

**Tribhuvan University**

**Rhetoric of War on Terror and Discursive Hegemony:  
A Study of Representation of the Maoist Insurgency in Nepal**

**Khem Raj Khanal**

**A Dissertation**

**submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University**

**in partial fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of**

**M. Phil. in English**

**2011**

**Central Department of English**

**Tribhuvan University**

**Letter of Approval**

This thesis entitled “Rhetoric of War on Terror and Discursive Hegemony: A Study of Representation of the Maoist Insurgency in Nepal” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Khem Raj Khanal in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Degree of M. Phil. in English has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research committee.

**Members of the Research Committee:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Head

Date:

\_\_\_\_\_

## Abstract

This research work explores the interpellation between the U. S. discourses of “war on terror” and counter insurgency in Nepal. It interrogates how the discourse of “terrorism” and “war on terror” flows to Nepal through mediascapes. For this, I analyze the news headlines of *The Rising Nepal*, in relation to the U. S. War on terror. I scrutinize news headlines, published between 9/11 and November 26 (on the date Maoists were declared terrorist by the government of Nepal), which share the semiotics of the powerful rhetoric of war on terror and also the responses back. The research reveals the hegemonizing effect of the rhetoric of war on terror especially in the Nepali politicians who adopted it to conceptualize and represent the Maoists insurgency. After exploring the connection between war on terror and the Maoists insurgency, it moves on to expose how the U. S. and Indian attitude have influenced Nepali political discourses especially regarding the label ‘terrorist.’ To explore American attitude, a speech of an American envoy to Nepal has thoroughly been analyzed, particularly in reference to the Maoists conflict. The discourse also helped India continue its influence in Nepal’s defense system and political directions of the conflict in Nepal. Thus the discourse helped weakening the sovereign decision making power of Nepali politicians and made the nation susceptible to international interference. During the insurgency, the Maoists resisted the label of terrorist on them through the rhetoric of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist dialectics re-contextualized as ‘prachandapath’ to fit in Nepal. The research explores that the hegemony of the rhetoric of war on terror discourse in non-Maoist parties collides with the Maoist’s rhetoric of ‘capturing of the power.’ In such collision, a ‘state of exception’ is created, in which the country is disposed further to the foreign interference, and each individual in the state turns into the ‘*homosacer*/bare life,’ losing every right to life.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank Dr. Anirudra Thapa, my teacher and the supervisor of this dissertation for his complete supervision, and critical and creative suggestions. Thanks go to Dr. Beerendra Pandey who, introduced ‘terrorism’ as an issue of an academic debate in M. Phil. classes which was perhaps the inception of the issue for my dissertation.

I also thank Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, the Head of the Central Department of English, for allowing me to research in such a controversial issue like ‘terrorism as a discourse’ in Nepal. I extend my gratitude to my gurus Prof. Dr. Abhi Narayan Subedi, Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharam, Dr. Sanjeev Upreti, Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Shiva Rijal, Dr. Debora Merola, Dr. Ishori Pandey and Rajendra Panthee who at times had given me valuable suggestions. I would like to thank all of my colleagues and staff of the Central Department of English. All the friends of my M. Phil. batch who always expected some innovative idea from me deserve my thanks. I remember my friends Dr. Tara Lal Shrestha, Ashok, Laxman, Chandra, Dipendra, Mahendra, Prakash, Balu, Krishna, Nirodh and Kishor for their direct or indirect support. I thank Dr. Prafulla Kar, the Director of the Contemporary Theory Center, Barodara, India for providing me the Fellowship for South-Asian-Scholar in Residence, which was highly resourceful for me to build up ideas for understandings about terrorism.

Best wishes and supports from my parents, grandmother, Laxmi, Naba Raj, Tara, Chiran, Laxu and Kishor, Mitramani and Kulchandra were greatly valuable during the research.

Khem Raj Khanal

July 2011

## **Contents**

I. Context Formation: Post 9/11 “War on Terror” Discourse in Nepal	1
II. Discursive Interpellation between US "War against Terror" and Counter- Insurgency in Nepal	13
III. The Presence of the Super Power and Its Discursive Rhetoric towards Maoist Insurgency	49
IV. Discourse of Resistance against the Label, ‘Terrorist’	66
V. Power See-saw with Semiotics of Weapons: Unseen Big Brothers at the background	92
VI. Conclusion: Foreign Hegemony through “War on Terror”	121
Works Cited	129

## **I. Context Formation: Post 9/11 “War on Terror” Discourse in Nepal**

The discourse of “terrorism” and “war on terror” flowed to Nepal from the U.S. massively after the events of “terrorist attack” on September 11, 2001 through the headlines in different media: TV channels, magazines, newspapers and internet. The media showed the images of crumbling buildings of Pentagon and World Trade Center with the whole city in cloud of smoke and news of death of many lives. Therefore, it came through the news full of shock, suspense and horror. The headlines in the *The Rising Nepal (TRN)*, for instance, were "Planes Hit Sensitive U. S. Targets in Terror Attacks" with subheadings: “4 Planes Crash with 266 People on Abroad,” “Fear Grips Major Cities.” Along with the news of the events there was abundance of reactions and message from the U. S. President and heads of the government of other countries. Most of them, for instance Government of Nepal, condemned and expressed sadness towards the event and passed the motion of condolence to the victims and sympathies to the U. S. government and its citizens. The terms like “terrorism” and “war against terror” got massive discursive importance to represent the power relation in the foreign policy of the U. S. which could influence the use of language, rhetoric and its effect in the politico-cultural scenario of Nepal as well.

Discursively the U. S. government and Nepal government shared the same point of departure to look at the events of September 11 which is reflected in the letter of condolence issued by the government of Nepal. On September 13, 2001, the responses from Nepal government came with the headlines, for instance, of *TRN* on its first page, as "Nepal Denounces Terrorist Attacks in the U. S.", "House Passes the Motion of Condolence" and "MPs Slam the Barbaric Attacks." The U. S., after the event occurred, declared the global “war against terror” to fight against its enemies. At that time, Nepal was going through the almost half decade long Maoist insurgency.

In the aftermath of 9/11 Nepali politicians especially leading the government were attracted to the rhetoric of "war on terror." The rhetoric of war on terror in Nepal assumed the status of in Gramscian term, the "hegemonic" discourse (210). After about three months of the September 11 attacks in the U. S., the ruling political parties and the then King adopted exploited the strength of the U. S. discourse to counter the domestic insurgency. The government of Nepal declared the CPN (Maoists) as a terrorist organization in November 26, 2001 and imposed "Terrorist and Destructive Activities (control and Punish) Ordinance. The government of Nepal used the rhetoric because the discourse of war on terror remained pervasive across diverse globe in political and social spectrum including in Nepal. The 'people's war' of Nepal was even compared with the terrorist attack of September 11. The same label of "terrorist" put to Al Quada was given to the CPN (Maoist) of Nepal as well. The naming of the CPN (Maoist) as terrorist organization and the subsequent political and military strategies adopted towards the party reveals how Nepali political thought is influenced by international political discourse interested through media language.

Thorough the analysis of the head lines in *The Rising Nepal* between September 11, 2001 and November 26, 2001, this research shows the correspondence between the discourse of terrorism in the U. S. and Nepal. For this I analyze the articles and speeches from the Annual Journals of Nepal Council of World Affairs' form 2000-2009. Then, I have related the range of books written in the contexts of Nepalese conflict that focus on international dimensions. My focus of analysis is more on discursive formations than on political, for example, I have analyzed the discursive features in the speech of James F. Moriarty.

Though the insurgency was called terrorism, the researcher does have no intention of proving/disproving it as terrorism. However, the term has been used for

discussion because the then government of Nepal, India and the U. S. had already used the label “terrorism” on CPN (Maoist). It might be academically incorrect to call the conflict ‘terrorism,’ however, the use of force, tactics of killing, rape, suicide bombing, arson, vandalizing, loot, embargo, kidnap, disappearances etc of innocent people by both: the insurgents and the government have been assumed to have caused a lot of terror in individual psyche. It is the product not only caused by the insurgents and state but also was contributed by the elements of foreign aid. In the name of development and of freeing the country from poverty, foreign support has been accepted in Nepal. However, poverty, historical backwardness, political instability and its uneven relation to the big neighbors remained contributors in the conflict. In this context, the researcher is more focused on how the discourse of labeling the Maoists has its origin and interpellation with the rhetoric of the U. S. discourse of terrorism. The research has a critical stand on the rhetoric of “war on terror” from third world country’s perspective. This research, to my knowledge is the first research on “terrorism in Nepal”, so it has tried to uncover the surface and deep rooted causes for why Nepal had to face the discursive necessity of naming “insurgency” as terrorism and declare a “war on terror.” The conflict was called with various names like insurgencies, people’s war, protracted war, civil war, conflict, terrorism and, after the rebels joined the hands to peaceful movement; it was even called a successful revolution. So in such a context it is interesting to assess the origin and implication of terrorism in Nepal.

Clearly war and terror are intimately related. One way to distinguish as Charles Townshend puts is: “war is what states do; terrorism is the recourse of those too weak to oppose states openly. The essence of terrorism is the use of violence by



the armed against the unarmed” (8). Some general definitions have been collected by Townshend in *Introduction to Terrorism*:

The USA, for instance, defines it as ‘the calculated use or threat of violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or intimidate government or the societies’; the UK as ‘the use or threat, for the purpose of advancing a political, religious, or ideological course of action, of serious violence against any person or property’. (3)

From this, it is hard to specify the behavior thus indicted, since the word ‘intended’ in the first and the ‘purpose’ in the second definition are vague. In Nepal, the Royal Ordinance called “Terrorist and Disruptive [Control and Punishment] Ordinance 2001 (TADA)” in its clause 3 defines terrorist and disruptive act. All the sections (a) to (f) of the clause 3, define different acts with “motive” to cause terror or crimes. To see the US, UK and Nepal’s definitions, as Townshend concludes, “Terrorism appears to be a state of mind rather than an activity (3).” It is very difficult to know the state of mind of a person and even more of an organization.

Townshend says that terrorism is labeling, because ‘terrorist’ is a description that has almost never been voluntarily adopted by any individual or group. It is applied to them by other, first and foremost by the governments of the states they attack. But, when the state too uses the armed forces against unarmed people and terrorizes them, at this time too it’s difficult to detect the motive of the state. “State terrorism is a “terror which is a semi random byproduct of repressive violence” [which] “needs to be condemned” (53). Deepak Shrestha has stated that, the “state sponsored terror to destroy internal insurgents, opposition groups and their supporters has existed in Nepal as well” (235). Describing anti-terrorist measures, Shrestha has mentioned that “after 9/11, the wound inflicted on one metropolis scattered the heart

of an entire planet.” Townshend puts that the “Elements of terrorism are adopted by the terrorist groups, or insurgents or the states as well because it works” (22).

Therefore, someone’s freedom fighter is another’s terrorist because of the terrorist tactics adopted against one another. It has also been adopted as a “strategy of liberation” against dictatorship and for national independence so both the state or the insurgents are prone to adopt it (26). Due to this it has been hard to distinguish insurgencies, rebellions, civil wars, people’s war and terrorisms. Nepal also faces the complexity of the situation in the use of the term ‘terrorism’ since the conflict was political in nature, yet both adopted tactics that terrorized people both involved and uninvolved in the conflict.

The protracted insurgency of Maoist in Nepal, as well as responses to them lacks research focused on discourse of terrorism. So, this research, attempts to build upon the beats and pieces of writings produced in the aftermath of 9/11 and around protracted insurgency in Nepal and particularly those which touch upon the issue called terrorism, in context to international relation of Nepal with the U. S. and India.

In international context of Nepal, India and the U. S. labeling the CPN (Maoists) as terrorists organization one the one hand, helped the later party to maintain the international attention to the thought of “Prachandapath.” On the other hand, the Maoist exploited a sense of nationalism. They evoked people against the state by calling it a ‘feudalistic monarchical system’ as a puppet under the western mode of capitalist imperialism led by, the U. S India. On the other hand, the international attention, forced the Maoists realize the negative effects of violence upon innocent ones and be more "responsible" before the international community in terms of the party’s human right records. It pressurized them not to violate the human rights, rather to concentrate on attacking the army and police only. They also felt the

need to showing themselves as Bhaskar Gautam claims of more of political nature (549). Ultimately, labeling the Maoists as terrorist added a big strength to the government of Nepal to pressurize Maoist to come to the peace process. Foreign support to the Nepal army also continued, the conflict protracted, and a heavy loss of life of civilians from both the sides occurred.

The U. S. becomes a major supporter to influence the conflict in Nepal because of its active and powerful rhetoric of global war against terror, which was meant against the Maoists as well since the party was enlisted in the U. S. list of terrorist organization. There were some suspicions on U. S. rhetoric in Nepal especially from the nationalist as well Marxist critics. Prem Singh Bashnyat, a critic on international relation of Nepal puts, “we should not ignore that the major trouble spots in the globe are some how connected with American interests which are the draw back of American foreign policy... so Nepal should analyze the American security package before implementation” (149). He highlights that the U. S. interests might irritate Nepal’s neighboring countries. Taking into account of the U. S. past foreign policy, Noam Chomsky in *9/11*, harshly shows the indistinguishable nature of war on terror and fascism:

The language or terms of political discourse themselves are a tool for propagandizing. The population used to prevent us from understanding and to disempowering us. ... Any terminology is ideologically laden. It has two meanings: dictionary and used for ideological war fare. So "terrorism" is supposed to be the far left" in my view it's far right, basically indistinguishable from fascism. (37)

Chomsky does not talk about Nepal but his ideas dwell upon the duality of the meanings of the terminologies that is useful in discourse analysis. He deconstructs the

idea of terrorism connected to far left and show the possibility of it in far right side as well. Similarly, Chomsky points out that the Bush administration's policy of "preemptive" war is in actuality a policy of preventive war, as it allows for "the use of military force to eliminate an invented or imagined threat (37)." Nepali Maoist during the conflict opposed U. S. policy towards Nepal. It was perceived as a threat put forward by the ideologues like Maoists to the U. S. This perception of the U. S. is clearly revealed as James F. Moriarty says:

We can never forget that we are dealing with ideologues that have all the violent hallmarks of Stalin, Mao, and Pol Pot and now continue to insist on the righteousness of their armed struggle. Theirs would not be a regime of benevolent socialism. It would be an authoritarian assault on all free Nepalese. Everyday the Maoist assails democracy itself through attacks on political party workers, and other civilians who want nothing more than peace. (18)

Thus, the Maoists in Nepal were felt as threat for the U. S. values for they were, as the envoy has put, "trying to export violence to the peaceful neighbors (18)." The ambitious rhetoric of the Maoist leaders to perform exemplary twentieth century communist revolution to the world was directly clashing with the envoys rhetoric for democracy. In this research, the language used by the American ambassador James F. Moriarty has been found to have full of obligatory remarks like: 'the legitimate political parties must ...', 'You should have it' and, 'urgently so.' and 'absolutely vital for Nepal', 'the way to peace is ...', "Why the United States is so keenly interested in Nepal?" have been analyzed. He poses Maoists as terrorists and himself or America as the freedom fighter for Nepali children, women and people. The obligatory remarks were put on America emphasis for the existing parliamentary democracy with

monarchy. But, the Maoist opposed him as 'imperialist terrorist.' So the problem of the label is expressed in a complex phrase that 'one man's terrorist is another's freedom fighter and vice versa.

#### Power, State of Exception and the Nations as Bare Life

Labeling, as a discursive process, does more than merely reflect events that take place in the world; it interprets those events; formulates understandings; and constitutes their sociopolitical reality. The speeches made by the American Ambassador to Nepal James F. Moriarty as a discourse, exposes American view against the Maoist. To analyze the language it is found that India and the U. S. were on the one hand and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) on the other appeared most antagonistic during and after the conflict. The antagonistic relation between the forces of the third world countries and U. S foreign policy is explained by Magdoff:

There exists a fundamental clash between the U. S. foreign policy and the interest of the people in the underdeveloped world ... By exerting its efforts to contain the revolutionary impulse that seeks to free itself from the material and psychological bonds of imperialism, the U. S. foreign policy, including its military posture and action, in effect, is the primary obstacle to the development of the under- developed nations.

(1)

Such opinion about the cause of underdevelopment of the country like Nepal has been taught to their carders by the Maoists as well. It is expressed in their semiotics, the sign system which creates especial effect beyond mere linguistic representation. An economist would better explain it; however, the discursive obligation put by the U. S. on Nepal government can be read in the ambassador's use of language with obligatory grammar. The discourse does more than merely reflect events that take place in the

world. The grammar of the discourse on war on terror and representation of the Nepalese political parties by the U. S. and Indian authority unveils the uneven international relation of Nepal with these countries.

Such obligatory grammar had material consequences of actions to influence Nepal's security matter. *Nepali Sena: (Challenges over Control of Nepal Army)*, a book about Nepal Army edited by Sudhir Sharma, adds some objective proofs that Nepal's security conditions are influenced by India and the U. S. at times. Hodges's idea that "language use and process of meaning making is inherently political in that it is imbued with relations of power that come together to maneuver, contest and negotiate the meanings at stake" (1) is apparent in Nepal's foreign relation. The rhetoric of war on terror and obligatory languages intermingles with counter insurgency rhetoric and strategies in the discourse produced in response to 9/11 in Nepal, and to Nepalese conflict.

