nationalism" (205). This paranoia is evident in Dirgha Raj Prasai's article "History of Nepali Language and Its Importance." Highlighting the importance of the Nepali language, he expresses his anxiety in this way: "If these languages had a prospect in the international arena, it could have been taken as a positive step. If forceful attempts are made to transform the local ethnic languages into official language of correspondence, it will result in ethnic conflict, which, in turn, may harm national unity. The Nepalese scattered here and in other nations should be alert to prevent such a situation" (5). Prasai's writing reflects his paranoia towards the indigenous languages. Upadhyaya thinks that such phenomenon is a universal one: "This is a universal view, it seems, when the issues related to ethnic/multi-cultural identities come in the way of establishing national identity" (119). The people like Prasai sideline the indigenous communities in order to justify the establishment of the monolithic nation state. We can bring in May's argument to understand it better: "Nation states are embracing and cohesive, whereas ethnic groups are exclusive and divisive. Nation states represent modernity while ethnic groups simply represent a harping, mis-informed, and misguided nostalgia" (May 20).

Likewise, the flag bearers of Nepali nationalism have created a trap of primordialism and instrumentalism to express their cynicism towards the demand for indigenous rights. Deriving from Gellner, Maddox says, "It has been argued that demands for indigenous rights are overtly primordialist, and that they may simply serve the instrumentalist needs of a newly emerging indigenous elite" (205). Therefore, such critics, as Maddox argues with a reference to Krishna

Bhattachan, "tend to overstate the risks involved in reform and ultimately re-enforce linguistic inequality and the dominant 'monolingual nationalism’" (205). Obviously, it has imposed socio-economic-cultural pressures on the indigenous communities. And, these pressures may result into violence. Ram Babu Gurung, the Director of the film, warns, “If the monolithic state fails to respect the indigenous people, the country will undergo a great crisis” (*Nawatalash* 25).

The recent researches by the scholars like Fisher, Krauskof, Kramer, and de Sales "have suggested that resistance to Nepali mono-linguistic nationalism at the grass roots is one of the underlying factors fueling the current conflict" (Maddox 205). Taking advantage of this very factor, the Maoists waged a ten year insurgency with the support of the marginalized communities of the country. They, according to Tamang, "made major advances by incorporating historically oppressed groups such as indigenous peoples and dalits as collaborators in their revolutionary movement" (293). However, the people had his doubts about whether or not the Maoist promises on cultural equality, caste and ethnic liberation are more than a positive façade designed to lure them into the insurgency and thus merely mobilizing tactics to realize their totalitarian political ends" (Tamang 294). After all, "coercion and threats are key aspects of the increasingly militarized approaches the Maoists take that violate human beings and their right to produce themselves and their culture" (Tamang 296).

The terror of Maoist insurgency prevails throughout the film. Even when Ram (Daya Hang Rai), after failing to get job, wants to return home, Garjaman (Mithai Gurung), his grandpa, says, "Come later when the situation improves. It isn't good now." In order to protect Ram, the Gurung family wants him to join the British army. An idealist Ram argues that he wants to do something in his own country. He doesn't want to be a modern slave. Garjaman warns Ram: “What do you do if you don’t go abroad? Do you want to be gunned down?”

Here, we can also see how Ram's father and grandfather have been brainwashed. As people belonging to the indigenous community, they can't even think of building up career in their own country. When Ram argues that whatever his ancestors have done is enough regarding the foreign army, his father challenges him with these questions: "Does being a Lahure mean only to earn money? Is that what you have understood? Is it not to inherit the name and fame of our ancestors?" To his father and grandfather, being a Lahure is a tradition. Ironically, Sushil, who aspires join the British army, makes fun of the Lahure culture prevailing in the indigenous communities in this way: "They fulfill the dreams of some and make ashes of that of many others. We are victims of Lahures." Sushil's argument manifests the hazardous impacts of the Lahure culture on the young people of the indigenous communities. Indeed, the indigenous people have been victimized by the Lahure culture.

Ram, an unemployed indigenous youth, is coerced to join Maoists. Yet he seems to be hopeful regarding the Maoists. He accompanies the Maoist squad, which takes action against the Chairperson (Shravan Mukarung) of the Village Development Committee. The Maoist cadres manhandle the Chairperson. Ram does not like the use of force. He says, "It is not the right thing to do. You should not manhandle him." Consequently, his own friends start attacking him. He flees from the village. He is disillusioned with Maoists. He realizes that he is an unbecoming citizen. He decides to leave Nepal. Suddenly Sushil (Ram Gurung), his friend, appears. Ram says, "I am unable to live here in this situation." Sushil is bewildered. He doesn't understand how Ram, a role model of educated indigenous youth like him, can undergo a drastic change like this. He says to Ram, "How can you say like that? Where is your faith? That ideal? How could you change like that?" Ram replies, "Yes Sushil, I changed myself. I changed my faith . . . I want to

break my ideal." He finds no support from the state to retain his faith. Whatever faith he had regarding the country was just an ideology of the monolithic state.