The ideas in this research are drawn from diverse sub-fields involved in the critical study of language, communication, media, cultural and political studies in relation to Foucaultian discourse of power relation. A critical perspective and a focus on discourses of war and terrorism in light of Maoist's insurgency in Nepal and its relation to the U. S. and India with the background of 9/11 provide the central organizing principle for all bits and pieces collected in it to form the text. This is a critical inquiry of the discourse. The moral of the critical inquiry is, as Hodges et al put:

Critical scholarship is motivated not only to study society for what it is, but for what it might become. In this way, critical scholarship desires to expose existing wrongs in society in an effort to shape a better world. Critical approaches, therefore, take a keen interest in

understanding the workings of power in an effort to counter abuses of power. (4)

As put above, the materials to this research are derived from diverse areas of socio-political discourses for understanding the workings of power in relation to the discourse of countering terrorism. As Horkheimer has said, "scholars in a vast array of disciplines can be seen to draw generally on the tradition of critical theory" (19). Many of the methodological approaches in this research have been drawn from the school known as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of James Paul Gee. Gee explains that discourse analysis is a "method of inquiry which believes that "language in use is everywhere and always 'political' (1)." But when a discourse interacts with other discourses, it hints to the Bakhtinian idea that language is polyglossic and is never neutral. Language use, and the use of all social signs, emerge from socio-cultural interaction, motivated by the struggles among different discourses. The emphasis on discourse also reflects a broader focus on "all forms of meaningful semiotics of human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use" (Blommaert qtd in Hodges et al 4). Along with individual utterances and their grammar, the interactions between different interest groups on the discourse for and against war on terror reveal the hidden politics of their discourse use for power.

Regarding discourse and power Michel Foucault have provided important frameworks. Notably, Foucault's idea of a "discourse formation" as Hodges contextualizes in critiquing 'war on terror' discourse, has potential for gaining power (7). The discourse of terrorism becomes a weapon to be exploited on the stage of global power" for "new world order (Erjavec qtd in Hodges 186)." The discourse flows from the U. S. to Nepal through Presidential speeches, speeches of American

envoys, Nepali politicians and multitudes of media among them *The Rising Nepal* has been analyzed here. Similarly, the information of Nepal goes to foreign governments through diplomats and intellectuals and media representations. Discourses have future claiming power. Borrowing ideas from “‘Emerging Threats’ and ‘Coming Dangers’: Claiming the Future for Preventive War,” of Patricia Dunmire, I have examined the ways speakers lay claim to the future in political discourse. The language use in the form of ‘act superior’ by India and the U. S. representatives suggests that they tend to place themselves in a privileged position in relation to knowledge of – and agency over – the future. This vision of the future control has been achieved through discourse of fear in the name of saving Nepal, in Hodge’s term, from being it a “failed/terrorist state” (5).

In terrorism/war against terror, to see from Foucault’s teleology of discourse, state power operates as bio power- that means it controls the individuals through multiple institutions. But, during war or terrorism, power operates from the top and from the below as well. When global war on terror becomes a part of the reality in a country, the subject country turns into the “state exception,” Giorgio Agamben’s term. Agamben in his *Homo Sacer*, revisits and revises Foucault’s account of the rise of modern biopower. Modern power operates at the level of bare life. At the root to sovereignty, there is the Roman figure of *homo sacer*, the sacred man who ‘may be killed and yet not sacrificed (8).’ The “terrorist” labeled individual becomes a *homo sacer*, similarly a nation labeled as terrorists by the super powers turns a *Homo sacer*. Sovereign power is founded upon the transgressive taking of ‘bare life’: violence and law are from their very inception conjoined. In the state of exception, the place of violence, sovereignty is at puzzle: what is ‘inside’ or what is outside’ law. The terrorist harboring nation’s sovereignty is always at stake in international relation



among colossal powers performing the discourse of terrorism and 'war on terror.'

Thus, the 'war on terror' discourse turns to have pragmatic value.

## **II. Discursive Interpellation between US "War against Terror" and Counter-Insurgency in Nepal**

It is interesting to trace out the process on how the discourse of "terrorism" versus "war on terror" came to Nepal dominantly after the terrorist attack in the U. S. in September 11, 2001, referred here as 9/11. Covering much of the spaces in the front pages, the news of 9/11 was reported in Nepalese media. The rhetoric, semiotics and language pattern to represent the events and actors of 9/11 were slowly and gradually begun to be used to represent the Maoists insurgency in Nepal that the party had launched since 13 February 1996 in the name of the "People's War." Context was formed; then, Maoists were declared "terrorists," by the government borrowing some ideas from the U. S. and Indian discourse of war on terror. Through the long process called "semiotic building" in critical discourse analysis, in Nepali context (Gee 139). The 'People's war', as Maoist's claimed it to have been, was named terrorism and even compared to Taliban or Al Qaeda. For instance Indian Foreign Minister Jaswanta Singh with the tag of terrorists and offered NA with 8 arba military support in 2058. American Ambassador to Nepal said the Maoists were the same as terrorists elsewhere such as the Shinin Path, Abu Sayaf, the Khemer rouge or Al Quada and did not withdraw the label of terrorist till 2010 and after. The UCPN (Maoist) has been requesting the US to remove the party from its lists of the "terrorist organizations." Nepali politicians, security forces and media, while they all accepted that it had been of different nature than that of the September 11 attack. Ramchandra Paudel, the leader of Nepali Congress, in an article questioned, "Is CPN (Maoists) revolutionary or terrorists?" Referring to the statements of American Ambassador's focus on need of foreign intervention for humanitarian purpose, he also hinted, "We cannot deny foreign intervention in the name of controlling terrorism."

Flow of discourses from one place to another is the reality of globalization. The discourse of war on terror against terrorisms in the world made a global flow after September 11 event. However as Arjun Appadurai says, in globalization though the flow of ideas is multifaceted, it is “uneven” and they flow “disjunctively” from the developed nations to the countries comparatively poorer and mainly located in the Third World. It is hard for those countries to resist, and the discourses construct the imaginaries and knowledge of the people, as Foucault says in "Truth and Power." Maoists tried to "refute what we are not [the label terrorist]", but in the overflow of the discourse on 'war against terrorism', their discourses remained too weak and they remained with the ‘terrorists’ label in the government’s discourse after November 26 2001. A state of Emergency is imposed in Nepal as recommended by Prime Minister Deuba. Maoist is declared to be a terrorist group. Thus the study of headlines in *The Rising Nepal*, referred here as *TRN*, the government supported publication especially in its English version between the date September 11 and November 26, 2001, helps reveal how the context of discourse on terrorism and war against terrorism/counter terrorism was discursively created in Nepal.

The CPN (Maoist) could resist at national level when the government of Nepal agreed to take the label terrorist back after the “peace-agreement was signed between the Seven Parties Alliance (SPA) and CPN (Maoist).” The seven parties (Nepali Congress, CPN UML, Nepali Congress Democratic, Janamorchha Nepal, Nepal Majdur Kishan Party, Nepal Sadbhavana Party Anandidevi, Samyukta Bammorchha) and the CPN (Maoists) signed a 12 peace agreement. However, the later party could not discursively out win the U. S. to take back the label of terrorist even after they became the largest party in the Constituent Assembly (CA). It shows that there must be a different point of departure and motive of the U. S. government to see the

Maoists Conflict than that of the people of Nepal and seven parties alliance after the CA Election. Election of Constituent Assembly was the bottom-line condition of the Maoists to proceed for peace talk but the government of Nepal denied it till the date they reached to the 12 point peace agreement. Before, the peace agreement, the government remained under the pressure of global war of the U. S. against terrorism. Both SPA and Maoists collaborated to abolish monarchy, declare the country as the republic one. On 2063 Jestha 4, the House of Parliament declared that there would be no right of the king and share the power in the government, however, since the “discourses” [of terrorism in international relations], as Gee puts, are connected to material world, activities, identities, politics, and semiotics” that contribute some other forms of power ( Gee 12). The other implication of the discursive power is linked to economic, military, political power and cultural hegemony. The discourse remained alive in Nepal's international relation, domestic politics and policy.

Responses to the 9/11 attacks were the first discursive procedures regarding the semiotic of terrorism. On September 12, the headlines in the *TRN* were "Planes Hit Sensitive US Targets in Terror Attacks" and with subheadings "4 Planes Crash with 266 People on Abroad," "Fear Grips major Cities.” TVs, magazines and newspapers images showed the crumbling building of Pentagon, and World Trade Center with the whole city in cloud of smoke. Therefore, the discourse of terrorism in the aftermath of 9/11 came to Nepali audience through the semiotics and texts of several kinds with pragmatics of shock, suspense, fear and grief performed/ represented on the Media spaces. On Sept 13, 2001, the responses from Nepal government came with the headlines, for instance, *TRN* in its first page as "Nepal Denounces Terrorist Attacks in US", "House Passes the Motion of Condolence" and "MPs Slam the Barbaric Attacks." Discursively the US government and Nepal

government shared the same point of departure to look at the event of September 11 through the discourse of condolence. Both the subject (Nepal as the giver of condolence) and object (US to whom it is given) are grievd to the sad event. It was natural among the nations to share the condolences.

As the condolences in the press releases and the news show the 'Prime Minister Sher Bahadur Deuba said that the Nepalese people have been deeply shocked and stunned hearing the terrorist attack in New York and Washington City of the United States on Tuesday morning.' "His Majesty Government strongly condemns this horrendous act of terrorism.' Prime Minister Deuba addressed both the house of the Parliament separately, on behalf of the Nepalese people and his majesty's government expressed deepest sympathies and condolences to the U. S. President George W. Bush through him to all American people and relatives and families of those killed in the attacks.” Likewise the war from 1996-2006 in Nepal with an estimated mortality of 13, 347 people of which government security forces committed 63% of the killings. The media, here *TRN*, tried to maintain neutrality with some sympathetic tone towards the victims and shared the same point of departure or attitude with them while reporting it. It is difficult to find out how all the common people reacted but since must of the media covered the news with condemnation of the attack, it must have been a shock to all the people as well. Shock effect in the audience is a feature of terrorism. “At this hour when the whole world is shocked , I want to reiterate his Majesty's Government's clear commitment to denounce any kind of terrorism and terrorist activity causing destruction and panic in the world in any name and pretext,” the PM said. The phrase in "any name and pretext" could naturally have been used to denounce the explanation of Al Quada. But the heteroglossic phrase also referrers to the conflict in Nepal since the speaker of this speech is Prime minister who used

similar phrases to refer to the violence at home country. This is further clear when he informed the parliament, “Against the background of this dreadful terrorist attack, the government has decided to alert and tighten all its security organs and management to avoid the loss of lives and properties of both Nepalese and foreigners in the Nepalese land,” He also informed that an emergency meeting of the council of minister that day, decided to mobilize security organs with high alert for the security of foreign citizens, missions, development projects and airlines services including other places of public importance. Prime Minister in the context to 9/11 further noted:

This event has compelled us to think about launching campaigns by all the governments of the world and people for a mutual cooperation and understanding against terrorism to end this kind of brutal inclination from civilized society. Any activities that aims to attain the political goal through violence murders and terror do not befit our civilized society. (*TRN Sep. 13*)

In this part of the speech, he defines terrorism as “any activities that aims to attain the political goal through violence murders and terror” and directly shows his compliance with the "world" to fight terrorism. Here, the word ‘world’ refers to the title news of The Rising Nepal that borrowed its title from AFP news agency which read, ‘The World Declares War on Terrorism’ published in the *TRN*. The violence, murders and terror can not be an alternative to peace, reconciliation and the democracy that grants the rights and paves the ways to fearlessly express the public opinion. Extending the speech he stated that, “we all Nepalese people condemn violence and terrorism” prime minister remarked, “we want to resolutely express the desire and rights of the whole humanity to live in a society free from fear, violence and terror (*TRN Sep. 13*).”

The government of Nepal expressed solidarity to the “world”, especially in condemning and fighting terrorism.

Discourses are dialogic product of multiple contexts and are responsive to the contexts of their production. The political players exploit the linguistic properties as their rhetorical means to generate contexts, connections and power through discourses in their favor. Before the government of Nepal reckoned the violence of Nepal as terrorism; it decided and declared that what existed in Nepal was actually terrorism, and those who did (Maoist) it as terrorists. Thus the conflict was named terrorism. Several voices had emerged in response to it. And, before the discourse was introduced in Nepal, especially the U. S. and India through their diplomats influence in creating context to name Maoist as terrorist. The US present had asked Nepal collectively along with to the rest of the world to answer few 'yes/no questions' which had to be responded by countries like Nepal clearly either to be in the 'axis of good or axis of evil.' The yes/no questions by nature of their linguist properties, always offer compulsive choices and are often imposed by the powerful and the superior to the comparatively weaker or the inferior one ones. To explore at underlying level, the questions meant: 'are you for terrorism or against it?' This came via media and diplomatic relations when the US president George W. Bush asked the then world audience in his 9/11 address. 'Do you support war on terror?' In such a context, the answers were only two: either 'yes' or 'no.' Nepal as a weaker country in comparison to the super power had a choice, a kind of existential choice in the sense that the choice might decide the future relation of Nepal to the U. S. If the Prime Minister did not agree, then, someone who agrees on 'war on terrorism', but not 'for terrorism', had to replace him. In such a context the then PM of Nepal utters 'war on terror' in Nepal and says, "It was not my choice but I was forced to .... as you know."

The "was forced to" is a dialogic and multifaceted passive voice expression. Why does the Prime minister hide the agent or the subject who forced him to do that action? There are reasons for using passive voice because it is used either for it's not necessary of its revelation or compulsion for its concealment. Both types of meanings work here. It was unnecessary to show the agent because it were obviously the violent activities of the Maoist's in the country that had "forced him to take the action" as the Prime Minister of the country. Everyone, the interlocutors of his speech at home and abroad would know it. It was not necessary to make his speech redundant by making the speech's context clear which was already clear to the listeners.

Secondly, the reason behind using, "I was forced to" as passive sentence, to declare state of emergency and 'war on terror,' was for concealment. It was to safeguard himself from telling the secret. He was not supposed to reveal who forced him to do it because there were the norms of diplomatic relation. In the discourse of diplomacy, it is not polite and sensible enough to use 'direct speech' or direct expression. The agents who 'forced' him were the members of the diplomatic relation, especially the leaders and envoys of powerful nations like America, India or the representatives of the super powers. It can not be ignored that the violent activities of armed struggle of the Maoist party was equally compelling to create such context. So, Prime Minister as an illocutioner had to maintain the rule of politeness and he had to be sincere to the superior power in using his language that is the rule of language. In such a context, it was easier for the prime minister (PM) to declare Maoist the terrorist without directly referring to the foreign influence? It would openly reveal the foreign interference so that people might have opposed or the rebels might have got justification to further escalate in the pretext of fighting against foreign influence. The PM could not, and in the discursive community of Diplomats he should not have done



it, therefore he made the use of passive voice to save his face from accepting the intervention of foreign powers in Nepal's internal affairs. Was there any thing personal that forced him to do so? The motive is also hidden under the discursivity of the passive. So for the then Prime Minister Sher Bahadur Deuwa a context was formed to declare existence of terrorism and 'war on terror' in Nepal so he uttered it.

Using passive does not mean everything is lost or hidden. However, he could conceal some information about the agent by using the passive, he uttered the 'war on terror' against Maoist insurgents, which was a big event in the history of Nepal because to 'say' something, that also by a King or Prime minister of a country, is to 'do' something big according to the critical discourse analysis. Maoists were labeled "terrorist" and the discourse of terrorism formally got entry through the mouth of the then King and the Prime minister in Nepal. In this context, it seems very interesting because it was not those Maoists who were supposed to have done it but those democrats, who opposed such actions of terror named the activities as "terrorism." It is nature of terrorism that nobody wants to be identified as terrorists themselves, but blame each other of being terrorists. This blaming game of language coincides with the "impulse of imitation" of each other's action that is to harm each other (Townshend 3).

Then, how should the Prime Minister or the government of His Majesty the King perform the 'war on terrorism?' since every action has an equal but opposite reaction. The war on terror, in other words the (government) going to attack the Maoists with all the force and international support instigated for the activities of Maoists on whom the label terrorist was put. In such a case, to use the tool, war on terror, the conversation with the source of the discourse that was the U. S., continued. We borrowed "your" tool but since it was foreign invention. How to tackle terrorism,

Nepal did not know. The discourse did not exactly fit in Nepal yet the government was trying. Some help was sought out. Then the foreign powers instructed the government, to follow what the US had done and how it had performed with the 'war on terror' discourse. Nepal responded and followed the US and the Indian mode of tackling terrorism by suppressing the insurgency. Since it was new for the Nepal government to implement, both the discourse and methods about how to operate war on terror were provided to the Nepal government and to its security forces. The U. S. and the Indian technical and intelligence support were sought after.

Thus, 'terrorism' and 'war on terror' were established in the Nepali universe of political, legal and media discourse as the new discourse opposed to Maoist claim for people's war. The co-reference between the international power players, especially, the U. S. and Nepal's interlocutors. Addressing the Council of World Affairs in Nepal, Prime Minister says, "We are committed to wipe out terrorism" (*NCWA* 2). "We" is a pronoun and a referent as well; but who does "we" exactly refer to? If by "we," he meant, all the people of Nepal, then among them some of them were "so called Maoist terrorists", or if you understand the government of Nepal, it should have been referred by 'it', instead of 'we.' So 'we' is a co-referent to the government of Nepal, its supporters on 'war on terror' at home and abroad. Since this speech was spoken before the Council of the World Affairs, 'we' might also refer to the people participated there who shared the similar perspective that the Maoist were terrorists, without much ado.

Discourse always has connections with the discourses of similar kinds of different places or sometimes with different discourse as well; and the connections are multifaceted. Quite few days before it declared the Maoist the 'terrorist', the government of Nepal had collected the records of the Maoists activities in the country with keen eyes to find the violent activities which could be called terroristic ones.

Some words and phrases recurred in US discourse on terrorism and war on terror got their presence in Nepal as well. The ways connections are made serve political purpose.

The connection of the discourse about suppressing the Maoist insurgency with the discourse of 'terrorism' and 'war on terror' on the date November 6, 2001, serves a huge political function in the history of Nepal. Throughout the research, I have shown how these connections and origin of discourse of terrorism in Nepal with the U. S. discourse of terrorism have served an interfering political goal of the international community and hegemonic response from the government of Nepal to the interference by “diminishing the state capacity” (Gupta 280). Whether or not the hegemony served myopic or farsighted consequences needs further researches on the political discourses in relations to the material world.