Here, it is essential to discuss the concept of *janajati* so as to discuss the plights of the marginalized *janajati* communities like the Gurung as depicted in *Anagarik*. Though both nationalism and *janajati* are modern concepts, nationalism, as the ideology of the state, has been able to appropriate modernity to realize its objectives. It's not easy to define *janajati*. We, as Seika Sato does, can relate *janajati* to ethnicity. Accoring to her, *janajati* is

> a localized (i.e., "Nepalized") expression of the community model (as well as a community built upon that model) known as "ethnicity" or "ethnic group" in Western parlance, which was in turn a community model generated and propagated mainly through as well as against modern nationalism, the movement to constitute a political community built upon the model of "nation." (356)

The above passage brings the nexus between nationalism and modernity to the light of the day. Sato argues that *janajati* was devised to counter the modern nationalism. Undoubtedly, *janajati*, like its Western counterpart ethnicity, prefers the marginalized over elites and cultural diversity over monolithic nationalism. *Janajati* has been "widely adopted by minor, marginalized peoples . . . in their efforts mainly against the homogenizing tide of nationalism" (Sato 357). *Janajati*, as a cultural and political construct of the marginalized communities, consists of certain traits so as to separate itself from the "Nepali official nationalism which tried to assimilate various minority groups under the aegis of the cultural traits of those in power, i.e., of high caste hill Hindus" (Sato 357). Therefore, "the *janajati*/ethnic movement is a cultural-cum-political enterprise to build and assert unique communities against the homogenizing trends of nationalism . . ." (Sato

357). Obviously, this film is a part of the *janajati* movement. Chhatra Karki sheds light on the relevance of the film *Anagarik* in these words: "At present the indigenous communities have been fighting for their identity and space. *Anagarik* has tried to include the voice of these citizens, who have been undergoing the oppression and exploitation for years" (*Samaya* 56).

When Ram is desperately looking for a job, he encounters an upper caste officer. Instead of offering him a job, the officer says, "Moreover, you people like Gurungs and Magars should join foreign army, shouldn't you?" This is how the upper caste people, who have occupied the important posts in the important offices, discriminate the indigenous people. We can discuss this problem of the caste in the light of Ambedkar's ideas on the Gandhian nationalism as well. Discussing the limitations of the Gandhian nationalism, Ambedkar, in *What Congress and Gandhi have done to Untouchables*, argues, "Instead of surrendering privileges in the name of nationalism, the governing class in India is using or misusing the slogan of nationalism to maintain its privileges. Whenever the servile classes ask for reservations in the legislatures, in the executive and in public services, the governing class raises the cry of 'nationalism in danger'" (226). Ambedkar's observation matches the present condition of the movements of Dalits and indigenous communities. As they are raising their voices for their due rights and privileges, the ruling ethnic communities are expressing concerns about the integrity of nation. It is only their ploy to stop these marginalized groups from getting their rights.

After failing to get a job, Ram realizes that the state has not ensured job for even the educated indigenous people. Out of frustration, he says, "Job for us in this country? Impossible!" One of his classmates has already become an officer. He is from upper caste. He teases Ram regarding his name 'Ram', an ideal Hindu king from the epic *Ramayana*, and argues that this is his own kingdom. Ram challenges the complacent upper caste guy: "But you've already grabbed

it! How can you give it to me? The state should give." Ram knows very well that individual solution doesn't work. It is not just a matter of Ram. It is the problem of all the indigenous people. The issue of caste becomes prominent for the people here as "caste does govern, very often, whom they vote for, how much they study and what work they end up doing. In other words, caste has a fully entrenched presence and a role to play in politics, in electoral democracy, in social reproduction and in the spheres of education and employment" (Vajpeyi 313). Here, caste determines the biopolitics regarding who should survive and who should perish.

The state has arranged things for the Hill based upper caste Hindus whereas it has nothing to offer to the indigenous people like Ram and Sushil. Discussing the significance of caste system in India, Vajpeyi argues that "biopolitics in South Asia can not be understood absent caste. Whether in pre-modernity or in modernity, whether through Dharma or through democracy, for better or worse, caste shapes the very bios, the political life of the human collective in India . . ." (Vajpeyi 313). And, the same is applicable in the case of Nepal in terms of caste system as noticed in the film.

Gellner, in his introductory writing to *Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom*, depicts how modernity, in terms of development and democracy, is connected to nationalism: "'Nationalism' (*rastriyata*), 'democracy' (*prajatanra*) and 'development' (*bikas*) are the three holy mantras of Nepalese politics" (10). This politics is, as the very nomenclature suggests, is limited to the Nepali culture, i.e., elite Paharia culture. Therefore, there is no space left for the indigenous people like Ram. In the film, Sushil makes fun of the nationalism's appropriation of democracy and development in this way: "There have been readymade issues since 1950. For example, democracy, change, development and peace." Ram realizes that the monolithic state

does not have anything to offer to the indigenous people. Instead, it has taken away everything from them. It's a great irony that the *indigenous people* have turned into unbecoming citizens. Ram says, "Sushil, it seems that our forefathers had only saved the sky for us in this country. They had not saved air to breathe. The river was ours but the water was already at the hands of others." Ram's expression reflects the helpless and hapless state of the indigenous people in Nepal. In his desperation, he says to Ram, "How helpless have we become?" Prakash Thansuhang, as an indigenous critic, is overwhelmed by the way the film has portrayed the reality of the indigenous people. He expresses that “the dialogue made us emotional and rebellious . . . . Yes, we are unbecoming citizens” (38). Thansuhang applauds the way the film has portrayed the reality of the indigenous people.

Since the film particularly focuses on the deterioration of the Gurung culture and language due to the nationalism's appropriation of modernity, it is significant to discuss the Gurung culture and language in the light of both the film and the ideas of the relevant scholars. Macfarlane, in his "Identity and Change among the Gurungs (Tamu-mai) of Central Nepal," cites one of the decisions made by the nation-wide Gurung conference held in 1992 in this way: "Gurung history was written and distorted by Brahmans" (184). Due to the cultural onslaught brought about by the imposition of Hinduism coupled with the deterioration in their traditional agricultural production, we can notice "a loss of confidence in the value of Gurung traditions and culture: a revolution of rising expectations, a growing frustration and disillusionment, especially among the young people" (Macfarlane187).