This project has attempted to analyze 'terrorism' in Nepal as a discourse, a new epistemology among other existing discourses. Thus, the term 'terrorism' in the title does not refer to acts themselves, but to the discourse, which has links with the meaning, and value aspects of the material world. More than referring to the exact activities it refers to the representation of the material world and its connection to the other semiotics and other discourses. By analyzing the connections, it tries to make the meanings and identities of the actors, in other words illocutionary forces in contexts, to reveal the politics of the discourse in Nepal's international relation, in order to as a researcher reassess the distribution of social goods caused by this discourse (Gee 12).

I have put the discourse on 'terrorism' and 'war on terror' in conversation in the context between the Nepal government and international power players especially U.S., India, European nations, UNO, China along with the Maoists' referred in the

then Nepal government's discourse as 'terrorist'. Sometimes the role of media, the public relations industries, particularly the *Rising Nepal*, *Gorkhapatra*, other government sponsored national dailies, *Kathmandu Post*, the English national daily form private sector. In addition, some information from the Maoist affiliated magazines and newspapers have been the source. Speeches of the political leaders between the period of September 11 and November 6, 2001 in particular, are taken as the main texts for analysis. These texts are linked with most dominant discourses published during that period.

The rationale behind choosing 'terrorism' as a discourse for analysis using the resources of language is to assess on how the discourse affected Nepali conflict. It reveals that in its escalation and its management, the unequal and uneven flow of the discourse from the west into the third world developing nations like Nepal, had hegemonic influence. My first task during my research is to recognize the locatedness of the discourse in international relation of Nepal. The analysis here primarily focuses on language, which "coincides with other stuffs" (Gee 2). As Gee puts, it involves acting-interacting, thinking, valuing, talking, sometimes writing and reading' in 'appropriate way with the appropriate props' at the 'post-conflict' period in Nepal. I am aware that 'discourse' on terrorism 'is not a unit with clear boundaries'. Therefore, here I want to make it further clear that uttering something, as 'terrorism' and 'doing terrorism' are different but the former may perform the function of the later.

"Discourse" on terrorism is "constructed and made to exist in the abstract as the coordinated patterns of words, deeds, values, tools, and objects", during the conflict and till now (at least in the U. S. definition and us list of terrorists) in relation to Nepal (Gee 2).

The same word "terrorism" in post conflict era may have different meanings, effects and responses than that in the period of conflict. Therefore, the discourse might function as a different rhetoric viewed from post-war, post peace accord-2006 and post Constituent Assembly election era of Nepal in which the once terrorists have become the biggest political actors in the CA election. "Discourses are always imbedded in the medley of social institutions, and often involve various "tropes" like books and magazines of various sorts. Discourses we represent and enact are "carriers" of any social or political values. "Discourses through our words, deeds carry on conversation with each others through history, and in doing so, form human history" (Gee 18).

In such conversation, multiple voices were coming from different political parties who represent different kinds of people in Nepal. In the following report narrated about the responses of the political parties of Nepal against the 9/11 event, I want to analyze the language of media and the political parties. As *TRN* reports the responses of the political parties' head leaders on the terrorists attack on 9/11 in the:

Also speaking today, deputy leader of CPN-UML parliamentary Committee K.P. Sharma Oli said that the UML strongly condemned this kind of terrorist attack and express deep condolence to the American people in the hour of shock and pains. He said the attack that had stunned the whole world was against whole humanity. (*TRN* 9/11)

This is an example of the voice of condemnation of the 9/11 attack and in favor of war on terror discourse. Next voice comes on behalf of Nepali Congress, "Member of parliament Ram Chandra Paudel said that it was the "attack against human civilization" (*TRN* 9/11). While saying this he repeats the phrase of American president George W. Bush. Stating that terrorism was a kind of cruel game that

deceitfully killed innocent people and made heavy losses in the society, Paudel said, "We Nepalese people are also suffering [like you or Americans] of the pains of the terrorism." Moreover, he empathetically showed the victimhood of Nepali from internal conflict similar to that of Americans in the 9/11. He maintained that victims were "us" and the actors of terrorism were "other." Similarly, voices kept on coming. Krishna Chandra Shrestha of Rastriya Prajatantra Party and Badri Prasad Mandal of Nepal Sadbhawana Party said that it was the horrendous crime against humanity and development. They too maintained the similar attitude to that of the government. These responses only condemned the terrorist but did not condemn the terrorist but did not question whether the US government was also responsible for it or not.

However, since discourses are "heteroglossic," multiplicity of meanings and responses were made (Bakhtin). In his essay "From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse," Bakhtin defines heteroglossia as the inherent diversity of unofficial forms of a particular national language. Bakhtin describes difficulties we face when forming our own opinions and ideas on a particular subject, a process he refers to as "ideological becoming" (Bakhtin 342). In doing so, he contrasts the official language or "authoritative discourse," which comes to us in the present from outside our consciousness, with "internally persuasive discourse," which comes from within our consciousness through assimilated forms of both official and unofficial language (Bakhtin 342). There were some responses that not only condemned the attack but also the US government. Lilamani Pokhrel, the General Secretary of the United People's Front Nepal, Narayan Man Bijukchhe of Nepal Workers and Peasant Party said their party was deeply saddened over the death of the innocent people in the attack. Pokhrel, however, said that it was due to the imperialistic attitude of the United States that had reached to the climax, some terrorist group attacked it. He also

protested the adjournment of the house of representative that day which unanimously approved a proposal of condolence and condemned the terrorist attack on the twin tower of the World trade centre in New York and in Pentagon, and the U. S. Defense Department in Washington DC Tuesday morning. Pokhrel's point of departure was a bit different from other parties towards the 9/11 attack and towards other party's responses. He maintained "us" position with the victims but critically showed the gothic or self-reflective nature of the verb. The cause of the attack for him is the U. S. itself. He maintained his position not in "we" but as "other" of other parties by stating that though the event was frightening, gothic or painful, to some extent; it was self-imposed or self-invited by American foreign policy i.e. "imperialistic attitude." At the root level, he assumed victimhood in the attacker's part as well. His point of view is more discursive and critical than the other has, though it sounded unconventional to the tone of condolence.

*TRN*, which was maintaining some neutrality, now openly takes side towards not only the victim but also towards the government of that country. On September 13, in its editorial, "Ghastly Assault", *TRN* writes, "all the peace-loving nations on earth must condemn such dastardly acts of terrorism, horrendous blow as it is for the Americans and their friends, and it should serve as an incident that prompts a renewed commitment from all the nations to stamp out terrorism. The same day there was a news that the "Prime Minister Wants to Work Together with the Press" to help government solve Maoist problem as well. The government was trying to bring the media in its favor because its media houses that disseminate the discourse that may help create truth that supports government.

On September 14, on the third day after attack of 9/11, the flow of ideas in the form of news and views in Nepali medias, for instance in pages of *TRN* about

"terrorism' and 'war on terror' were reported referring to the news agencies like *Washington Post*, *AFP*, *BBC*, *CNN* and so many other media in the Western World. "Top Intelligence Services Link that Attack to Bin Laden," "British, German and Israeli Intelligence services claimed strong proof of link to extremist Bin Laden; "The World Declares War on Terrorism;" "Coalition of Washington's Overseas Friends and Rivals Declared War on Terrorism;" NATO, China, Japan, Russia Germany Philippines and Britain All Agreed to Fight Terrorism" were the headlines. President Bush kept on saying: "terrorists will be hunted". Though, smaller countries like Nepal were not asked, they declared that "world" "war against terrorism." "Russia and NATO [too] focused on Intensifying Their Cooperation." In such an international context, "The Government Furnished the Detailed Activities of Maoists [said to have] Carried Out [by them] Since August 30" and highlighted the activities of violence done by the Maoists on 'ordinary people'. Each discourse has its relationally with the events and objects to gain authenticity of knowledge and truth.

Along with the international news on war on terror, "The Second Round of Peace Talk Begins at Tiger Top Resorts" on September 13, news about the conflict in Nepal was reported. "Krishna Bahadur Mahara [was] Representing the CPN- Maoists" which had been fighting in the name of "people's war" since 1996 (*TRN*). Daman Nath Dhungana and Padma Ratna Tuladhar were playing the role of mediator in on going peace talk. While 'peace talks' were appearing in the news papers the U. S. and Indian officials and Nepali 'main stream politician' were meeting time and again. The U. S. officials were concerned about 'terrorism' issues. 'Larry M. Dinger, the Charged Affairs a. i. of the U. S. Embassy in Kathmandu, declared "No Terrorist Connection on Terrorist Attacks in the U. S." Dinger expressed thanks to the Nepal government for its solidarity on the U. S. War on Terror:



US would welcome any information from Nepal and Nepalese on the recent terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. Talking to journalist he said, 'US is working to eliminate these terrorist activities from the world stage. "I have gone to the government of Nepal to seek assistance ... the Nepalese government has said that it would assist as Priminister Sher Bahadur Deuwa expressed in the Nepalese parliament, he said. He also said they had not received any information of Nepal's connections in the attacks but added that the US was incredibly gratified to know how Nepal and the world reacted. 'The reaction from the HMG the King , the government, press and the people showed that every one has been affected, he added that you so much.' (TRN 9/14)

The U. S. as a basis of its foreign policy took especial interest in how Nepal reacted towards terrorist attacks on the U. S. International relations of a country are shaped by communication of actions and reactions both in material and discursive. TRN further reports, "There is a long line to sign the condolences book carrying flowers and words of compassion, we appreciate that." Dinger said. He said the response from South Asia was so great and it may be that the region has also been facing such problems. His remarks of 'eliminating terrorism' and '(No) Nepali Connection' are important for analysis of discourse on terrorism because though apparently he says 'no connection,' discursively connection was suspected.

The headlines were highlighting "Global Fight against Terrorism." The impact of September 11 events is overwhelming across the world, which should be understood as a global threat against humanity," Dinger had noted. In response to a query whether he felt any terrorist activities in Nepal, "the government of Nepal

should take strong action. The terrorism is after all terrorism, it couldn't only be against US or UK, but it could also be against Nepal” (*TRN*) However, Dinger maintained that there was no connection of Nepal or Nepalese, but his tone is persuasive that there could be terrorism within it. "We Are Facing Similar Problem," he shared the point of view with government of Nepal (*TRN*). "How long will the U. S. continue to bombard on Afghanistan?" he himself asked. Then he said that the interest of America is not to put Afghanistan people in trouble, we are against terrorism. Hence, as he said “the war that is going on is against terrorism, but not against humanity.” The U. S. is providing humanitarian assistance to Afghan people and the assistance will be continued, according to him. He maintained humanitarian aspects of the ‘war on terror’ than the evil ones. In response to a query of Prof. Suryalal Amatya, in a programme organized by Nepal Council of World Affairs about the emergence of bacterial terrorism, he asserted that the U. S. is taking the problem seriously.

On September 14 *TRN* news headline was, "Nepal Gets US Support for Private Sector." The U. S. has "agreed to provide a grant assistance of the U.S. \$ 18.7 million to Nepal to implement two different programs: the first of \$10 million would be used to support increased private sector participation in environmentally and socially sustainable hydropower development and rest \$ 8.7 million will be used for strengthen governance of natural resources and selected institutions. The aid does not have apparent connection to the discourse of terrorism. However, its implication has been analyzed in the second chapter because foreign aid discourse in Nepal's international relation was a debate on idea of promoting or eradicating Maoist problem.

"Government- Maoist Talk to Continue Today" was the news on *TRN* on September 14, so it reflects that all the conflicting parties and the people were hopeful that the "talk" would have come for better, as the discourses are speech acts and saying is also doing in discourse. But, the semiotics, one of the most important aspect of truth formation, expressed on the news were referring to the violence in the recent past, for instance, the government was preparing a list of "Maoists Activities from July Onwards" based on their attacks on government offices as well as on individuals and violent activities like threatening of the government officials, kidnap, beating and killings. Such events were made to justify the naming of the Maoist party as terrorist. It enlisted the activities also like the 'Maoist of shattering some coca-cola bottles,' the cultural symbol of globalized world, in a restaurant. Cococala and other multinational companies, especially Indian and American ones were called the imperialists by the Maoists and so they were made the target by the Maoist. While such discourses would help the government gathers concern and solidarity of the foreign powers for suppressing the Maoists.

The tone of language used by the government was captured media attention. "Nepal Government Says Emphatic No to Political Demands of Maoists" appeared as the headline on September 16, also quoting "Home Ministry Appeals for Peace Orders." The discourse of "Emphatic No" and "appeal for peace" were contradictory. The gesture, tones and intonation of the government was captured by *TRN* with the adjective "emphatic no." "Mahara [Maoist representative for talk] on Press Release Reiterates Need for More Talks" (*TRN*). He further made "demands to full fill their political demands: for making public the status of their 72 carders including Dandapani Neupane, abrogation of the existing constitutions, making path way to republican system of government.

The tone of the Nepal government towards the Maoists and the President Bush against the actor of the 9/11 attack are similar. It is the same page where news headline is "Bush Declares US at War [against terrorism]." There is a desire by the American people not only to seek revenge but to a war against barbaric behavior and people that hate freedom and hate what we stand for' he said. Bush says, "the world is at war, ... against barbarians, and there will be no compromise.' The conflict will not be short." In his later speech he asked the world "either you are with us or with the terrorists". The tone in the phrases 'emphatic no' and 'no compromise' were almost the same. The front page of *TRN* looked as the stage for power play of multiple discourses (Foucault, 22) represented. The titles in *TRN* read: "Francis Fukuyama: End of American Exceptionalism," "Home Ministry appeals for peace order, Mahara Reiterates Need for More Talks;" "Follow Path of Buddha;" "Maoists Pressures against Local Bodies." These headlines interlace the U. S. war on terror discourse with the Maoist struggle right from the beginning at least in the eyes of the readers since the news appeared in the same pages of the papers. "Language is the Main Stay of the Nation" was headline about the speech of Deuba, the then PM speaking in a programme about releasing a book. Interestingly, the discourse analysis approach in this research has a ground that the nature of conflict can be understood through the analysis of use of language. The nation was plunging into conflict because of 'no agreement' in language/talk/discourse among the spokespersons of the conflicting parties. In other words "stay of nation" was in the rhetoric of language that the political leaders and foreign diplomats spoke not with felicitation intentions but with unhappy utterances, which led it into vicious conflict.

Discourse during the period of conflict and war made use language mostly for making speculations, declarations, actions and commitment for future. Language is

used for talking about financial management which is an investment for achieving the pragmatic of the rhetoric of war on terror. While in US as *TRN* on the same page reads, "US Congress Approves \$40 Billion Antiterrorism Package" to fight terrorism globally. The fight which will not be a short fight, rather it would be a long fight according to many reports in Nepali press about the U. S. activities, arrests and attacks in terrorist areas. There were rarely the voices in the *TRN* that would strongly claim from any government agencies and political parties that "terrorism" should not be attacked with the violent means. It was in a way accepted hegemonically by the Nepal government that terrorism should be responded with military attacks.

Nepal Council of World Affairs, the organization of international affairs experts, expressed its concern and passed condolences to the victim of 9/11, condemned terrorism and demanded no concessions to fight terrorism because, as they believed, the tentacles of terrorism may go against the national boundaries. *TRN* published their position about countering the terrorism:

Nepal is also [similar to 9/11] in grip of senseless violence. Terrorism has emerged as a curse for humankind in recent time. The tentacles go beyond national boundaries, and campaign needs to be launched to counter terrorism in the world. As an organization devoted for the cause of peace and friendship between the people of all the countries, the Nepal Council of World Affairs expects government and people everywhere help each other to fight the menace of terrorist violence.

Thus, by saying that Nepal is also in grip of senseless violence' they were implicitly making connection to the 9/11 discourses. The council too urged all the governments including that of Nepal to fight terrorism. The intellectual community was not that critical of the discourse.

Media plays vital role in representing terrorism and war against terrorism, therefore it is popularly said that media is oxygen of terrorism, with the same token, of war on terror. *TRN* in its editorial, expressed, that the 9/11 event could be an opportunity for larger unity against terroristic activities that it obviously referred to Maoist insurgency as well. thus it highlights Nepal's "Unwavering Support," to war on terror in its editorial:

On September 13, in fight against international terrorism. While support from other countries, "likely to be direct participants in one way or the another in the strikes against concurrence on the need to effectively combat international terrorism, support from countries like Nepal, which have always been on the side of international struggle against senseless violence. The government [of Nepal], rightly described the terrorist attacks in the US as a crime against humanity and said that the US terrorist incidents had also created an opportunity for larger unity, understanding and cooperation among civilized societies and governments ... Nepal's unwavering support to the best of its capacity, to such a "world war" is only natural.

Here, the neutrality of the media has totally turned into hegemonic compliance to the U. S. war on terrorism through its focus on unwavering support as rightly made decision. "Anti Terror Coalition [is] Coming Together." The US Foreign Minister Collin Powell's remarks were published in *TRN*. He said, "I am pleased that the coalition is coming together." Actually the U. S. led war on terror was supported by the very powerful European and Asian and African countries all over the world. So there was only a little chance for Nepal to be out of it. What was important is that Nepal's support to global war on terror was used as a tool in an attempt to suppress

the Maoist insurgency with discourses on international policies to gain their strength by gaining support from international community.

"US Seeks Support to Check Terrorism" and US- EU Pledge Together to Combat Terrorism" were the main news, then. US director Robert Karr at the American centre in Kathmandu says, "We [European Union] and [US will act jointly to expand and improve this co-operation worldwide. He said, "in a press release from the American Embassy in Katmandu, 'United States would not accept any kind of terrorist activities.'" He said, "US would eradicate those that wanted to create instability in the world with global support. It was reported in this news item. "But Karr declined to elaborate on how the US declaration regarding the eradication of global terrorism was going to address the terrorist activities being launched in different countries like Nepal." Before September 11, the word terrorism was rarely used and heard in Nepali media. But after 9/11 it was massively found in Nepali media whenever there was issue of war in conflict.

*TRN* published the interview of US Envoy Charge D Affair Larry Dinger entitled "Nepal's Response to counter Terrorism Encouraging: US Envoy" (*TRN* 10/7). He spoke of annual the U. S. support with his remarks "we are friends and we work together." He thanked Nepal for showing "full support for global coalition to try to eliminate terrorism." He expressed that resolving security issue in Nepal was very important. On October 8, ministry of Foreign Affairs Nepal issued a press release and stated that "there is need for international cooperation to root out terrorism" in "all its manifestation and forms." While the government reiterated its support "US Action against Terrorism" on 10/8, CPN (ML) accused the government for 'breaching its principle of non-alignment.' Nepal's Workers Peasant Party opposed the attacks on Afghanistan by the U. S. The U. S. envoy said that US was fighting war against

terrorism for democracy and it would strongly support for democracy in Nepal. According to *TRN*, implicitly referring to the Maoist insurgency, democrats and political leaders in the government expressed that 'anti-democratic forces were becoming active in Nepal. "Ultra Leftists Deviation a Threat: Nepal" was the dominant opinion from the CPN (UML) towards the Maoists. "The Vice Chairman of National Assembly Paswan, a UML elect "voiced against terrorism. He said, "At present massive public opinion is being formed in the world against terrorism and terrorists and the government and the national parties should join hands to sustain the opinion" (*TRN 10/9*). UN Security Council Offer [ed] Unanimous Support" to US and British Strikes against Afghanistan (*TRN 10/9*). *TRN* editorial entitled "World Wide Support", and also showed concern that the already widespread hunger and deprivation might worsen in Afghanistan. A film review of recent Nepali movie *Army* was published entitled "Army's War on Terrorism." The idea of "war on terrorism" seemed to have entered to the popular visual discourses as well. "Maoists [are] Selling Dreams to Mislead People: Deuba" and "US Doctrine on Terrorism" "Anthrax Hits New York", "House Passes Anti-Terrorism Legislation", were the news published in *TRN* on 13 and 14 October. These discourses were interlinked due to the same spatio-temporal interactions in/through mass media.

Manipulation of mass media by both the government as well as rebel or terrorist is obvious. The "Government was willing to Work with Press: Says Deuba" was the news in *TRN* that shows importance of press realized by the rulers during the time of conflict. A Letter to the editor views that "as the global citizen we must be with the Americans in this time of need (*TRN 10/30*). He opines, "We (Nepalese) do not have infrastructure so despite the principle of co-existence and Panchasil we should allow the U. S. some air space" [to fight terrorism] in Nepal. The concept of global



governance or global citizen seems to have emerged among people along with the global war on terror. Similarly "We Want Talk, not War: Taliban," "Nation Echo New York Mayor's Anti Terrorism Call," "US Warns Threat of New Terror Strikes," "After Afghanistan, Could Iraq be the Next?," "A Lesson Learnt from Afghanistan," "Terrorism Must not be Mixed with Islam: Putin," "China to Fight Economic Battle against Terrorism" were dominant news in October. Such multiple voices appeared in the news in which the discourse of "terrorism" occupied the larger space and greater attention even among Nepali audience and also generated more discursive power. In such context, the Priminister Deuwa said, "Nepal will always be against terrorism" for establishment of peace", in a program jointly organized by the Nepal- India Development and Friendship Association (*TRN 10/28*). The op-eds like Relation of "Terrorism and Democracy," with the rhetorical of structural opposition appeared in the media, which was later contextualize labeling the Maoists as the terrorists while the government standing for democracy.

Addressing the United Nation's 56th Assembly Ram Shran Mahat, the representatives of Nepal government said that "without any delay terrorism should be resolved." The phrase "without delay" must have indicated to the case in Nepal because the U. S. had already started its 'war against terrorism' in Afghanistan. UML called the "Maoists as a Crowd of Criminals." In this national and international context Prachanda, the then Supreme Commander of CPN (Maoists) declared the "uselessness of ceasefire." In the same page, there was news with a call that the Maoists must be isolated in the political arena. Maoists Attacks in Several Places: Asian Air Helicopter Destroyed," "23 Policemen and 14 Soldiers Killed in Maoist's Attack Last Night," "Government Committed to Devise Strict/Cruel Measures" were the head news. Attacks by the Maoists were made in places of 18 districts, especially

in army barracks, police stations and government offices that night. The responsibility of the attacks was taken by Prachanda "as the supreme commander of People's Liberation Army and CPN (Maoist)." On November 27, the headlines in *Gorkhapatra* were, "His Majesty declares state of emergency all over the country;" "Some Articles of constitution are Nullified;" "Maoists Declared Terrorist," and "A Royal Ordinance called Terrorist and Disruptive [Control and Punishment] Ordinance 2001 or (TADA) Implemented," "freedom of expression through media was curtailed." At about the same time Indian prime minister had submitted a similar proposition for implementation in his country which was called Prevention of Terrorism ordinance (POTO) in the Union Cabinet for Amendment" (Shrestha 250).

Thus, through the several discourses, semiotics, for instance as manifested in the headlines relationality of discourses and events to their products, the spatio-temporal context was created for pronouncing "terrorism" and "war against terrorism" officially entering to Nepal. Media and political parties are the major medium to bring the discourse of the West particularly from the U. S. to Nepal. Though Nepal government withdrew the label 'terrorist' from the Maoists, US government has not withdrawn the tag from the Maoists till 2012. Nepal is still using this tag to several other violent groups of Madhes and hilly regions even after the Maoists came to the mainstream through peace talks, 12-point peace agreement held in Delhi as well as through constituent Assembly election. The 'people's war' that began with the failure of talk/text (40 points demands) between the then Prime Minister, finally came to a halt in November 2005 with a talk/text that is: 12 point peace-Agreement, but during which a context was created in a "hegemonic" (Gramsci 233) way to introduce the new political discourse of more powerful West: "Terrorism" and "War on Terror" in Nepal. The CPN (Maoist) launched the so called "people's war" since 13 February

1996. Before this Babu Ram Bhattarai, the Chairman of United People's Front had submitted the "40 points demands" related to nationalism, democracy and livelihood, but no negotiation was entertained by the government as well as the party. Stuart Hall explains how Gramscian sense of hegemony occurs. He says that because of the discrepancy in perceiving the *status quo* (bourgeois hierarchy), most people attend to their immediate (personal) concerns, rather than (publicly) think about and question the fundamental sources of their social and economic oppression. According to Giorgio Agamben, "terrorism" creates a permanent state of exception in the country which "harbors terrorism" therefore, Nepal and its people remain in a permanent state of emergency or exception as long as such organizations (labeled terrorist) are protected by the government or remain the stake holders in the government of Nepal, because "power determines the truth of the discourse" in international relation (Foucault 1972). In "state of exception" the sovereignty of a nation and its people's rights are suspended, free or equal existence with the powerful ones is denied, and they are turned into "bare life" (Agamben 2). As long as the international community led by the US in the name of war on terror, views Nepal as an abode of terrorist, Nepal remains susceptible to international vigilance and inspection.

My analysis of speeches by the U. S. president George W. Bush, the U. S. envoys, Indian envoys and Nepali politicians suggests that a project of constructing a 'new world order' by mixing the language of peace and that of war has been an ongoing project of the U. S. and Indian project since long especially after the U. S. influence increased with war on terror rhetoric significantly in south Asia. The US envoys reiteration of the "US for democracy in Nepal" constructs an image of sociopolitical reality in one way, and the so called democratic parties' align towards this line constructs hegemony. While the opposing narrative "Maoists as terrorists"

constructs a different image of the U. S. towards the Maoists. To bring Hodges's ideas of hegemony in this context:

Hegemony occurs when the representation of the world forwarded by one ideological perspective is taken for granted or becomes naturalized as a "common sense" conception of reality ... "Ideological dominance and hegemony is 'perfect' when dominated groups are unable to distinguish between their own interests and attitudes and those of dominant groups" (Van Dijk 102).

The then Nepal government after 9/11 and before peace agreement seems to have completely hegemonized so that western rhetoric of "war on terror" had been taken as a panacea for suppressing insurgency by declaring them as terrorists. The political parties of Nepal which were against the Maoists were still happy with the U.S. labeling the Maoists as terrorists believing that the U.S. interests and their own as the same, and have accepted it as "common sense." "Common" in the sense that the violent arm struggle was regarded as terrorism by the U. S. and those who supported this belief. "Common sense" beliefs live long lives even in light of empirical counter-evidence or logical refutations. Nepalese leaders know that the U. S. and India have their own national interests empirically, yet, Nepalese follow their discourses. "Remember," Writes Wittgenstein in *On Certainty* (1969), "one is sometimes convinced of the *correctness* of a view by its *simplicity* or *symmetry*, i.e., these are what induce one to go over to this point of view. One then simply says something like: 'That's how it must be'"(qtd. in Hodges 14). For the parties, the Maoists must be terrorists because they are attacking government infrastructures and people the way the U. S. labeled terrorists did. The attackers are called terrorists by the U. S. and India, following this rhetoric and policy of war on terror. Nepal government too

declares such organization as terrorists; but, the government did not bother to know how they are not merely the terrorist, because their labeling it was “hegemonic common sense” than a product of critical understanding of the Nepal's spatio-temporal context. Thus in addition to the role ideology plays in the interpretation of the discourse in Gramsci's notion of hegemony, helps understand why the Maoist conflict gained a similar name to that of attack of Taliban or Al Quada on 9/11.

Media discourse also includes images; and the images of war play an important role in the representation of social actors. Almost all the mainstream medias like TVs, FMs and news papers like *Gorkhapatra*, *Kantipur*, *The Kathmandu Post*, *The Rising Nepal* and Magazines gave almost a full coverage to the images of the collapsing buildings ablaze in flames on 9/11; and tried to link their news as well as editorial comparing with Maoist's conflict. In “Visual Discourses of War: Multimodal Analysis of Photographs of the Iraq Occupation,” David Machin shows that, even if the way the media speak and write about war during the past 150 years remains similar, the use of photographs has changed. But additionally, the ways these photographs represent war , what they include and exclude, the kinds of settings and action they show and the kinds of social actors that are depicted, reveal that the discourses about war that were dominant in each society at each time, have also changed. In particular, the elements that are depicted and the elements that are ignored have shifted from war to war. Significantly, the use of image banks and the tendency to treat them not as documentary evidence but as elements in a visual layout help to conceal the realities of war, and allow talk of peacekeeping and maintaining order to go uncontested. The images of terror along with the verbal discourses reveal how the powerful especially those who can influence media through politics, economy or other. The “discourses try to shape the way that populations might come

to think about the nature and meaning of war” (122). So the images of 9/11 were shown for years to justify the prolonging of the war on terror.

The impact of Bush administration policy after 9/11 – namely, its decision to label Maoists as terrorist creates a dichotomy between ‘us’ and ‘Them.’ But the “us” versus “them” dichotomy works at different level. Sometime the 'us' assumed by the U. S. envoys in their speech include only the western democracies. 'You' refers to the 'legitimate' parties of Nepal and 'them' refers to the 'Maoists'. 'They' at the same time refers to the 'people' and 'children' as the victim of the conflict. But the basic dichotomy lies between 'us' as anti- Maoists or in other words the fighters of "war against terrorism" and those Maoists as Other/ unwanted/ terrorist /illegitimate.

National and international media, such as the major wire services, play a significant role in shaping emotional responses to terrorism. In “Fear of Terror Attack Persists: Constructing Fear in Reports on Terrorism by International News Agencies,” Maija Stenvall suggests that a textual approach towards the issue of fear can illuminate how reports in newspapers, television and radio, along with rumor and propagandas construe emotions such as fear, worry and concern. The fear created both by the so called "terrorists" and so called "legitimate powers" results that abstract fears become “actors” themselves in the response to terrorism.

Finally, fear is an issue that underlies many of the discourses of war and terrorism in the wake of 9/11 and Maoist insurgency. This research explores into a more philosophical discussion of the role of fear and violence in politics of fear: to make critical inquiry into the uneven international relation. Through the discourse of “terrorism” and "war on terror" the perpetuation of a “clash of civilizations” (rising ethnic conflict within country in case of Nepal) (Huntington 1) mentality, the research attempts to overcome the “paralysis of criticism” (Marcuse 2) that often grips society

when an enemy is dehumanized beyond the point of rational thought, to keep foreign influence. When "terrorists" remain invisible or underground they become the source of fear, but when they are still called "terrorists" by some powerful nation even after they become people's elected representative in the government the whole country remains in fear of foreign interference because any government with terrorist background or label is a subject to attack. This has been only through indirect speech acts: "They are still terrorists." From this descriptive utterance, we can decode a declarative: "They must be eliminated." Now, the source of fear shifts from terrorists to who names them "terrorists." But, those people who do not belong to either party or even the government of previous "terrorists" may be a source of constant fear.

Fear is a direct threat to normal humanistic values and way of life. As Matteo Stocchetti suggests, sanity and humanistic values often become casualties in the war and terrorism, but do critical discourse studies offer any contribution to the resistance of those casualties? The research tries to maintain that CDA can have some credible efficacy to be used as an instrument of social justice" in international relation as well (Chilton 21).

Nevertheless, the focus on discourse taken by this research does have a role to play in academic explorations of war and terrorism. In his philosophy of language and meaning, Charles Taylor stresses the constitutive dimension of language, which goes beyond the mere denotation of pre-existing phenomena. He analyzes the pragmatic of language as follow:

Language expresses, creates a public space and then places items into that space. It sets up relations among individuals and establishes shared meanings. In effect, "relations of power and property themselves are

not possible without language; they are essentially realized in language” (271).

So far analysis of the use of language by media and political actors have shown, language use in time of conflict carries ideological pragmatics of the interest of the speakers. If language is constitutive of social reality is a notion inherent in the discursive turn in the social sciences. Then how does the linguistic process involved in the constitution of that reality unfold? How does language stake out, justify and defend positions? How does language define, shape and identify events and individuals? How does language come together in discourse to construct ideologies, beliefs and understandings? In many ways, these questions require a focus on discourse that only close textual analysis can provide. The aim of the research is to illuminate some of these processes in the critical study of politics, society, culture and international relation in the wake of 9/11 and Maoist insurgency in Nepal. If language plays an integral role in the process of justifying war and violence, in spreading fear and dehumanizing enemies; then it seems inevitable that it should also hold the capacity to address the complexities of events like Maoist insurgency, construct the ethos to engage in communicative practices capable of checking abuses of power (Foucault 298). In order to understand the relationship between discourse and war (including the strategy of terrorism), let us consider Carl Von Clausewitz’s (1976) maxim that war is simply politics by other means. War and diplomacy may appear opposite to one another because generally diplomacy represents the art of communication employed in the service of peaceful cohabitation. While diplomacy’s opposite, war [also war on terror] signals the breakdown of communication, resulting in physical violence. It is important to note, however, that both ends of this continuum rely crucially on uses of language. The practice of diplomacy relies on dialogue and



tireless negotiation in an effort to reach shared understandings among rival groups.

War, too, relies on discourse – communication within the group to divide interests and dehumanize the other as a prelude to violence.

Charles Tylor In his philosophy of language and meaning stresses the constitutive dimension of language, which goes beyond the mere denotation of pre-existing phenomena. Language expresses, creates a public space and then places items into that space. It sets up relations among individuals and establishes shared meanings. In effect, “relations of power and property themselves are not possible without language; they are essentially realized in language” (Tylor 271). The ‘people’s war’ based on principles of Marx-Lenin-Mao and Prachanda emphasizes the class nature of Nepali society. A society is so complex to understand but to make convince the people few semiotics like “feudalistic”, “bourgeoise” had been used by the Maoists to describe the society. Someone’s property was snatched or he was sentenced with “people’s operation”, or *Janakarbahi* for being a “feudal or *samanta*.” There are no any clear behavioral traits of a *samanta*, or common folk but, when the label *samanta* was imposed he had to bear the punishment of certain kind, which was similar to the bounty added to the head of the Maoists along with the label terrorist. In severe case, i.e. the *samanta* takes help of police to suppress the rebels; he would be killed or given severe punishment “*safaya, or dhulai (washing)*” by “people.” The semiotics required some extreme actions. *Samanta* was attached to *safaya* while the *Maoist* was attached to police or army brutality. Anyone could be labeled anything incase any individual had little resemblance with the semiotics discussed.

One might wonder why the government had to declare Maoists terrorists, since it could attack, and had been attacking, by calling them simply Maoists. This question proves the power of language and its relationality. If the government called them they

would remain a political party, but if pronounced “terrorist”, they would be equal to Osama Bin Laden, and bounty on their head could easily be put and could be killed at anytime. All the world will have to condemn the terrorists whatever bad or good agenda they might have. The world would be against them and for the government because the “the world” had already declared “war against terror” i. e. terrorists. The “semiotic” would link it to the “world.” The “world” actually refers to the most powerful nations in the then world. So the ‘world’ in the TRN headlines declares war on terror had political function of the declaration of the speech of American President.

As Paul Chilton points out, Aristotle’s notion that humans are “political animals” rests upon our unique capacity for language, or “the power of speech” (4–5). The capacity, therefore, undergirds human engagement in politics as both ends of the continuum sketched out above; language is a prerequisite for both war and diplomacy. Michael Billig, drawing on Henri Tajfel, provides an extended discussion of the consequences of this idea, which contradicts early beliefs in psychology that associated war with an innate primitive instinct and language with higher thought (McDougall 120). Billig writes:

The apparent irrationality of war is not the product of irrational psychological drives, but is the outcome of the seemingly rational human propensity to make sense of the social world. [...] When Bush and the majority of the American people advocated the bombing of Afghanistan after September 11, 2001, they were not responding to a release of innate, instinctual urges. Their collective response was based upon understandings of the social world, which involved a heightened sense of “us” and “them.” (Hodges xi-xii)

The use of language to naming and declaring thus creates dichotomy between 'us' and 'them' which ultimately becomes the warring groups. Similarly, the declaration of 'people's war' by the Maoists in the 1996 and the government's responses with war against terror were "rational calculations" (Hodges 12). It, therefore, follows that "in constructing understandings of the social world – language might help create a social justice, by pointing the misuse of power in discourses like 'war on terror.'