In the film, Ram, the protagonist, a young Gurung man, illustrates this fact. He is disillusioned with his ideals about his country when he learns that there are no opportunities and rights left for him. Nor is there any chance of restoring the cultural identity. He is no longer a

citizen. Out of this disillusionment, he decides to go to Hong Kong for earning livelihood. It is a "historic failure of the nation to come to its own" (Guha 7). Likewise, Alyosius argues that "when imagination is limited to a minority of the elite, it turns out to be an illusion to the masses-the nation" (225). In the film, the nation remains mere an illusion to the indigenous people like Ram and Sushil. The same is the story of Lal Bahadur Gurung. Lal Bahadur, Ram's father, a retired British soldier, can not adjust himself to the society. He indulges himself into drinks and brawls all the time. Finally, he asks his father's permission to go to Hong Kong: "Father, I'll go to Hong Kong. I came to know that they are looking for security guards." When his father questions him why he should go now, Lal Bahadur Gurung replies, "What would I do even if I remained here?" Here, Lal Bahudur remains an unbecoming citizen throughout his life.

Macfarlane rightly claims, "Part of this cultural pressure comes in the form of religious pressure. There is a growing threat from and dominance by the competing literate world religions, Hinduism and Buddhism, threaten the old unwritten shamanic religion of the Gurungs" (187). Harka Gurung illustrates how Gurungs have been undergoing cultural onslaught at the hands of the monolithic and hegemonic Hinduism, one of the pillars of Nepali nationalism: “The Gurungs gave up beef-eating and adopted other Hindu customs. Since their Lamaistic attachment made it problematic to assimilate them into Hindu fold (as in the case of Tamangs), the alternative for social upgrading was internal cleavage . . . in its Brahmanic interpretation subscribed to by some of their elites” (508). So they, following the Hindu caste system, have been divided into two clans: ‘Char Jat’ and ‘Sorah Jat’. In this case, Nepali nationalism, with the support of its hegemonizing Hinduism, has resorted to 'divide and rule' policy to subdue the Gurung community. The present film *Anaagarik* is also a cultural reaction to these pressures.

We see how the Gurung culture is deteriorating in a small village of Rumjatar. The people do not speak Gurung language. Nor do they follow the typical Gurung rites and rituals. Instead, they have been already turned into Hindus. However, we can see them practise shamanism, which shows their affiliation to their Lamaic tradition. But their shamanism, due to the cultural onslaught brought about by the monolithic nationalism spearheaded by Hinduism, has grown weak. The Shaman called for the treatment manages to diagnose the problem: “She has been under the spell of some evil spirit.” He is defeated at the hands of the evil spirit, however. The shaman falls flat on the ground. The film portrays him with the help of a top angle shot. This shot foregrounds his helplessness. The shaman says, "The rest lies in the hands of the almighty. What can we do?" Here, the cultural onslaught brought about by hegemonic Hinduism working for the monolithic nationalism emerges as the evil spirit, which has weakened the Gurung people's faith in their own best practices like shamanism. Nabin Subba rightly argues:

> [W]hen the king Mahendra introduced it to reinforce the autocratic *Panchayati* system, not only did he use it as a political propaganda but also to establish his cultural policy of one language, one costume, one religion, one country among the people. Not only did it prohibit other language, religion and culture in the field of cinema but helped speed up the deterioration of those languages, religions and cultures. (*Chalchitra Manch* 59)

Subba presents the king Mahendra's hegemonic policy of one language, one costume, one religion, and one country as the cause of deterioration of the other indigenous cultures, religions and languages. Contemplating the deterioration of the Gurung culture and the position of the indigenous people in Nepal, Ram says, "Sushil, it seems that our forefathers had only saved the sky for us in this country. They had not saved air to breathe. The river was ours but the water

was already at the hands of others." He adds, "We've to offer our head even to put our feet on this soil? How helpless have we become?" Ram's expression reflects the helplessness of the indigenous people in their own country.

The challenge Sushil poses to Ram, however, gives an alternative perspective. When Ram tells him that he is leaving for Hong Kong, Sushil bursts out in this way: "But this is cowardly of you. Your weakness. You are holding your ancestors responsible for your weakness. I'll never accept it! You are a traitor! You're a coward and escapist! You donkey!" Ram's migration, however, is not escapism as Sushil believes. Nor is Ram a traitor. Instead, the migration is just a concrete manifestation of Ram's disillusionment with the monolithic nation state. Thus, Ram represents dismal and bleak condition of the indigenous youth in Nepal at present. This outburst of Sushil against Ram shows that Sushil, a person trying hard to join the British army like most of the indigenous youth in Nepal do, has adopted Ram's faith. Here, Sushil emerges as an embodiment of hope for the indigenous people. The film's ending also justifies it. When we see a plane carrying Ram to Hongkong take off, the typical Gurung music used in Rodhi dance plays at the background. It serves two purposes. Firstly, it prevents the audience taking Ram's departure as a tragic event. This departure only brings the predicament of the indigenous youth to the limelight. This lighthearted background score accompanied by a beautiful panoramic view of green and fresh Kathmandu valley only reinforces hope. For Sushil, Ram's alter ego, is still in Nepal. The indigenous movement has not come to end with Ram's departure. Instead, it is getting more reinforced in the form of the youth like Sushil. The disillusionment of the indigenous people's towards the apathetic state has only given them an impetus to move ahead. Secondly, it is an assertion of the Gurung cultural identity.