The "tough security or "state of emergency" imageries are embraced by politicians that privileges the use of war over the use of diplomacy in international affairs. They are a powerful narrative constructed, at base, through language. The rhetoric during the state of emergency was full of semiotics like 'curfew,' 'tight security,' 'high alert' 'possible attack' etc. in Nepal. Language can create, dislodge and build anew. Only language can create new narratives and that mark a political strength. In a nuclear age where the power of language to lead us into war and sanitize its destruction presents indescribable consequences for the planet, and ourselves shifting the balance of language use towards the diplomatic end of that continuum of politics remains a vital necessity (Hodges 13). Who gives commands and who has to take permissions determines the today's world order. If a country, which has been taking permission since ages, starts to produce commands, the regional stability or the world order might be disturbed, that exactly applies in Nepal's relation to India and the U. S.

Discourses since 9/11 have constructed the reality of 'global war on terror' and provided the frameworks through which the world now views itself divided into terrorists versus 'us' non-(terrorists people). Dissecting these discourses may be one piece in the construction of new ones that bring the casualties of sanity and humanistic values back to life. The primary social function of scholars, after all, is "to

influence discourse” (Graham et al. 216). Discourse analysts in this research, from the perspective of the third world countries like Nepal for right to equality for the smaller nations where humanity is at crisis due to the uneven global distribution of power is an attempt to intervene in the power of big countries like India and the U. S. maintained by discourse of war on terror. It also makes such countries cautious about their motive of spreading democratic regimes turning otherwise. It therefore, follows that in constructing understandings of the social world, language not only holds the capacity for dehumanizing the Other and justifying seemingly irrational actions, but of bridging towards mutual understandings and recognizing the Other as not wholly unlike ourselves but critically assessing one's own abuse of power. As Nelson writes, “Human conflict begins and ends via talk and text” (Hodges 449). It is the discourse that creates knowledge, knowledge creates truths, names, labels, represents, categorizes and imposes laws, declares state of emergency or permanent state of exception leaving the nations and people either as "docile bodies" or just in state of "bare life."

### **III. The Presence of the Super Power and Its Discursive Rhetoric towards Maoist Insurgency**

To know the American attitude towards Maoists the representation of the Maoists and Nepal by an American Ambassador may not be sufficient but useful. Speeches at discursive level are heteroglossic because they employ rhetoric, narratives, and speak on behalf of or against some others and reveal multiple voices. The speech is a genre which employs rhetoric most effectively, so the illocutionary forces of the discourse might help bring social or political change. That might help a society transform from violence to peace and peace to violence. Both the possibilities remain there. The language in the speech “Nepal- US Relationship” of James F. Moriarty, the personal representative and the Ambassador of America to Nepal, through its grammatical structure reveals the ideology and power politics of the speaker. Language, according to Foucaultian discourse, has the power to create knowledge and then truth; and whom and what to include or exclude. Relation of speaker and hearer in context plays vital role in discourse, power and truth formation. The relation assumed by the speaker American Ambassador, the point of view and attitude of the speaker towards the audience, especially the Kathmandu based politicians directly and the entire people of Nepal including the Maoists indirectly, and the subject matter, that is Maoist conflict in Nepal and the choice of mostly “most” and “should (or should not)” structure sentence reveal the American pressure on the then government of Nepal to take “action” against the Maoists, which includes labeling them of the “terrorists” tag and perform the norms of the discourse “war on terror” against them.

Ambassador Moriarty in his speech, "Nepal - US Relation," begins his speech by establishing the friendly universe of discourse by showing the intimacy of his country US, and Nepal. He highlights the mutual friendship of both the countries:

In the spirit of the long friendship Nepal and the United States have enjoyed, I want to talk about two concepts that I think are absolutely vital for Nepal at this point in its history: democracy and reconciliation. Before I do so, however, I would like to explain why my country, the United States, has the temerity to speak out on issues such as this. (18)

After establishing the universe of discourse, he makes declaration of urgency of the subject matter and declares that he thinks something "absolutely vital for Nepal" and tells that he would explain it emphatically, that the audience must listen and act accordingly. He acts "as in times where ideologies were triumphant, the world is today profoundly affected by those who claim to be in sole possession of the truth" (Baudrillard 116). Truth-claim is one of the problems in the world peace.

Then he refers his speech to the message given by the President of America to the "world" including to Nepal. He in this second inaugural address, President George W. Bush declared that United States "will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation: that moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong and freedom which is eternally right" (18). The choices here were put before the Nepali leaders. The choices were only two. In conversation "give options" and "do not impose" are the rules for friendly conversation. But "imposing" creates power and reveals that the speaker is undeniable. Nepalese had to play act inferior before the speaker.

Declarative sentence of 'act superior speaker' constructs compulsive power. It helps to maintain control over the future discursively. He uses declarative sentence that, "Freedom, my friends is the cornerstone of America's engagement with Nepal at this crucial moment in your history." "Freedom, civil rights, and democracy-these are principles upon which my nation was founded. They are principles we live by today," he informs. He expresses his attitude towards the democracy, "They are principles we hold dear for our future. As my president's personal representative to Nepal, I believe they are principles essential to the future of your country as well." He shows confidence on his knowledge about what Nepal needs and wants to claim truth for future. Claiming of the future is a discursive form of power.

The declarative sentences used by the Ambassador reveal his confidence and superior position: "Nepal, today is at a cross-roads: Unless the principles of freedom, civil rights, and democracy once again take root through a process of true reconciliation among the legitimate political forces, I fear that your country will inexorably slide toward confrontation, confusion, and chaos." He further strengthens his declaration by using expressive sentences, "I fear." When the powerful one fears the weak audience must be frightened as a rule. "The continuing divisions between the Palace and the political parties aid only the Maoist and their plans to turn Nepal into a brutal and anachronistic state. Nepal's deteriorating condition is put more emphatically by the use of "only." The message is clear that all Palace and political parties "must" unite against the Maoists. Fear is aroused by the speech on the direct audience.

Use of discourse for power is chief feature of language of diplomacy. The U. S. wants to maintain its superior power in relation to Nepal, by claiming 'others' as bad. He also reveals American interest being questioned in Nepal through the dialogic

nature of his speech. He says, “I get asked all the time why the United States is so keenly interested in Nepal.” This was actually a question posed by the Maoists accusing the U. S. as imperialist. But he answers very cleverly by indirect statements to that question, “This coming [y]ear the U. S. government will provide more than \$ 44 million in bilateral developmental assistance- for health programs, good governance and hydropower; for victim of conflict and to support is proof positive of our continuing support for Nepal, but what drives that support? The indirect answer of the direct question hides some reality of power politics of the U. S. in Nepal. However, he rebottles his position by throwing the question he should have answered to the audience, “but what drives that support?”

He further elaborates the answer in a roundabout way, however it is revealed that the U. S. interests was related to the issue of democracy, power, regional stability and to suppress the insurgency:

Our concern over regional stability is of course one factor. With a violent, ideological Maoist insurgency desiring to take over the state and then to export its revolution to peaceful neighbors, there is much to worry about. But our other concern is something that my President has in fact pinned his second term on: freedom. As a nation defined by both liberty and democracy, the United States wishes to see the expansion of both around the world. We believe freedom is a birth right of all people and that a rights-based democracy is the best way to balance majority desires and minority protections. (18)

His speech is compelling because it uses grammatical categories that are assertive: “is off course,” “there is much to worry about”, “we believe” and “the best way” along



with declarative sentence. It shows that the envoy felt it necessary to impose his President's wishes or the wishes of the U. S. in Nepal.

Conditional sentences help one to maintain a utopian world even in an adverse situation. He further declares *what is there* and what *should* be in Nepal. "In your 12 years of active democracy, Nepal achieves much to be proud of. Literacy rates improved, roads were built, development accelerated, foreign investment went up, and people has a voice through elections." But he puts a hedge. "Young democracies, however, never sail on calm seas. Undeniably, there was corruption and flattering policies and chaos in your political institutions. But that happens in every young democracy" (19). He maintains that the values his country upheld only are the best one and they should be followed by others. He gives the contexts of his own country to rhetorically persuade the audience about the unavoidability of the values he talks about even though they are not working in Nepal now. "Look at my own country in its first few decades of democracy. Things were surely chaotic. We know how challenging it can be to develop democratic institutions, but Nepal was working through those challenges before 2002. He says that democratic values had already entered in Nepal. But they only problem it has is the Maoist" (19). He puts all the blames to the Maoists for Nepal failing to implement American democracy. "In fact, Nepal could well be just one of many newly developing democracies around the world-struggling but lowly crating new democratic spaces- if it were not for one thing: the Maoist insurgency." He wishes that "there" were no Maoists in Nepal at all through, "if there were not" conditional sentence (19). Maoists seem to stand against what the U. S. stands for. So, they are felt as obstacles by the speaker to US interest of establishing 'western mode' of democracy.

In the speech, he tries to answer those who support the socialist agendas of the Maoists, “Some have painted the insurgents as a group of socialist who just want to give more rights to the downtrodden and to get the government to pay attention to rural peoples and social justice” (19). He even acknowledges a favor to those sympathetic to Maoist’s goals. They may be the Left oriented other political parties who are addressing them without violent tactics. He has expressed his satisfaction towards maybe, communists like CPN (UML) who claim to be socialists or communist but are not questioning the U. S. interests that he previously mentioned. “We hope that one day the Maoist too will become part of the political mainstream and give up arms, but for now their own worlds and actions say otherwise” (19). He claims hope for the future to put the Maoists to follow the U. S. values: democracy and freedom, if possible, in the half of the sentence “but” in the later part, makes him deny that possibility.

Sentences with direct speech act forms function as ‘indirect speech acts.’ The reason he further puts about why there is no possibility in the Maoists to agree to American value is, “They wanted to collectivize agriculture- a recipe for mass starvation.” These three are the informative sentence with the direct speech acts, but the sentences have indirect illocutions. The first one is used satirically. Nepal is an agricultural country, but, Ambassador says that agriculture is a recipe of mass starvation, and Maoists on the other hand were claiming for modernization of agriculture in the point 30-33 of their demands. In contrast to Ambassador’s claim, Maoist were given slogans revolutionizing agricultural sector:

A system of providing minimum wage for those working in agriculture and industry should not be provided. Poor farmers should be made exempt from loan payments. Loans provided to small farmers should

be written off. Fertilizers and seeds should be made available at cheap rate to farmers. Farmers should be provided access to market for their products (Bhattarai).”

The ‘should be’ rhetoric of the Maoists clashes with that of the envoys’ declaratives.

Representation of the others in a selfsame style is a way of gaining discursive power. Ambassador says, “They want to reeducate class enemies- a plan to wipe out educated, free thinking people. They want to export their revolution- a war that would threaten all of South Asia” (19). He equates re-educating as a plan to wipe out educated and free thinking people; and also equates revolution in Nepal as a threat to south Asia. He moves from the treat of Maoists from individual or local level to the regional level expanding the universe of discourse. He knows what “they want to” and tells it to the other parties and the rest of the audience in the world including to his President, who was fighting war against terror world wide.

Evoking historical memory in discourse helps maintain discursive strength and the relationality of his knowledge about Maoists with those who were against American values in the past. Moriarty reminds his audience of the violent rulers of the history attached to Maoist’s origin. He makes connection of the Maoists party with the tyrants of history:

We can never forget that we are dealing with ideologues that have all the violent hallmarks of Stalin, Mao, and Pol Pot and now continue to insist on the righteousness of their armed struggle. Theirs would not be a regime of benevolent socialism. It would be an authoritarian assault on all free Nepalese. Everyday the Maoist assails democracy itself through attacks on political party workers, and other civilians who want nothing more than peace. The Maoists have used force and

the threat of force to prevent elections from being held in Nepal since 1999. And absent election, there can be no functioning democracy.

(19)

In the given speech, the Ambassador reveals that “socialism” might be an alternative to “democratic values” but he declares, the Maoists in the path of the Stalin, Mao and Pol Pot would bring “authoritarian assault on all free Nepalese” through violence (19). He regards election as the measuring rod of democracy but Maoists, who were asking for constituent assembly, for him, actually deny that.

Linguistically the use of “must”, imposes an obligation. Moriarty is utmost confident about the use of American directive upon the Nepali politics to work. He categorically says, “Nepal's legitimate political parties also *must* bear some of the responsibility for resolving the crisis currently confronting the country.” He takes side with the legitimate parties and denounces or excludes the illegitimate, especially the Maoists. But, he maintains an act superior position; and by denouncing the legitimate parties as well, “While they were in power, the parties were seen by many Nepalese as squabbling tribes who put partisan and personal interests above the needs of the country” (19). Out of power, the parties have taken few steps to address their shortcomings; the parties will not be able to win back the trust and confidence of many Nepalese.” The parties are not going to gain the confidence of the people. Though he condemns the party he maintains that American values have not yet failed. He says, “But the shortcomings of individual parties do not mean that democracy can not work in Nepal. Instead, it only underscores the need for elections, and functioning democracy, so that the people of Nepal can sit in judgment on their would be leaders” (19). Again he shows trust on the election.

He uses language to evaluate the degree of success and failure of democracy in Nepal. Similarly the envoy, as an addressor assumes 'acts superior role' to the palace as well, though he softly criticizes the palaces and sees more positive attitude towards the palace. He pinpoints the faults of palace too: "Clearly the actions of February 1 [Royal Coup] represented a big step back from democracy while we saw some progress in April and May with the release of most political detainees and an end to the formal state of emergency" (19). He appropriates the then government for its commitment at least on paper, "the Government's four-point plan is laudable, including as it does cleaning up corruption, attacking terrorism imposing fiscal disciplines, and ensuring good governance. He shares the point of view closely with the palace than to the Maoists and other parties. He completely agrees with the government/palace for its "laudable" declarations including "attacking terrorism" (19). It shows that America was obviously against the Maoists but also unhappy with other parties who were not as strong as the palace to "attack terrorism" (19). While he was advocating the right to freedom, he was happy with the government declaration to "attacking terrorism." The questions are the indirect speech acts of his declaration that the government was not still effective the way America wanted. "Six months after the imposition of direct rule on February 1, with a questionable cabinet full of Panchayat-era politicians and even a convicted criminal, the government seems to have gone back on its own core principles. If the Palace is serious about its commitments to democracy, it must act so in both word and deed." He expects democracy that America cherishes for in the palace that is full of "*pancas* and criminals" (19).

By representing all of them as objects and as 'others' with negative attributes like weak, infantile, the corrupt, violent, the agent of the sentence gains power over the 'other.' With negative attributes he maintains American position superior so that

he could put his say at the top. In contrast to all the Nepali political power players with negative attributes he establishes the US as savior of all liberties and democracies:

We call on the government to restore all civil liberties, including freedom of the media and freedom of personal expression. We call on the Government to release all political detainees, we call on the Palace to reach out to the political parties with sincere proposal that reflect their common agenda of multiparty democracy and constitutional monarchy and a return to full electoral democracy. (19)

Though he puts doubts on the palace too, he expects the palace to be the chief player of democracy that would give space to the political parties and let them chance to go to election under “multiparty democracy and constitutional monarchy (19).”

Comparatively, American rhetoric while suggesting Nepali political forces is powerful and compelling one. He “calls on” the palace but dictates the parties to obey the palace if palace desired, “For their par, the political parties must keep an open mind and accept a hand, if offered (20).” He shows faith in the palace and suggests the parties that they should have good faith on it. He calls for the parties to negotiate in good faith with the palace to find a solution to Nepal's problems (20).” What they must do is to please “us”. He suggests the seven parties that they must not go totally against the palace, if the wanted democracy.

The common minimum program by the seven parties is a good start- we are pleased they are working together in a coalition. However, obviously an eighth actor needs to be included if Nepal is to progress- the Palace. The parties should make clear that they are ready to discuss all ideas to find a common path feared to a functioning democracy.

That is what political parties do. They compromise, they discuss, and they form coalitions. They work together to create policies and governments that fulfill the will of the people. (20)

Ambassador suggests that the political parties have to compromise with the palace. He emphasizes that “the people want reconciliation [between the palace and the other parties not with the Maoists]. “They [people] want peace. The way to achieve peace is with a democratic Government united against the Maoist assault on Nepal.” He directly opposes Maoist’s activities.

Use of language as a prescription helps the user to maintain ‘act superior’ position like a doctor over a patient. Ambassador shows the indifference of the Nepalese people towards democracy. “One thing people never seem to talk about is democracy itself and what kind of democracy Nepal wants. The 1990 constitution was ground breaking, and it functioned fairly well for 12 years.” He emphasizes on need of election among ‘legitimate’ political parties excluding the Maoists despite were fighting the “people’s war” demanding election of constitution assembly all over the country. He maintains his ignorance for a while because he assumes the Nepali politics to have “got back” to the time when there was no Maoists insurgency. The deixis ‘back’ contrast with the rebel’s demand to go forward. He says, “But you won't get there all the legitimate political forces on board- that means the parties and the palace.” His emphasis is on uniting the palaces and the parties to exclude the Maoists the illegitimate ones.