In all, *Anagarik* is a cultural reaction to the pressures imposed on the indigenous communities like Gurung community by the state. The state resorts to appropriation of modernity so as to reinforce as well as sustain its monolithic ideology rooted on the *Paharia* culture by pushing the indigenous communities to the margins. In this connection, the film depicts deterioration of the Gurung culture in terms of the disintegration of language, religion and economy. The Gurung people have forgotten the Gurung language. Likewise, they are not clear about religion. They somehow practise shamanism. It shows their affiliation with Tibetan Lamaic tradition. However, they have been already brainwashed by Hinduism. In the film, the monolithic nationalism has appropriated every force of modernity whether it be democracy, development, education, job or identity, and thus subsumes the Gurung culture to itself. In such a context, the film presents an indigenous person like Ram and Usha, who start questioning the nationalism imposed on them. They see how they have been turned into people without due rights and opportunities which they, as citizens, really deserve. Ram's decision to migrate to Hongkong only highlights the plights of the indigenous communities further. Therefore, this ending forces the concerned communities, both the elites and the indigenous ones, to pay attention to the pressures and devastations resulted by monolithic Nepali nationalism's appropriation of modernity to sustain itself by subsuming the cultural diversity. Moreover, there is a large space left for hope. For Sushil, who has incepted the ideals from Ram, is in Nepal. Of course, the indigenous people like Ram, Usha and Sushil can also resort to violence if the condition for them worsens. Migration, as shown in the film, is not the only outlet left for them. However, the director shies away from violence. Perhaps he does not see solution in violence. Therefore, he portrays Ram as a person disillusioned with the coercion and violence Maoist insurgents practise. In reality, violence, as an outlet to the pressures, still looms large.

Anyway, the dramatic way of highlighting the problems the indigenous people have been facing in their own country also gives us a hint that there is no alternative to polycentric nationalism. Furthermore, the film's endeavor to bring the Gurung cultural practices, occupation like carpet weaving, and folk music and dance to the limelight manifests its assertion of cultural identity of indigenous communities including the Gurung community. In this way, the film seeks to create a space for the cultural identities of the indigenous communities. In this regard, Sherpa's observation is rather relevant: "Current movements in Nepal led by many of sixty 'caste' and 'ethnic' groups for the recognition of a variety of rights is a part of an explicit questioning of Nepali national identity" (16). Demands for ethnic languages and cultures have put the question of the integrated national identity in question. Furthermore, the indigenous people, as per Turner, have started doing "the appropriation and use of the new technologies by indigenous peoples by their own ends" (qtd. in Sherpa 22). Because of this, the indigenous filmmakers have been able to make films, which have transcended the parochial nationalism. Sherpa rightly avers, "In the process, the Nepali state and the national society at large are bypassed in favor of various cultural nationalisms" (22). The irony is such that "the films made by ethnic directors and/or in ethnic languages will become the alternative cinema, which ironically represents the nation in the global film circuit" (Sherpa 25). These fissures observed in the Nepali nationalism show a different path for the day ahead despite the country is still under the grip of monolithic cultural nationalism.

In this manner, *Maitighar* has been presented as a film, which illustrates the way monolithic nationalism based on the religion, language and culture of the ruling ethnic community appropriates modernity so as to sustain and reinforce itself in the long run. *Anagarik*, on the other hand, illustrates the devastating consequences of such practice of monolithic

nationalism in the country like Nepal, which consists of diverse ethnic communities with their own mother tongues, cultures and religious practices. Likewise, it also manifests how these marginalized indigenous communities respond to such imposition of the monolithic nationalism. Slowly, the indigenous filmmakers are making their presence felt in the world cinema circuit. Their films like *Anagarik* and *Numafung* are taken as representations of the Nepali nation abroad whereas the mainstream Nepali films are still busy following melodramatic songs, dances and stories replete with the Hindu gods and goddesses, a trend set by the pioneering films like *Aama* and *Maitighar*.

III. Nationalism's Appropriation of Modernity in *Anagarik* and *Maitighar*

The present dissertation has examined *Maitighar* and *Anagarik*, two Nepali films representing the Nepali society from 60s and late 90s respectively, in terms of the nationalism's appropriation of modernity. After a meticulous study of both the films in the light of various critics on nationalism and modernity, it becomes clear that the monolithic hill based Hindu state has manipulated different forces of modernity like education, language, development, citizenship card, and communication technology so as to reinforce itself at the cost of the indigenous communities and their voices. Between these two films, *Maitighar* has been presented as a film, which illustrates the way monolithic nationalism based on the religion, language and culture of the ruling ethnic community appropriates modernity so as to sustain and reinforce itself in the long run. *Anagarik*, on the other hand, illustrates the devastating consequences of such practice of monolithic nationalism in the country like Nepal, which consists of diverse ethnic communities with their own mother tongues, cultures and religious practices. Likewise, it also manifests how these marginalized indigenous communities respond to such imposition of the monolithic nationalism.

The very history of the Nepali film commenced with a conscious role played by the then king Mahendra. While visiting America, he watched a number of films. He came to realize the film's power in educating the illiterate Nepali people across the country. On his way back, he picked up Hira Singh Khatri and asked him to direct the first Nepali film *Aama*, which upholds the good message of the *Panchayati* system suitable to the Nepali soil. He also managed the government personnel to show this film in many places of Nepal. Following *Aama*, *Maitighar* was produced. Though *Maitighar* was the first Nepali film to have been produced by the private sector, one mustn't ignore the presence of the autocratic *Panchayati* system. Therefore, this film,

too, upholds all the images and themes of nationalism based on unity in diversity. Unlike *Aama*, it is not that much direct in its nationalistic themes except in its songs. However, the underlying meanings of the portrayal of Maya as the mother nation, the use of a widow as a pure woman almost like a goddess, Maya's sacrifice for the sake of the husband and children paralleling to the Nepali citizen's sacrifice towards the nation, and the songs replete with patriotism make it amply clear that *Maitighar* upholds nationalism from the beginning to the end. And, interestingly, to achieve its goal, the film heavily relies on the forces of modernity. The Nepali modernity is not just the modernity under the influence of the West. Very often our modernity, especially in terms of the visual culture, is a negotiated modernity that blends influences from the West and India with the indigenous languages and customs. In *Maitighar,* the presence of Bollywood is the biggest evidence. Mala Sinha, who plays the role of Maya, was a celebrated Bollywood actress during 60s. Likewise, along with Nepali singers like Narayan Gopal and Premdhwaj Pradhan, the songs are sung by Indian singers like Lata Mangeshkar, Asha Bhonsle and Manna Dey. Furthermore, Sunil Dutt, one of the veteran Bollywood actors of 60s, also appears in a cameo role. He delivers the Chief Guest's speech in Hindi. We can see a scene of honeymoon picked from the Bollywood films. Moreover, there is also a birthday party scene. And, the reference to Britain as *Belayat* as the hero's destination for the further study also gives us a hint how the modern forces are entering Nepal through its porous borders. Against this background, we see Kathmandu grappling to be modern. We see the soldiers, who look like the *Belayati* soldiers in their outfit. We see the colleges like Tri-Chandra and ASCOL, the centres for educating people. The film dwells upon the need of education in a great deal. Maya sacrifices a lot for the sake of her children's education. She gets herself updated about her son's education though Rabi does not know about the existence of his mother. When she comes to learn that he is about to give up his

education due to the shortage of money, she, with the help of Gofle Dai, manages to provide him Rs. 5000/- to help him pursue his career as a lawyer. Likewise, she has sent her daughter to Kathmandu for the higher studies. Rather than letting Jagatman Subba ruining the career of her daughter, Maya poisons him to death. Here, Jagatman Subba, a person hailing from the indigenous Subba community, has been portrayed as a villain. Obviously, the Nepali speaking hill people belonging to Chhetri caste, have been presented as the people, who play main roles including Maya, Mohan and Mohan's family despite the film does not delineate it concretely. Moreover, Maya, herself, has been portrayed as a person interested in books. She reads novels and religious books. In one scene, she even reads out lines from the Veda to Phoolmaya and Gofle Dai. This is how the importance of education for development of the nation has been foregrounded.

Here, it is interesting to observe the portrayal of the woman in the film. Obviously, the society depicted in the film is patriarchal one, where a woman is appreciated as a caretaker, beloved, wife and goddess. In all these roles, the woman is objectified and commodified. In the film, Maya's body's issue becomes very sensitive one as if everything depends on the sanctity she maintains as a woman, especially as a widow. Following the patriarchal tradition of putting the woman on the trial regarding her sanctity and devotion towards her husband, Maya has been portrayed as a woman, who becomes ready to sing and dance but not to sell her body. Actually, she has been kept alive for the sake of contribution and sacrifice she can make for the nation's development. For these things she is allowed to pursue the shady things like singing and dancing. She becomes an outsider, however. She might be worshipped for her sacrifice and contribution but not accepted by the Hindu patriarchal society. That's why she does not want to face the society. She dies in the prison. There is no room for her outside the prison.

In this very connection, the relationship between Gofle Dai and Maya is also interesting. Gofle Dai, a pimp, announces that he will protect Maya's sanctity at any cost as she has called him her *Dai*, her brother. In a way, his devotion towards her delineates a citizen's devotion towards the welfare and the development of the motherland. Surprisingly, Maya, to Gofle, becomes a symbol of the country. That's why he is selfless towards her. So, this is also another stint of nationalism in *Maitighar*.

The analysis of the patriotic songs makes it evident that the film has almost been used as a nationalistic propaganda rooted in modernity. Here, too, the presence of the king Mahendra as a composer of the songs looms large. The prayer, which opens the film, wishes the good luck to the motherland. It invokes the nation as a mother, a goddess. And, there is an expression of gratefulness towards this nation so that the people could think of paying it back through sacrifice. The title itself suggests country as the mother's house- or motherland. In the song entitled "Maitighar, maitighar, maitighar", the protagonist's birthplace Pokhara eventually turns into Nepal. This song directly praises the natural beauty, innocence, honesty, solidarity and love among the people. The way this song has been filmed also tells one volumes about its intention to convey the nationalist message of unity in diversity much required for the status quo and the so called integrity of the nation. The song sweeps over the significant indigenous cultures and costumes from all the Terai, the Hill and the Mountain. Finally, the first song the students at Tri-Chandra College sing during the cultural programme, too, directly projects the glory, pride and fame of Nepal and Nepali people. All the major national icons like Buddha, Sita, the Mt. Everest and the brave martyrs are invoked. The Nepalis, regardless of their diversities, are hailed to make sacrifice through unity for maintaining such a glorious history set by these national icons. Ignoring the illiteracy, poverty and oppression and exploitation of the marginalized people all

over the country, the song, by invoking the glorious past, tries to paint the image of Nepal as a land of peace and beauty. Following this song, many songs and dances are featured. They evoke the ethnic cultures of the nation. Such practice pays a lip service to the stereotypically represented indigenous communities only to give the false impression that there is a horizontal relationship between the ruling ethnic group and these marginalized indigenous communities. It only helps the monolithic nationalism create the impression of unity and diversity at the cost of the marginalized communities. Moreover, it becomes clear that *Maitighar*, in terms of its erotic songs and dances, and its melodrama, try to lull the people by diverting them towards escapist entertainment. It does not rouse marginalized people for their rights. Instead, it, through the poison of escapist entertainment, interpellates the marginalized people to subsume themselves to language, culture and religion of the ruling ethnic community. And, we see how this kind of cultural hegemony imposed by monolithic nationalism reduces the indigenous cultures and good practices into stereotypes and eventually leads to their disintegration as illustrated in *Anagarik*.