Use of language to contrast victimizer versus victim is also a means of construction of power. When a feeling of nationalism is aroused by evoking crisis in nationalism the speaker arouses emotions against the rebels. He puts all the innocent children of Nepal on the one side and the Maoists on the other side as perpetrators. He

solely represents Maoists as the victimizers and the children as the victims in the hands of Maoists to appeal the emotions of his audience:

For the sake of Nepal's children, - your children- the children caught in the conflict outside Kathmandu, the children who now carry guns, the children who only want education and jobs and a peaceful future, the children who will one day grow up to govern this country- the legitimate political forces should rise above their difference and come up with a plan to work together. Otherwise there may not be a country to govern. (20)

His use of the language creates the feeling of nationalism and a fear that Nepalese might lose the country. Their country might not remain for the children or the children will not remain for the country. He urges the political parties to fight for the children and nation if not for themselves. He evokes the ideas spoken by his country's great freedom fighter Lincoln, "As President Abraham Lincoln famously declared when my own country's existence was threatened by the Civil War: 'A house divided against itself can not stand. The establishment of the relation of the present discourse to the past is used as a means to construct discursive power in the speaker. "These thoughtful words are more than eloquent rhetoric; they are truth and they ring true here and now" (20). He not only imposes the present democratic norms of America but he imposes the ideas of the past as the truth value in Nepal. Lincoln had to fight when the then government of the U. S. did not give legitimacy to the blacks to participate in politics. He is evoking the other side of the coin to suppress the illegitimate forces of Nepal for which, "Nepal will not endure if its legitimate political forces are divided; you must act now to preserve your children's future" (19). He urges the parties to fight unite and fight against the Maoists at least for children.



Use of adverb “urgently” to urge someone to action creates illocutionary force in speaker’s voice which the Ambassador to uses here. He declares that he is concluding his remarks that day. He demands immediate action from legitimate political parties to attack, illegitimate force or ‘terrorism’ or those who do it. He says, “To conclude my remarks today, it is not for the United States to say how Nepal should construct its democracy. But we do say unequivocally that you should have it. And urgently so. The time for rhetoric is over. The time for action is now (20).” These all the concluding sentences do not provide option to the listener. They are compulsive commands. Thus, American pressure to suppress the Maoists can easily be traced in the grammar of the American ambassador to Nepal.

American influence has been assessed by some critics who are critical of it. American influence is spread in certain form all over the world through the discourse of "war on terrorism", and especially in third world countries like Nepal. The rulers of Nepal have a choice: either bandwagoning with the U. S. or resisting against it. It has also continuing legacy of backwardness among south Asian least developed countries. Rajeev Kunwar highlights the dangers of depending on Euro-American discourse:

It is ill affordable to insulate International Relation from post colonial theory and dangers in working from Euro-American texts or development edicts, both because they do not speak to the different cultural and economic circumstance of non-European societies, its silence about race, class, gender, erasure of colonial violence and dispossession, and because they leave no room for experimentation or alternative horizons. (Kunwar 5)

In fact the idea of third world serves as a key site of “empowerment” in the global politics of development and also a key site of 'disciplinary' efforts to manage

contradiction' of neo-liberal globalization” (Burger 32). The future is uncertain or full of risks in this intricate world whereby impacts and outcomes of discourses on terrorism and their implementations in policies and actions are becoming more unpredictable. The political system has the function to produce and implement collectively binding decisions where as academic system has the function to produce knowledge, knowledge of complex circumstances like terrorism. Though there are three kinds of restraints on the independence of a state in present international system, each state is obliged to take account of system where economic pressures, the unwritten code of international society which legitimizes the existence of it but does not make it orderly or safe and the hegemonic authority of the strongest power or powers.

The adherence of the U. S. to the palace in Nepal would reflect the dubious nature of its policy. It is, therefore, not the sole arbiter of political authority and no single authority commands the exclusive loyalty of the individual under state apparatus as Foucault would say. The individuals may remain between the tires of several governments like legitimate or illegitimate national or international and find them as the ‘bare lives’ under the responsibility of no one in the era of terrorism. Jean Baudrillard averred "if America is now no longer the monopolistic center of world power, this is not because it has lost power, but simply because there is no center anymore. It has, rather become the orbit of imaginary power to which everyone now refers. He further maintained that, "America has retained power, both political and cultural, but it is now power as a special effect" (Baudrillard 10). America has become a model, uncontested and uncontestable. “The clash of civilization”, thesis was a "clash of ignorance" to Edward Said which might somehow be applicable in case of

Nepal that the U. S. might be unaware of the root causes of the Maoist conflict in Nepal.

The "Triumph of the West", or possibly as West to set the agenda in terms of defining "standard of civilization" has been the norm in the 21st century. "Standard of non-discrimination for standard of civilization is implicated in the universalizing project, and as a critical concept in international relations (law). It is neither neutral nor abstract rather it is enmeshed in the history of subordination and extinguishing alien cultures- the diminishing of cultural pluralism (Khanal: 2000). It is quite true even today that Y. N. Khanal reflected in a nutshell on Nepal-US relation: Nepal as loneliness of the powerless as opposed to the loneliness of the too powerful. After the declaration of one of the major parties as 'terrorist' Nepal as a character in international political arena, remained a split personality torn between 'terrorist' and the 'innocent' mass in the U. S. eyes.

After the fall of the USSR, there resulted the emergence of a single superpower, the United States of America, and it has been pursuing its economic, security and strategic interests across the globe. The major world powers are largely in agreement to deal with contemporary international concerns through calculated co-operation rather than adversarial ideological approach (Pudasaini 28-35). Pudasaini highlights the global impact of 9/11 events:

The tragic events on 9/11 September 2001 in the U. S. brought actions against terrorism on the global high agenda and cooperation on the issue became a crucial litmus test for good relations between the lone superpower and nations across the globe. (Pudasaini 28-35)

The discourse of 'war on terror' has become a hegemonic acceptance of the U. S. by many other countries including Nepal. Regional politics has sharply changed. India

and the U. S. are coming closer due to shared belief in democracy, trade potential, geopolitical interest and desire to prevent terrorism. Good relation exists between China and the U. S. largely because of economic reason. India and China are also improving their bilateral relations on economic. (Pudasaini 28-35). The US naturally has an interest in containing China as an emerging military and nuclear power through improved relations with India while maintaining booming trade and investment between China and the US. In such a context, the U. S. Congressional report has highlighted that, "China has significantly increased its activities in Nepal where it has "several key interests," ranging from the Tibetan refugees to part of its strategic objective to encircle India" due to the geo-political location of Nepal between the two Asian giants. The West especially the U. S. has viewed Nepal cautiously regarding China's activities as the report said, In March 2011, China announced that it will seek to further strengthen its relations with the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC)," it said. China became an observer in SAARC in 2005. According to CRS, Nepal's status as a small, landlocked state situated between India and China makes it important to foreign policymakers. Nepal's reliance on these two giant neighbors leads it to seek amicable relations with both, though ties with India have historically been closer. According to the report, "Some believe that India is concerned that a Maoist regime in Nepal could lend support to Maoist rebels in India. China, meanwhile, has taken several steps to pressure Nepal to repatriate, or at least constrain the activities of, refugees crossing the border from Tibet," the report said.

Experts in foreign policy of Nepal hoped that the new Nepal Government catapulted to power by the mandate of the April 10, 2008 constituent Assembly (CA) election starts to redirect foreign policy so that the necessary paradigm shift in foreign affairs can be fully achieved by the new government to enhance to build international

relations to build a democratic inclusive prosperous post conflict Nepal in the changing world (Pudasaini 28-35). In present context, it is found that Nepal can not exist without showing strong commitment against "terrorism" until it is economically and militarily as powerful as its one of the neighbors. Split personality of Nepal in its foreign policy (on ideological and opportunists line to deal with the foreigners) is the key cause of conflict. More than the democracy within the country the attitude to look towards the foreign powers is the main cause that shapes the internal issues in post 1990 Nepal because the democracy was already there for the ones who could use personal might, though good governance was lacking. ] Poverty and all the problems aroused by it mainly depend on Nepal's tendency to foreign dependency albeit its own natural resources.

“Nepal [Cow] in Between Elephant and Dragon” by Rajeev Kunwar exposes that the onslaught of globalization may have diminished the state sovereignty. But an essence of any nation's foreign policy is centered on national interest and pursue as a nation –state a "strategy of survival" or "struggle for existence." “Some thinkers dwell on Sinophilic manner and some scholars have portrayed a third boulder in the yam theory that is the U. S. [Hawk], an extra regional power in the emerging geo-strategic field”. In such a context, discourse of ‘war on terror’ became an internationally accepted discourse to expand US influence in Nepal in pretext of both 9/11 attack in the US and the Maoist conflict in Nepal. The pragmatic effect revealed in Moriarty’s speech as discourse and rhetoric, in this analysis, shows that the discourse formation is analogous to power construction; and during that time it helped in US influence in the conflict management of Nepal.

#### **IV. Discourse of Resistance against the Label, ‘Terrorist’**

In semantic and syntactic analysis of discourse, the then Communist Party (Maoist) was the object of the statements in the newspaper headlines for instance in

*TRN* , ‘The Government labeled the Maoists “terrorists”, “India labeled the Maoists terrorists,” or “US labeled the Maoists terrorist.” Structure of sentence coexist with the structure of power in international relation. In this context how does the object defend itself from the label by hurling back the adjective to the subject, is important to analyze.

In “Nepalese revolution: How Is It Interlinked with World Revolution?”, C. P. Gajurel aka ‘Gaurav’, the then foreign affair head of the Maoist Party of Nepal, Prachanda (the party president) and Bhattarai (the leader), as the addressee of the label “terrorists” defends their insurgency by claiming it to be the “People’s Revolution” but call back the US, UK and India supported military domination of the Nepal government as ‘terrorism.’ Therefore, analysis of the rhetoric and use of language of the Maoists to resist the label ‘terrorists’ helps to reveal the alternative perspective on the discourses of terrorism and war on terror in Nepal. An news paper *Revolutionary Worker* mentions:

As fighting in the People's War in Nepal intensifies, the U.S. and other powerful countries are stepping up efforts to help the reactionary Nepalese government hunt down and arrest those leading this popular insurgency--the leaders of the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist). As part of the conditions for negotiations the Nepalese regime had rescinded the "terrorist" tag on the CPN(M).

The Maoists leaders have first criticized the U. S. activities done in the name of “war on terror” and then tried to claim how “Maoist’s ideology”, in their opinion, is an alternative to the betterment of the world. While doing so they put the U. S. and the India as the opposition force as well as the oppressor of Nepal. In contrast to James F.

Moriarty's representation of the US in as a benevolent democracy, Gaurav reveals the coalition of the discourse of 'war on terror' with the discourse of 'people's war.'

A glorious and momentous people's Revolution is advancing in Nepal in leaps and bounds thereby influencing not only the politico military-economic situation of Nepal but also that of the world politics to a considerable extent. US imperialism has vowed to collide with this revolutionary war along with its accomplice the British imperialism and it's allied imperialist forces of Bush's "war on terror". (Gaurav 291)

Gaurav has the authentic voice from the Maoist party; and his attitude published in the *Problems and the Prospects of Revolutions in Nepal* represents how the party reacted against the label "terrorist." When they were labeled as terrorists the Maoists were defending themselves as the "revolutionaries." From the perspective of critical discourse analysis, naming is a process of constructing, knowledge-truth-power, then it is a means of refuting the hegemony of power as well. In this process the Maoists named themselves as 'revolutionaries' and refuted the label "terrorist." The concept of terrorism and labeling some activities as terrorism becomes a weapon to be exploited on the stage of global power", which both the addressor and the addressee are trying to manipulate (Erjavec qtd in Hodges 186).

To show internal contradiction within other's discourse can be a medium for weakening the opposition's ideas. The CPN (Maoist) rather labels the western countries especially the U. S. and U. K. as the "imperialist reactionary states inclined to combat this revolution at the Himalayan country" (Gaurav 291). Gaurav points out the contradiction in attitude of those countries towards Nepal's conflict. "In the international meeting of the donor states in London, ... sharp differences came up

regarding the nature and character of the aids to be provided to the Gyanendra-Paras-Deuba regime of Nepal” (Gaurav 291). By playing with the contradiction of the donor country he tries to maintain his party’s moral strength and puts the rest of the countries as the sympathizer of Maoists. “US and its accomplice UK, were virtually in minority when all the other representatives opposed to assist the tottering “Nepal government" through military aid” (291). He shows the direct compliance of the U.S. and the U.K. against Maoists while supportive for the palace. But he focuses on other countries’s stand not to impose military support but the humanitarian support to Nepal government which was fighting against Maoists. He writes, “They put forward their opinion that Nepal should be provided assistance in humanitarian and development works, not at the military equipment” (Gaurav 291). Then Gaurav maintains his party’s perspective on UK government. He blames them of conspiring against Nepalese people’s freedom:

Tony Blair government was exposed in its own parliament when it conspired to provide 2 military planes, 2m1-17 support helicopters, explosive ordinance disposal gear and military training to the regime of Nepal through 'Global conflict prevention Pool' which is run by the Ministry of Defense, the foreign office and the international development department without being discussed the issue properly at the house. (Gaurav 291)

It shows that Maoists recognized the UK as their enemy for not regarding them as the revolutionary and for rather helping the royalists government with weapons. “The main reasons for giving military aid and training all around the world in the first place, is to keep contracts with our guys in the place that counts, the army, because they help to overthrow the governments” (Chomsky 6). In case of Nepal, the aid if



adopted, in Chomskian perspective, it could be to suppress 'the people's war' and defend monarchy which was a 'puppet' government for the Maoists.

To show that one shares same subjectivity with some power holders is a medium of strengthening one's discursive strength. For this, he positions himself close to the perspective of the parties in Belgium. The politics of subjective sharing is to show that the Maoists had support from international communities in Europe as well, which would give the party some discursive strength.

Discursive power is attached to the real objects or events that generate power. The issue of bringing weapons, as reported by Krishna Jwala Devkota from Belgium, had a big debate and street demonstrations in Belgium and Nepal at that time. In 2002 August the Belgium Anti-Imperialist forum Nepal protested against Belgium decisions to export 5500 pieces of machineguns to Nepal government. Deuba, in his visit to Belgium to procure the arms faced big protest demonstrations. One progressive organization of Nepalese in Belgium gave letters of protest against this arm deal. And, according to them, it was also a protest against ongoing 'genocide carried out by the Royal Nepalese Army (RNA)' and also they demanded the lifting the emergency in Nepal. The deputy-prime minister Magda Alvoate resigned from the post due to this issue. Thus, in Gaurave's use of language it is seen that the maoist tried to show the popularity of their party abroad, by showing the international subjective alliance to their party.

To show paradox in the opponent's discourse may also be a discursive means to gain power. The Maoists were most enraged with the U. S. since it was supporting the government to suppress them as 'terrorists.' He writes "So far the U. S. senate is concerned, it demonstrates itself to be so diehard reactionary that there is no party in the senate to raise any voice against loot, plunder, oppression, brutal attacks and

savage war against any country and the people carried out by the government” (291). He questions not only U. S. support but also the U. S. democratic system because as he says has no differences of voices in ruling parties and the opposition in the senate. Maybe for him opposition party must have opposing views. He appeals the sense of morality among the audience to condemn the U. S. policy and says, “It is a matter of shame to claim the U. S. as one of the greatest democracies in the world, where there is no real opposition in the parliament, ruling party and ‘opposition’ is alike! Just the shareholders!” (291). Thus, he maintains the Maoists had some sympathizers in Belgium but both the ruling party and the opposition had the same voice against the Maoists.

Internationalization of the agenda of ‘people’s war’ creates broader spatio-temporal horizon of a discourse. Here, the internationalization of the discourse of ‘people’s war for debate’ can become a source of gaining power in discursive war of being tagged with ‘terrorist’ and defending the party from it. The tag made the party’s publicity higher than earlier. In contrast to ‘global war on terror,’ Gaurav tries to gain that strength by placing his party’s importance to the height of the American rhetoric: “Thus, the Nepalese Revolution influence directly to the world political events at different levels” (291). After internationalizing the scope of his party through the discourse, he creates the dichotomy of ‘we’ versus ‘them.’ He places his party and his supporter as the good ‘we’ and the ‘bad other.’ He considers “the Nepalese revolution” as the “beacon of revolution for the oppressed in the contemporary world situation, has been proving as a challenge for this rotten system of imperialism and reactionary” (292). He regards the revolution his party has launched almost as powerful as the “US imperialism” and discursively the opposite force. “Consequently, the Maoists and other revolutionary forces are waging various

levels of struggle and solidarity action in support of the Nepalese revolution, in various parts of the globe on the one hand and US imperialism and reactions are vowed to suppress it on the other.” The conjunction ‘and’ between the two clauses shows how he maintains equal strength of ‘the US war on terror’ and ‘people’s war.’ He maintains that the subjectivity of the world’s revolutionaries is similar and supportive to his party. All those who are fighting against the U. S. imperialism are revolutionaries and U.S. is the oppressor for him or his party. He concludes, the ongoing Nepalese Revolution is for the class interest of the masses against imperial powers. “Therefore, it will be sheer ignorance to conceive the Nepalese Revolution as insignificant in world perspective and confining it to the territory of Nepal” (292). Then, finally he discursively refutes the label terrorism through indirect speech acts without referring to the violent actions of murder, killings, kidnap, capturing of property, threat and fear caused by themselves against the government forces and the fear in people in general.

### **Struggle Against US War of Aggression: A Rhetoric of Political Seduction?**

For Maoists the ‘war against terror’ led by US was a war against the people of the world. Maoists, as Gaurav puts, believe that “George Bush has already (in 2001) declared war against the people of the world in the guise of "war on terror" (297). In the pretext of ‘war on terror’ as they believe, “US-British army killed thousands of innocent people of the impoverished country of Afghanistan, maiming many more and torturing other thousands not only in Afghanistan's prisons but in US special torture cells in Cuba” (Gaurav 297). The party assumed the US-British coalition as “warmonger [war] has made Iraq as its second target and has already flied its fighter Jets in Iraqi sky” (Gaurav297). They maintained the “us” as the ‘enemy of people’ by sympathizing at the people in Iraq and Afghanistan but almost no words have spent in

critiquing the activities of Islamist groups. He points out that the U. S. made ‘massive attacks’ and ‘bombigs’ on Palestine people continuing unabated by its Middle-East watch dog Israel” (298). Thus, the Maoists are as concerned to the grief of those the U. S. oppressed countries.