In Ram Gurung's film *Anagarik*, one can observe how Nepali nationalism's appropriation of modernity so as to reinforce as well as sustain its monolithic ideology rooted in the Paharia culture pushes the indigenous communities to the margins. In this connection, the film depicts deterioration of the Gurung culture in terms of the disintegration of language, religion and economy. The Gurung people have forgotten Gurung language. They speak Nepali since Nepali, in the context of state dictated by the monolithic Nepali nationalist ideology, is a language of power, job and opportunity. Likewise, they are not clear about religion. They somehow practice shamanism. It shows their affiliation with Tibetan Lamaic tradition. However, they have been already brainwashed by Hinduism. They are Hindus in every other respect in terms of their religiosity. In the film, the Nepali nationalism has appropriated every force of modernity whether

it be democracy, development, education, or citizenship, and thus subsumes the Gurung culture to itself. Therefore, the Gurungs do not even know how their cultural identity has been destroyed for the sake of so called national integrity sought after by the Nepali nationalism. However, the Gurung people, as they get an opportunity to be educated in a bit more liberal times after the restoration of democracy with the termination of the *Panchayati* system, become aware of all the devastations brought about by the monolithic Nepali nationalism. Consequently, they, like Ram, the protagonist of the film, start questioning the nationalism imposed on them. His education does not lead him to opportunities as he was promised. Instead, it leads him to a dead end turning him into an unbecoming citizen. He sees how the indigenous people including Gurungs have been turned into people without due rights and opportunities which they, as citizens, really deserve. In a way, they have turned into people without country in their own country. When this insight dawns in him, he realizes how devastating his ideal about the nationalism is. He realizes how he has been brainwashed by the Nepali nationalism. Whatever he has been pursuing in the name of democracy, freedom, integrity and development, he is actually following the path set by Nepali nationalism, which leads him to a dead end. That's how it has become a chain for him. Therefore, he decides to get rid of his ideal. Obviously, the ending of the film sounds pessimistic as the protagonist leaves Nepal for Hong Kong. However, it should not be taken as escapism as Sushil argues. Instead, this forced migration only highlights the plights of the indigenous communities like the Gurung. This kind of appropriation is a part of the Hill based upper caste communities' biopolitics to deprive the marginalized indigenous communities of the resources of the state so as to ensure their own access and control over those resources. In the long run, such biopolitics, as can be observed in the film, leads to the disintegration of the culture of the marginalized indigenous communities and eventually to their extinction. Therefore, the

melodramatic ending forces the concerned communities, both the elites and the indigenous ones, to pay attention to the pressures and devastations resulted by monolithic Nepali nationalism's appropriation of modernity to sustain itself by subsuming the cultural diversity. Of course, the indigenous people like Ram can also resort to violence if the condition for them worsens. Migration, as shown in the film, is not the only outlet left for them. However, the director shies away from violence. Perhaps he does not see solution in violence. Therefore, he portrays Ram as a person disillusioned with the coercion and violence Maoist insurgents practise. In reality, violence, as an outlet to the pressures, still looms large. Anyway, the dramatic way of highlighting the problems the indigenous people have been facing in their own country also gives us a hint that there is no alternative to polycentric nationalism.

In the recent years, demands for ethnic languages and cultures have put the integrity of the monolithic national identity in question. The marginalized indigenous communities have also started appropriating modernity for achieving their goals. Ironically, the indigenous films, due to this appropriation of modernity, have started disseminating the notions about Nepal and Nepali nationalism abroad by bypassing the mainstream films, which are still clinging to the monolithic nationalism of the ruling ethnic communities. This new trend in the Nepali film, in terms of the indigenous films, reflects the current time, when the indigenous communities are fighting hard for their due rights and privileges as our country is moving towards the federal republic. Again, we should not forget that these indigenous cultures, themselves, are more political than cultural. So there is nothing like 'authentic culture' the way there is no nothing like nationalism based on unity in diversity in reality. Both the notions are ideological constructs. Many people, therefore, are scared of disintegration of Nepal at this juncture of history. However, there are possibilities of negotiations. Nationalism, when it turns into totalitarianism, must be questioned. Maybe all

the diverse nationalisms should be acknowledged and given required autonomy so that they could flourish together. Obviously, we need to find overarching unifying symbols/icons, which are not totalitarian at all, for the sake of unity. Maybe this is the path Nepal and the Nepali film should take in the days ahead.

IV. Works Cited

Advani, Shalini. *Schooling the National Imagination: Education, English and the Indian Modern*. New Delhi: OUP, 2009.

Ahmad, Aijaz. "Nationalism and Peculiarities of the Indian." *Nation in Imagination: Essays on Nationalism, Sub-Nationalisms and Narration*. Eds. C Vijayshree *et al*. New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2007. 37-57.

Aloysius, G.. *Nationalism without a Nation in India*. New York: OUP,1997.

Ambedkar, B.R. *What Congress and Gandhi have done to Untouchables*. Bombay: Thacker & Co., 1945. 226.

Anagarik. Dir. Ram Babu Gurung. Perf. Dayahang Rai, Ram Gurung, Meethai Gurung and Puskar Gurung. Vangra Films, 2008.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd ed. London: Verso, 1991. 6.

Anjan, L. “A Plight of being an Unbecoming Citizen in One’s Own Country." *Rooprekha* (April 3 2007): 5.

Aloysius, G.. *Nationalism without a Nation in India*. New York: OUP, 1997.

Aziz, Ashraf. *Light of the Universe: Essays on Hindustani Film Music*. New Delhi: Three Essays, 2003.

Baruah, Sanjib. *Ethnonationalism in India: A Reader.* New Delhi: OUP, 2010.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. 148.

Bhaukaji, Bimal. “Watching *Anagarik* as a Mute Audience.” *Rajdhani* (Feb 10, 2007): 7.

Bhugra, Dinesh. *Mad Tales from Bollywood: Portrayal of mental Illness in Conventional Hindi Cinema*. Hove: New York: Psychology press, 2006.

Bonitzer, Pascal and Serge Tobiana. "Anti-retro: Michel Foucault in interview with Pascal Bonitzer and Serge Tobiana."*Cahiers du CineFma*. Vol. 4. Ed. David Wilson. Trans. Annwyll Williams. London: New York: Routledge, 2000. 159-172.

Dasgupta, Susmita. "Commercial Cinema and Sociology." *Encyclopaedia of Hindi Cinema.* Eds. Gulzar, Govinda Nihilani and Saibal Chatterjee. New Delhi: Encyclopaedia Britannica (India) Pvt. Ltd., 2003. 367-81.

Dindukhi, Dipendra. "Plight of Being an Unbecoming Citizen.” *Nawatalsh* (Jan/Feb 2007): 25.

Dwyer, Rachel. *Filming the Gods: Religion and Indian Cinema*. London: New York: Routledge, 2006.

Garga, B.D. *The Art of Cinema: An Insider's Journey through Fifty Years of Film History*. New Delhi: Penguin, 2005.

Gaston, Robert. *The Indian Film Theory: Flame of Sholay, Notes and Beyond*. Calcutta:

Sampark, 2010.

Gautam, Bishnu. “A Good Beginning.” *The Rising Nepal* (March 30, 2007): 5.

---. "Politics and Nepali Cinema." *The Rising Nepal* (April 11, 2011): 5.

---. "Why Nepali Films Are Getting Weaker?" *The Rising Nepal* (Sep 6, 2010): 5.

---. "Satya Harishchandra: The Facts And The Myths." *The Rising Nepal* (March 21, 2010): 5.

Gautam, Deepa. "Nepali Chalchitra ra Mahila Hajuraamako pala (Nepali film and the generation of the grandmother)." *Chulchitra Manch* (Film stage) 3.3 (2009): 38-41.

Geiger, Jeffrey and R.C. Rutsky, eds. *Film Analysis: A Norton Reader*. New York: London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005.

Gellner, David N.. Introduction. *Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom*. Eds. David N. Gellner, Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and John Whelpton. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1997. 3-31.

---. Introduction. *Resistance and the State: Nepalese Experiences*. Ed. David Gellner. Delhi: Social Science Press, 1997. 1-30.

Ghimire, Raman. "Samakalin Sonch Chhaina Nepali Cinemama (There is no contemporary thought in Nepali cinema)." *Chulchitra Manch* (Film stage) 3.3 (2009): 52-57.

Greenfield, Liah. *Nationalism and the Mind: Essays on Modern Culture*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2006.

Gulzar, Govinda Nihilani and Saibal Chatterjee, eds. *Encyclopaedia of Hindi Cinema.* New Delhi: Encyclopaedia Britannica (India) Pvt. Ltd., 2003.

Gurung, Harka. “State and Society in Nepal.” *Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom*. Eds. David N. Gellner, Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and John Whelpton. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1997. 495-532.

Harris, Erika. *Nationalism: Theories and Cases*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Heide, William. *Bollywood Babylon: Interviews with Shyam Benegal*. New York: Berg, 2006.

Higson, Andrew. "The Concept of National Cinema. *Screen*. 36-46.

Islamoglu, Huri and Peter C. Perdue, eds. Introducton. *Shared Histories of Modernity: China, India and Ottoman Empire*. New Delhi: Routledge, 2009. 1-20.

Islamoglu, Huri. "Modernities Compared: State Transformations and Constitutions of Property In the Qing and Ottoman Empires." *Shared Histories of Modernity: China, India and Ottoman Empire*. Eds. Huri Islamoglu, and Peter C. Perdue New Delhi: Routledge, 2009. 109-146.

Jaffrelot, Christophe, ed. *Hindu Nationalism: A Reader*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2007.

Jain, Jyotindra. "Introduction: Image Mobility in India's Popular Culture." *India's Popular Culture: Iconic Spaces and Fluid Images*. Mumbai: Marg Publications, 2007. 7-17.

Karki, Chhatra. “When the Country Becomes a Foreign Land.” *Samaya* (April 5

2007): 56.

Kumar, Priya. *Limiting Secularism: The Ethics of Co-existence in Indian Literature and Film*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2008.

Lakier, Genevieve. "The Myth of the State is Real: Notes on the Study of the State in Nepal." *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 10.1 (June 2005): 135-170.

Lamsal, Dhruba. “The Lesson Taught by *Anagarik*.” *Nepali Shikhar* (Jan/Feb 2063): 64.

Liechty, Mark. *Suitably Modern: Making Middle-Class Culture in Kathmandu*. Kathmandu: Martin Chautari, 2008.

Limbu, Yubraj. "Under the Quilt of Sky: Unbecoming Citizens." *Gorakha Sainik Aawaj* (nd): 46.

Macfarlane, Alan. "Identity and Change among the Gurungs (Tamu-mai) of Central Nepal." *Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom*. Eds. David N. Gellner, Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and John Whelpton. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1997. 185-204.