After sympathizing to the Middle East nations, and critiquing the U. S. led activities in Middle East Gaurav connects the issue of ‘war on terror’ to Nepal. The subjectivity is built by aligning to those who opposed American ‘act superior’ tendency. The fear of American direct intervention is envisioned in the discourse of the Maoists. “Though the Maoist Movements of Nepal and other countries are not under the US list of ‘terrorists,’ but it will not make any difference”, says Gaurav. They are not keeping these names in the "list" only because of the apprehension of being further exposed among the masses”. To be put in the list was a great concern of fear for the Maoists in 2003 which was later actually put in the “list of the terrorists” by USA. Listing is a discursive practice. Listing itself is a political act infused in discourse of power. Maoists though showed antagonism against the U. S. from earlier had desire not to be put in the list of terrorists. To show that they are not terrorists they put forward the discourse that gives them revolutionary status rather than that of terrorist: “This can correctly be understood through the news we received from the *Revolutionary Worker*, a leftist weekly coming out from USA, which says "The People's War in Nepal is a genuine war of liberation that has nothing in common with groups like al Qaida. But the Nepalese government and the Indian government have officially labeled the CPN (Maoist) terrorist” (Gaurav 297). The media coverage of the party is also a matter of discursive power, because the media reaches to a great number of the people and the subjects expect that they are convincing the audiences with their ideas.

Regarding listing or labeling, Gaurav i.e. the Maoists, were very angry against the Nepal government, however they further blamed the Indian and American government for influencing the government to do so. He puts forward the Maoists perspective:

And the rulers of Nepal have packaged their plea for foreign help to fight the insurgency as "part of the global fight against terrorism."

Again, the US State Department has not put the CPN (Maoist) on their official list of 'terrorists' but the US government-along with Britain and other imperialist powers are all- supporting the Nepalese regimes campaign against the Maoist, in which hundreds of people in Nepal's countryside are being killed; many more, accused of being "Maoist sympathizers". Are being rounded up and jailed; and all kinds of constitutional rights have been suspended. (291)

In the 'state of emergency' as well as in 'the state of exception,' all the rights of people are suspended. Due to this the people had been turned into bare life and are neither protected by the law nor they are free/ out of law (Agamben 2). Legal or illegal arrests and tortures were common by the government during that the emergency. Govinda Bartaman narrates how all the innocent members of the same family were beaten, killed, almost unconscious woman raped, beating of infants, disappearances, beatings of pregnant women, loot of properties by the government forces and the neighbor threatened not to maintain any human relation with that family (Gautam 288). He calls it an example of naked, "cruel or extreme" dance of "state terrorism". The Maoists highlighted the "state terrorism" imposed in the name of counter insurgency with "Terrorism and Disruptive Acts Control and Punishment Ordinance" against the label dubbed on them. But the anger of the Maoists is against

the foreign powers more. The Maoists put the blame on the US government for instigating the Nepal government to put the label on the them. "US secretary of state Colin Powell went to Nepal in January to meet the King, Prime Minister and head of the Royal Nepalese Army" (Gaurav 297) to devise plans against the Maoists. President Bush has been presented as acting superior role in conversation, who calls and orders Nepali Prime Minister. "President Bush invited Nepal's Prime Minister Sher Bahadur to the White house to talk in May and then asked congress to approve \$20 million in military and economic aid for Nepal." The foreign aid to the government is inimical to the Maoists since most of it had been used to suppress them. Gaurav further quotes *The Revolutionary Workers* paper to expose how the US had shown negative attitude towards the Maoists:

Christina Rocca, Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, testified to the House International relation Committee that "the Maoists [in Nepal] have shown themselves to be ruthless enemy by their tactics in the field and through terrorist attacks against both government targets and innocent civilians." And the US government has given special training on "resistance against Maoist terrorism," to Nepali Officials. (Gaurav 297)

He uses language used again them by the US to strike back with the same terms and phrases and even label the US forces as terrorists. It can be deciphered that the forces ranging from Maoist to Islamic fundamentalism are the target of the U. S. and vice versa at least in discursive war. "Though the immediate targets of US imperialism are some Islamic forces, but these are not regarded by US its *ultimate* targets" according to the Maoists. He raises the discursive strength by posing his party as a direct counterpart of the US. "Ultimate targets are Maoists and other revolutionary forces

and masses in Maoists beliefs” (Gaurav 298). Though the Maoists have defended with their might, they are too weak in discursive connection because their voices are hardly presented by the medias in the world dominated by the superpowers already gaining the worldwide support to fight global war against terrorism.

Blame game and labeling the other with bad name like terrorist becomes a primary function of language during conflict among the parties as perceived threats. The Maoists have labeled the India as the “expansionists.” “Down with Indian expansionism” and “American imperialism” were the most pronounced slogans and wall poster during the conflict. While India was helping Nepal government in pretext of suppressing the Maoists they were against it. What made the Maoists oppose the Indian discourse of maintaining “peace in Nepal” is answered by Gaurav from Maoists perspective which reveals Nepal- India power relation. He writes:

The Indian state, which is expansionist, has become more aggressive these days when Maoist People’s War is advancing towards nationwide conquer of power. The Indian fascist state shattering all its so called "one of the biggest democracy of the world" veil, is constantly assaulting the journalist, human rights activist and social leaders of Nepalese people in India and extraditing to the fascist Gyanendra- Deuba regime of Nepal. Their sole crime was that they supported the cause of the Nepalese masses and opposed the fascist repression unleashed by the regime of Nepal. This assault has been intensified by the Indian State especially since the last August (2002) and is going on unabated. (Gaurav 298)

The Maoist leaders used language to critique the use of power deployed in the name of democracy by showing contrast between the nomenclature and concept against that

of the practices. Since they were fighting to establish the republican system against the parliamentary democracy, they used language and rhetoric to expose the negative aspects of democracy practiced by the western nations like the US and India.

According to the Maoists India is misusing its power to advance its influence. The image of India as the largest democracy of the world has been questioned and it is exposed as a veil for abusing of human rights and suppressing weaker neighbours.

Gaurav has sided to the idea of human rights and ethos of civil rights, despite their own party had been using force, strategically to generate a discursive source of power to critique India.

Some hard hitting labels are put back by the Maoists to India in reaction to the Indian attempt to suppress their 'revolution.' They accused India and the U. S. as the allies in suppressing the Maoists and they even call that India was just a lackey of the U.S. imperialism. He creates frightening image of India, "One of the tasks of the Indian state has now become espionage the Maoist and their sympathizers, if there are any in India and submitting them to their accessory, the hated fascist Nepalese regime" (Gaurav 298). He also complains Indian police for being loyal to Nepali Government and "for putting naked assault to Nepalese revolutionaries in India which was hardly seen before in the history of India, it has been outspread after US came at the front to suppress the Nepalese revolution and India works as lackey of US imperialism" (Gaurav 298). He blames India of exercising "Hindu fascism ... which is being exercised in domestic as well as its foreign policy, manifested in assault and extradition of Nepalese personalities. The use of these semiotics could have helped the Maoists to put the moral strength of India down before the audience at large.

Truth value of a discourse is highlighted by the speaker/producer of the discourse by foregrounding the manner of discourse of their own. Major concerns of



the Maoists conflict at discursive level is with, “who will lead this anti imperialist struggle and how can it be advances” (Gaurav 298). By claiming this big responsibility they are trying to prove that they are huge force in changing the power relation in the history of international relation through the procedure of their discourse formation as strength of their party. How the discourse represents its own truth formation process also gives some power. “Scientific process” is the semiotic conventionally put close to the truth which Maoists also claim to have in their discourse, “We Maoist thorough scientific analysis have drawn conclusion that only proletariat has the capacity to lead such anti-imperialist struggle thoroughly and up to the end. So, they mean to say that their conclusions are authentic, true and powerful.

The politics of maintaining the truth value of discursive formation is to gain more power that they expect useful to “lead the anti-imperialists war.” Though the Maoist have been sympathetic to Islamist organizations which, according to them, were the mere products of frustrations and despairs. They, the Islamists, were guided not by the truth of “scientific” analysis like that of the Maoists but that of the religious fundamentalism. So by highlighting the fundamentalists element in the Islamists organizations, Maoists claimed that they are the sole organizations which has “scientific explanation” to fight imperialism. Since they claim their discourse to have been “scientific” they claimed that they are the right forces to lead anti imperialist war. Gaurav compares and contrasts Al Quaeda from the Maoists:

Some misguided people even go to the extent of looking forward to Al Quada. The root cause of this type of idea is frustration and disappointment. Real practice has repeatedly proved even recently that such fundamentalist forces have not that capacity to lead anti imperialist struggles. It has not any clear-cut- imperialist line, it has no

such history it has no such an aim. Everybody knows what treatment Saddam has met with Kurdistan Movement. It does not mean that we should not support Iraqi people in their fight against US aggression; we should strongly support them in this genuine battle. Only point is that we should not lose sight from the scientific principle of characterization of the political forces and that of the struggle. (299)

In his own, words he concludes in declarative sentence, “Therefore, it is Maoist force, which has the capacity of leading this anti- imperialist struggle” (299). Maoists themselves are aware that the war against the super power is not possible militarily, but discursively. He uses several hedges in the sentence to represent the “struggle” into discursivity: “We are not talking here about the capacity of Maoist forces fight against US super- power militarily. It is known to all that US is a super power and has piled huge stock of lethal arms. What we mean by anti-imperialist struggle is not the arm conflict with US” (299). The dichotomy between revolution as good and imperialism as evil He justifies Maoists not fighting against US militarily by pin pointing to other semiotics that create power in international politics: the “lethal weapons.” Here, the Maoists claim that there concern is about “the question of building anti-US imperialist movement at the world level in a conscious and planned way, but incorporating broadest level of masses on the basis of a correct line (299).

The dichotomy created between correct versus false and in which the Maoists are put to the ‘correct’ category by themselves is prevalent in the discourse. Maoists have used many declarative sentences to claim the truth of their discourse. For instance, “This is 'era of imperialism and proletarian revolution' whose specific feature is the revolution; whether it may be new democratic or socialist, or national liberation movement in individual countries are closely linked up with anti-

imperialist-struggle.” Gaurav further claims the truth value, “Obviously, imperialism involves itself and stands against all revolutions taking place in any country, without exception” (299). “When Maoists People's Liberation Army (PLA) strikes on the reactionary fascist state of Nepal and its armed forces the US imperialism feels it's wounded and starts reacting against CPN Maoist and the PLA at different levels” (299). Maoists see the empathy of the U. S. to the royalist government which was always repressive.

In the discourse of ‘war on terror’, the Maoists found themselves along with mass as object and victim of the action taken under the pretext of terrorism envisioned that they were made the ultimate target of the “the U.S. war against terror” for their discursive strength was more “scientific” than that of Al Qaeda’s religious fundamentalism. Discourse gets more power when their semiotics of power are linked to the actual activities like attacks of the police stations and army barrack by Maoists and the Maoists areas by the government forces. Right at this situation, at an occasion of observing the '11 September' (which has nothing to do with CPN (M) and its PLA, the “US ambassador to Nepal persisted Maoist to surrender arms and come to the negotiation with the government” (299). Thus, here the direct link was made between the discourse of 9/11 and the Nepali Maoists insurgency.

Nepali Maoists produced discourse critically on the responses of the other countries. In conflict discourse, they are most observant of the U. S. responses to the conflicts of other country. “It is also true for revolutions in other countries how the US imperialism expresses its concern to suppress the armed revolutionary struggles led by CPNI (ML) (PW) and MCC in India, how it is acting against the revolutionary movement in Peru and Turkey” (299). The critical stand point maintained by the Maoists over the U. S. response to other revolutions is a discursive method of drawing

more power in favour of them, by putting them in the pedestal, as Gaurav puts, “So these are the clear signals how the Maoist forces are ultimate targets of US ‘war on terror’ (300). Maoists perceived that their party’s idea, the party and the carders of it were the major targets of US attack.

Use of language to appeal the mass and in favour of mass gives a way to discursive power. The Maoist Party discursively maintains that the attack of the U. S. after September 11, on Maoists was actually an attack on mass of people. “Thus, the master plan of Bush to launch war of aggression against revolutionary forces, against the masses and against the various states, especially aftermath of 11 September has causes the world situation to undergo change in various aspects” (299). Use of language to have control over the future through discourse has been a source of power in international relation. Since Maoists too want to claim powerful status in the future, they claim some truth for future:

Coming months and years are sure to be marked by revolutionary forces in general and Maoist revolutionaries in particular have to be prepared to meet this new challenge and turning it to excellent opportunity for revolutionary transformations. Our party is ready to shoulder this responsibility working along the side with all Maoist and other revolutionary forces to intensify our struggle further to achieve our objective and goal. (Jan 2003: 300)

Claiming the truth for future and appealing the mass to unite is the most powerful rhetoric that leftists especially the Maoists in Nepal have employed in their discourse. The Maoists struggle, thus, was linked to oppose the most dominant discourse of international power relation “war on terrorism” in Nepal. While the American president declares the “war against terror” globally there is lack of any check and

balance to it international level except by some Islamist fundamentalists because the world has been hegemonized and agreed with this rhetoric. But the Maoists of the small country like Nepal have claimed to have got the ‘scientific’ analysis of the ‘objective reality’ of world politics and launched a discursive struggle against the ‘imperialism’ of the U. S. the only superpower in the contemporary world in the disguise of war on terror.

It shows that, as long as there remain clashes of the discourses the possibility for actual clash can not be denied due to the *pragmatic* value of the discourse (Austine 3). Since the clash is with the super power, the existence of the smaller nations can be in crisis. The crisis might invite a state of exception where human life will turn into bare life before the powers which take no responsibility of violence but accuse each other for the crisis. Prachandapath had been interpreted as the “ambition of Prachanda to be the leader of Asia” (Gautam 355). He also point out the possibility of imperial power launching the vicious circle of war in Nepal if Maoists kept such high ambitions. The discourse of “terrorism” can breed more terror in the future, if the U. S. war on terror and Maoist’s ambitions to “win the world” kept on persisting, resulting terror among people. So far, truth is subjective it will be in the position of indistinction whether it was war or mere terrorism.

The discourses as scripted first are also performed later in politics. To identify and name the social condition; and perform the discourse in their situatedness is its characteristic feature of language in period of conflict. After naming the “situatedness of the discourse” as Nepal in “semi-colonial domination” the Maoists devised further discourse to counter the name they had given to the antagonistic forces. The Maoists tried to perform their scripts not only discursively but physically as well. But to perform physically they devised some texts further called “strategies” and “tactics” of

“new democratic revolution.” “The party has categorically declared that after the new democratic revolution all forms of imperialist and expansionist domination and exploitation shall be ended, all unequal treaties shall be abrogated and relations shall be established with all countries on equal basis” (288). To be free from the power of what they called “expansionist semi-colonial domination” they put forward the proposal to make the text/treaty defunct or non- performative. India had “pressurized Nepal to sign another treaty in the pretext of changing scenario after 9/11 and Maoists insurgency in Nepal- the *supurdagi sandhi*” for further subjugation of Nepal (Gautam 100). It was a difficult choice between doubt and hope for third world countries like Nepal (Gautam 102). Maoists established the universe of their discourse of “people’s war” by situating itself among other discourses they created, as Bhattarai writes,

In the present day world marked by superpower imperialism and in the case of South Asia dominated by Indian expansionism, the national question assumes great significance in the agenda of proletarian revolution, hence, the Maoist communist revolutionaries in particular ought to do their best to divest the reactionary coatings off the bourgeois nationalism and make a judicious use of the revolutionary masses. (Gautam 102)

The Maoists claim the future creating fear among the leftist inclined people that there could be foreign intervention of powerful countries. So they called for further unity of the people evoking the nationalist feelings. “Nowhere it is more urgent and important than in the case of Nepal where the unity of all the progressive forces opposed to Indian expansionism and its puppets would be needed to thwart the impending danger of external armed intervention against the People's War led by the Maoist

revolutionaries” (289). The danger impending in the future is also textual strategy to make people feel that Nepal is really in need of new form of nationalism which is not “the puppet” nationalism of the “expansionists” and “imperialists.”