Maddox, Bryan. "Language Policy, Modernist Ambivalence and Social Exclusion." *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 8.2 (Dec 2003): 205-224.

Madhava Prasad, M. *Ideology of the Hindi Film: A Historical Construction*. New Delhi: OUP, 1998.

Malla, Ashesh. "Abhibyaktika dui Shashakta Madhyam: Cinema ra Natya Rangamanch (Two strong means of expression: Cinema and Theatre)." *Chulchitra Manch* (Film stage) 3.3 (2009): 24-27.

Maitighar. Dir. D. B. Thapa. Perf. Mala Sinha, C. P. Lohani, Rajendra Nath, and Sunil Dutt. Sumonanjali Films Pvt. Ltd., 1966.

May, S. *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001.

Mazumdar, Rajani. *Bombay City: An Archive of the City*. Ranikhet: Permanent Black, 2007.

Mitsuhiro, Yoshimoto. "A Search for National Community." *Film Analysis: A Norton Reader*. Eds. Jeffrey Geiger and R.C. Rutsky, New York: London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005. 494-508.

Poole, Ross. "National Identity and Citizenship." *Identities*. Eds. Linda Martin Alcoff and Eduardo Mendieta. UK: Balckwell, 2003. 271-280.

Rajadhyaksha, Ashish. "The Bollywoodization of the Indian Cinema: Cultural Nationalization of in a Global Arena." *Pleasure and the Nation: The History, Politics and Consumption of Public Culture in India*. Eds. Rachel Dwyer and Christopher Pinney. New Delhi: OUP, 2001. 17-40.

Robert, Gaston. *The Indian Film Theory: Flames of Sholay, Notes and Beyond*. Calcutta: Sampark, 2010.

Rosenstone, Robert, ed. *Revisioning History: Film and Construction of a New Past*. New Jersey:

Princeton University Press, 1995.

Sarkar, Tanika. *Hindu Wife, Hindu Nation: Community, Religion and Cultural Nationalism*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001.

Sato, Seika. "Discourse and Practice of *Janajati*-Building." *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 11.2 (Dec 2006): 355-388.

Sharma, Prayag Raj. “Nation-Building, Multi-Ethnicity, and the Hindu State.” *Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom*. Eds. David N. Gellner, Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and John Whelpton. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1997. 471-494.

Sherpa, Kesang Doma. "Un/Re Imagining Nepali National Cinema." Diss. Yale University, 2004.

Smith, Anthony D.. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2001.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Nationalism and Imagination*. Calcutta: Seagull, 2010.

---. "Nationalism and the Imagination." *Nation in Imagination: Essays on Nationalism, Sub-Nationalisms and Narration*. Eds. C Vijayshree *et al*. New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2007. 1-20.

Stalin, Joseph. *The Essential Stalin: Major Theoretical Writings, 1950-52*. Ed. Bruce Franklin.

London: Croomhelm, 1973. 61.

Subba, Nabin. "Bhabi Nepalma Chalchitrako Sworup." *Chulchitra Manch* (Film stage) 3.3 (2009): 58-67.

Subba, Pragati. “Search for Identity.” *Nepal Focus* (Jan/Feb 2007): 40.

Subedi, Abhi. "Long time no see." *The Kathmandu Post* (July 6, 2011): 7.

Tamang, S. Mukta. "Culture, Caste and Ethnicity in the Maoist Movement." *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 11.2 (Dec 2006): 271-301.

---. "The Multilingual Policy of the Federal Nepal." *Himal* (Feb 2009): 38-40.

Tasker, Yvonne. *Fifty Contemporary Film Directors*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Taylor, Charles. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: London, Duke University Press, 2004.

Thamsuhang, Prakash. “Takphewa Tangnam, Thamel and *Anagarik*.” *Loktantra Nepal* (Jan/Feb 2007): 38.

Thapa, Bal Bahadur. "A Cultural Response to Nationalism's Appropriation of Modernity in *Anagarik*." *Pore ta* (rhododendron) 1 (2009): 68-76.

Thompson, Job B. *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of Media*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1995.

Upadhyaya, Phanindra K. "Multicultural and Multilingual Issues: Hegemony and Denial in the

Constitutions of Nepal since 1990." *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 5.1 (2011): 112-129.

Uprety, Sanjeev. "Nepali Modernities and Postmodernities." *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 12.2 (Dec 2007): 225-249.

Vajpeyi, Ananya. "A History of Caste in South Asia: From Pre-colonial Polity to Biopolitical State." *Shared Histories of Modernity: China, India and Ottoman Empire*. Eds. Huri Islamoglu, and Peter C. Perdue New Delhi: Routledge, 2009. 299-320.

van Dijk, T.A. "Denying racism: Elite discourse and racism." *Race Critical Theories*. Eds. P. Essed and D.T. Glodberg. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992. 307-324.

Vasudevan, Ravi S., ed. *Making Meaning in Indian Cinema*. New Delhi: OUP, 2000.

Vijayshree, C. Introduction. *Nation in Imagination: Essays on Nationalism, Sub-Nationalisms and Narration*. Eds. C Vijayshree *et al*. New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2007. ix- xvi.

Virdi, Jyotika. *The Cinematic Imagination: Indian Popular Films as Social History*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2008.

Vitali, Valentina. *Hindi Action Cinema: Industries, Narratives and Bodies*. New Delhi: OUP, 2008.

Warrington, Marine Hughes. *History Goes to the Movies: Studying History on Film*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Whelpton, John. “Political Identity in Nepal: State, Nation, and Community.”

Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom. Eds. David N. Gellner, Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka and John Whelpton. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1997. 39-78.