Similar pattern of imperialist as evil versus Maoist as good has been maintained by Prachanda the Chairman and the supreme commander of the CPN (Maoists) party and its military wing People’s Liberation Army, to bring people in his side through speeches. Though he was declared the “terrorists” with bounty of 1 million on his head, he further asserts on need of “people's war and the expansion and consolidation of international relations” as an integral part of world proletariat revolution (161). The name and the label put on his name compels the researcher to dig out the discursive war he launched internationally that invited the tag of ‘head of terrorist’ from international community. He has tried to get support of the moral discourses, justice, and right to revolution to gain the discursive strength of his ‘people’s war.’ At the same time he has also shown the connections of the discourses of ‘people’s war’ in Nepal with the international proletariat revolutions like RIM. He has put the “expansionism ‘and ‘imperialism’ as antagonistic forces and mass as the protagonists. He has claimed that the “capitalistic” discourse of the western democracies which is antagonist to them is facing crisis now. He shows that the inimical discourses are not good at all. He also consoles his ‘people’ that there is wide international support from the international community. This discursive consolation by linking in the international relation gains discursive power to his party. Because the international discourse are connected to physical activities and objects like economy, organizational and even military strength. He claims the truth for future when he claims that Nepalese People's War will have a historic role in developing new wave of world revolution in the near future” (162) . He establishes the so called

the “best position” to his party because of the dialectical path of its own development” among not only the oppositional powers but also “among the Maoists like CPI of India and other revisionist” (162). To claim the best position one can gain this power by letting the opponent down discursively. So he shows the weaknesses and ugliness of the opponents. He explores paradoxes of the point of views in the discourses made by the government of Nepal towards the Maoists:

At first the government declared that the people's war' was a "political problem" and could be solved through "dialogue" but later it devised the strategy of suppression and "wipe it out within the period of three months." The government is proceeding ahead with the strategic policy of using the government sponsored goons under the name of people's Defense Committee, killing of revolutionary carders with surprise attacks, making false and vicious propaganda against the leadership of People's war, mobilizing huge commando police and military forces through unannounced, countrywide campaign of repression, arrest, and torture and making for a armed interventions against, peaceful programme of different mass organizations. (Prachanda 152)

Appeal to different identities and gaining support from such identity categories is a discursive process of relationality. The construction of dichotomy between state as an oppressor and the Maoist as the revolutionary with good moral is the basic pattern in political speeches of the Maoist's leaders including Prachanda. Prachanda then bears the responsibility of liberating the mass of various identity i. e. nationalities as addressed earlier, from such cruelty and appeals them with Marxists-Leninists-Maoist rhetoric of class struggle to unite. He claims the popularity of the people's war internationally. He claims the truth: “People's victory is certain!” (Prachanda 163).



Thus, truth formation through discourse was performed by the Maoists to convince the people in their agendas.

"Nepalese revolution is an integral part of world proletarian revolution and this will serve the world revolution." ... The initiation of the people's war and its successive development has, at one end; the Nepalese people's War has received moral support from all the Parties. In the course of development, today, the international responsibility of our Party and the revolutionary Nepalese people has increased qualitatively. (161)

By showing the Nepalese People's war relations with international revolutionaries, he exposes the "hatching conspiracies and intrigues particularly of the ruling classes of India and the American imperialists, the world gendarmes", against his party to suppress the People's War. He claims that Nepalese's people's War has proved to be a big slap to the world imperialist system which is undergoing new economic and political crisis. It is now becoming clear that the Nepalese People's War will have a historic role in developing new wave of world revolution in the near future (162). The Maoists' rhetoric and global war on terror rhetoric both are preoccupied with internationalism, to some extent, to the desire to win the world.

The pattern of representation imperialist versus revolutionary is prevalent in Baburam Bhattarai's use of language too. The discourse of "Politico-Economic rationale of people's war in Nepal" has been foregrounded by the Maoists for the need of their struggle against the imperialism. Maoists have represented the present "the present is an era" as the "era of imperialism or monopoly capitalism" (Bhattarai 69). The Maoists agreed with what Bhattarai claimed in his Ph.D. thesis later published as a book "The Nature of Underdevelopment and Regional Structure of

Nepal - A Marxist Analysis". He claimed and re-contextualized the following idea in his party discourse as well:

Because of the nature of unequal and uneven development inherent in capitalism most of the world's capital and wealth become concentrated in the hands of the few imperialist countries of the West and the North, whereas most of the countries where as most of the south and the east (i.e. Asia, Africa, and Latin America) are suffering from underdevelopment and poverty. That the gap between the rich and the poor has never been so wide in the history of mankind so far and this is growing ever wider has been acknowledged by the statistical findings of the imperialist organizations themselves. For example, only the annual sale amount of 200 big multi-national companies of the imperialist countries exceed the gross domestic production of all the countries except the nine rich big economies (i.e.) USA, Japan, Germany, France, Britain, Russia, Italy, Canada, and Australia) and they alone own one-third of the world's wealth. (72)

Maoists have interpreted the world's politico-economic condition through Marxist dialectics of rich versus poor. Similarly, the richer industrialized countries have been misusing the surplus gained by exploiting the poor nation in delivering weapons and there by war and controlling the science, technology and media in their favor. Since the media is the medium of knowledge production the truth is what these powerful nations want. To check the widening gap the Maoists claimed to have raised war against imperialism, as found in these discourse. In the name of free market system "bigger fish eats smaller fish" logic has been applied. The competition and war of the richer nations is to re-divide their economic territories. Almost six times more people

than the number killed in the first and the second world have been killed by the war made by these big countries in the post world war eras. Billions of dollars have been invested by the richer countries in arms, ammunitions, military and nuclear weapons. Putting the discourses of war mongering nature of the richer countries in the West and the North Maoists has called it “era of war capitalism” (72). “Among the oppressed nations of the world, Nepal stands amongst the most oppressed ones” (72). The sole cause for the poverty which has led the masses to despair and need for violence has been interpreted by the Maoists as below:

That this poor and underdeveloped state of the county is not because lack of natural resources or due to the laziness of the laboring masses but due to the internal and external reactionary relation, can be proved by comparing Nepal's position before and after the semi-colonial Sugauli Treaty of 1816 with other contemporary countries or the world. Nepal sandwiched between the giant states of china and India and surrounded on the southern, western and eastern sides by India in the lap of Himalayas, was in its history first oppressed by British Colonialism, and after the 1950s oppressed by various imperialist powers, and principally by Indian expansionism. After the Sugauli treaty and up to now, the internal development process of Nepal has remained stunted and distorted by the destructive effect of external imperialist or /and expansionist forces. (73)

Such interpretation of backwardness of Maoists has been reacted by several discourses like, “extremists”, “people's war without people”, “romance of petty bourgeoisie”, “armed struggle was a mistake” or in governments discourse the ‘terrorists’, are the charges made by others to which Prachanda has called

“revisionists” or “reactionaries” (Prachanda 169). Thus the ‘war’ is at first the war of the discourse that gained Maoists the label of “terrorists.” This research has explored that though poverty, backwardness and political unrest have been explained by the Maoists in imperialist versus revolutionary dialectics, the main thrust of struggle lies against textual domination that is in the form of treaties. So it’s the textual subordination that forces Nepal to remain dominated.

Maoists blamed the ‘Imperial powers like US and UK’ and the ‘expansionist’s power like India’ as the major cause of Nepal’s backwardness. They interpreted that the richer countries have used the third world countries as their captive markets through free trade, multinational companies, and multilateral transactional corporations including monetary funds. Such nations held control over science and technology and produce the discourses that supports them. Then the surplus is used in the investment of weapons to put the smaller nations in threat. If there are competitions they are only among the richer nations for expanding their territory of their market. So the wars among the richer nations are to re-divide the sphere for their influences. And in a world wide scale the siphoning of wealth from the oppressed countries to the imperialist countries takes places in the form of profits of capital investments in industries, interest of financial loans, commercial profits of trade in goods, and services, etc. that is why whatever capital investments the imperialist forces make in oppressed countries through multilateral means like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, etc. and through unilateral means like transnational corporations of their own country or their government, they take away ten times more capital to imperialist centers from the oppressed countries in various ways. Besides this, through their monopoly in science and technology, communication and capital the imperialist countries to be distorted and dependent. At the other end, according to

the "bigger fish eats smaller fish" logic and rule of the imperialists there will always be fierce competition among the monopolist capitalist groups to expand their hegemony and there will be war in order to maintain their own influences (or territories), or to re-divide the old economic territories. They sponsor the governments of the smaller nations that agree to be their captive market. But if they oppose they call them the terrorist's organizations or the terrorist's nations. From Maoists point of view there is clear nexus between imperialism and war [on terror]:

This is proved by the facts that after the advent of imperialism the current 20th century, two world wars have occurred (more than 160 wars have occurred after the Second World War), and six times more people have lost their lives in wars in this century as compared to in wars in the previous 19th century. Similarly, the very fact that the imperialists spend one thousand billion US dollars per annum in armaments (almost half of which the USA alone sends) proves the nexus between imperialism and war. That is why imperialism is also called "era of war capitalism." Thus at one end, contradictions between imperialism is pushing the whole world to the brink of war. Under such situation it becomes not only natural [to bandwagon?] but also inevitable for oppressed nations to fight the war of liberation based on the strategy of relying not on capital, armament or technology but on the oppressed masses. (Prachanda 72-73)

'Extremist,' 'the 'terrorist', 'practitioners of the people's war without people,' war as the romance of petty bourgeoisie", "armed struggle as a mistake" are the charges made by "revisionist" (Prachanda 169). Thus, he sums up the labels put on them and refutes them.

Thus, in discursive analysis, the Maoist struggle was basically clashes of names and labels hurled by one another, semiotics of blame and defenses made from each others. “Terrorism” and “War on Terror” are the semiotics that they carry extremist’s imperialist attitude to win the whole world devised by the west, at least in Maoists interpretations. Similarly, the Maoists’ rhetoric also uses semiotics like ‘win the world’ that claims all the power to be brought to their hand in a totalitarian way to counter against the ‘war on terror, which the world already had accepted. In the discourse picked from the time of conflict and analyzed here, by discursive representation of Nepal as a ‘base area’ for the world revolution Maoists have produced the fear for the future because base areas are the most prone to the severe wars, confrontations or violation of human life. War on terror discourse and tag of terrorists on the Maoists made the nation susceptible for foreign intervention. Thus the people of Nepal had to remain under the terror of global ‘war on terror’ accepted by the Nepal government officially and the ‘people’s war’ fought by the rebels for making Nepal republic.

## **V. Power See-saw with Semiotics of Weapons: Unseen Big Brothers at the Background**

The war semiotics, in other words security metaphors, like ‘weapons,’ ‘People’s Liberation Army (PLA),’ ‘Police, Army (RNA) now Nepal Army (NA)’ and other ‘security forces of Nepal’ and the performances of the “semiotics” into actions are the major source of fear and terror among people during the conflict (Chilton 1). Even those people who never saw the weapons of any side were also terrified at times because they had been illocutioned to the terror semiotics through different media including FMs, newspapers, radio, TV, internet, mobile/phone, pamphlets and even the rumors. Though the weapons and armies are the real objects in conflict, they reached to people more frequently through language than the tangible actions. Their perceptions were made through language along with audio-visual representations in medias. Though around 15 thousands people were killed by the weapons in the conflict, partly called the event whether ‘terrorism,’ insurgency,’ ‘rebellion,’ ‘revolution’ or ‘people’s war,’ a population of about two hundred seventy million people were in constant fear of the weapons, that caused terrorism, because that reached everyday through news and rumors in to their mind. But who are the ultimate power players of these semiotics in relation to national and international level and what is their politics can be revealed through the discourse analysis in international context.

For this I have studied the book *Nepali Sena. (Nepal Army: Challenges over Control of Nepal Army)* which was edited by Sudhir Sharma and was published in Kathmandu by Martin Chautari in 2010 as one of the primary sources. The book highlights the character of the Nepal Army, and the PLAs, collecting the articles from prominent critics of Nepal’s security sectors. The point of departure in this chapter is

what the discourses say about the sources of weapons that gave power and caused terror via foreign policy in Nepal's international relation.

In his introductory article, "Increased Power of Nepal Army", Sudhir Sharma reveals, "Nepal has come to such a stage that debates have begun whether Nepal needs an army or not?" He states, "before talking to integration, rehabilitation or democratization of [PLA], or democratization of [NA], perhaps, the time has come to *debate on* whether a country like Nepal situated between the giant neighbors: China and India needs an army or not" (Sharma ix). The undecisive rhetoric of "whether or not" used about the need of Nepal Army also questions that till now whether it was used for security or source of domination, torture, expense and terrorism. What is the semiotic relation of the Nepal Army with the countries fighting war on terror in post 9/11 era, and how the relationality is maintained and represented in discourse is important question to dig into the root of "terrorism", and "counter terrorism" in Nepal. To draw a brief history of arm rebellion- after the coup of 2017 by king Mahendra Nepali Congress had adopted a guerrilla strategy 'hit and run' of which Nepal army could take control of (Bhatta in Sharma Sudhir 71). However the discourse of terrorism and "the US foreign policy by metaphor of war on terror" was not been prevalent at that time and the world was yet to be globalized to have a direct relation with the countries in distance like that of the U. S (Chilton 19).

Who orders to prepare the text and who actually follows the order also determines power relations. Similarly when the text (like children's homework) is meant to be submitted for scrutiny or examination the preparer of the text 'acts inferior' to the examiner. The power lies in the hand of the examiner. "The Royal Nepal Army submitted a report to the assistant of the foreign Minister of the US. Christina Rocca which was about implementing the Civil-Military National Unified



Campaign Plan (Nagari-Saina-Samyukta-Aviyan-Yojana), in 2060/07/23.” The “briefing report” was about “countering of terrorism.” So the discursive procedure and position of the report maker and examiner and the examinee’s position shows that the U. S. was exercising some power directly or indirectly over RNA about controlling Nepal’s Maoists. A Nepali Ambassador to USA has never submitted with the American government’s policy of implementing the army. So in the text (both spoken or written) examiner has control over the examinee. Nepal Army assumed obedient examinee’s position regarding mobilizing army and countering ‘terrorism.’ The language in the report submitted to the US Ambassador focuses on oppressing the Maoist insurgency:

2. The oppression will be conducted against violence, terrorism and disarm the Maoist. When the Maoist arms are reduced significantly and only if they agreed to accept to landing on the constitution of 2047 BS, the government would start a talk to them.
3. After implementing Unified Command by Nepal Army the remaining security and civil forces like Nepal police, Nepal Armed Police and Bureau of Investigation to come under the army.

Sharma comments that the Army was successful in neither of them; however it did not let the Maoists defeat the Army (Sharma 6). Sharma’s speculation according to speech act theory could not perform the desired goal which was about suppressing the insurgency that was named as terrorism.

The semiotics during the conflict used in media and rumors as well were about several types of weapons used by the Maoists as well as the government. Most often the Maoists were reported that they used the domestic weapons like sickles, swords, *khukuri*, hand made sockets bombs and the modern weapons looted from the police or

army, while the source of weapons to the security forces were reported to have been provided by or sold by the rich nations in the West like the U. S., Belgium and the U. K. as well big brothers like India and China. Such news would further terrorize the people that the conflict might be further accelerating. The Maoists told that they had fought for bringing the Nepal Army (NA) under civilian supremacy, however, situation turned opposite. The army used the opportunity for empowering it by accumulating more weapons that are material manifestation of verbal semiotics for power:

Using this opportunity of conflict NA increased strength almost twice. The SLR rifles used by the Royal Nepal Army were made in Belgium, and were replaced with the American M-16 guns and Insas Rifle from India. 55 machine guns were brought from Belgium. Anti-mine vehicles, Night-vision equipments, bomb disposal units etc were bought. The Army helicopters which were about a dozen in 2058 reached up to 27 within 3 years time, Army then were Avro jet, one sky-van and 2 sky-truck and two spy-jets (Sharma 6).

SLR, in popular term “long range,” “night-vision,” “guns,” “ambush,” “bombs” were the most often heard semiotics from local people’s mouth. The entire media channels, neighborhood- gossips, friends talk in the villages and cities were mixed up with war semiotics. Fear was inherent while the sources were both local as well as foreign and both material as well as fear constructed through semiotic representations in which the ‘global war on terror’ and ‘people’s war’ were the basic semiotics.

America was engaged in its global ‘war against terror of whatever name and kind’ and supporting the government to increase military strength in Nepal also. American support helped establish “an especial force called Ranger Battalion.”

Before this Royal Nepal Army had only "Gha" and "'Nga" *Gulma* barrack under Bhairavnath Gana of that kind" (Sharma 7. *my translation*). It's not only weapons but the semiotics too were imported to Nepal. Nepal's security force learnt new names for weapons, strategies and operations which affected people's daily phenomena. These discursive elements too were boosting the confidence of the army men; thus the army discursively empowered.

Power, politics and economy are intertwined in the language of maintaining security and order which is again interlinked with issue of terrorism. "The budget allocated to the army in 2047-48 BS was only 1 billion and 10 million (1 Arba, 10 Crore), since then the army budget in 2058-59, reached to 5850 million and reached to 10 billion and 25 million (10 Arba, 25 Crore) in 2062-63" (Sharma 7). With the same token and the "budget on social spending, mostly on health and education decreased" (Shrestha and Thapa 103). The most heard semiotic was "security" than others like health, education and so on.

'State of emergency' with several 'dos' and 'dents' imposed by the government with illocutionary force is a terrorizing semiotic to hear for common people. In normal understanding it demands the suspension of people's right and gives power to the security sectors. People can be arrested in suspicion of "terrorists" even without proof. If an innocent individual having some kind of connection with the Maoists was arrested but had not contributed to the Maoists they would not accept him to be their carder, however the state also would not accept him as a ordinary citizen. He will belong to neither Maoists nor to the government side. Then he would belong neither to "us" nor "them" and turn to a bare life existent denied by the power.

Due to the imposition of state of emergency and 'Terrorism and Disruptive Act (Control and Punish) Ordinance' tremendous political

as well as legal power to the army increased. The war necessity helped increase the infra-structure, number of army and arms, budget and international approach and support to the army.

Army belonged to the “us” side of the palace and Maoists belonged to “them.” People were either divided or put under the fear by them. “Influence of palace grew higher the way the palace wanted” (Sharma 7) So, that the palace could use it to fulfill the political motive. “After the royal coup, the foreign donors like India, the U. S. and the U. K. stopped support for a time being. It made Nepal Army psychologically and logistically weaker” (Sharma 7). To view linguistically the neighbours declared for a time being that you do not belong to “us.” So, as long as the palace belonged to “us” side of the foreign power it was powerful but when it also turned to “them” almost like Maoists, it also belonged to the “terrorists” side, in other word “state terror.” For a time being the foreign aid to the “state terror” was stopped.

The one who declares has the power over its operation. “The Indian Defense minister Parnav Mukharjee in 2062/4/23 said, "Nepal army is not capable enough to control Maoist”. The same night the Maoists had attacked an army campaign in Pili of Kalikot and captured it. Coincidentally the declaration of the Indian Foreign Minister’s sentence was performative. “And The Army central office said that it was due to the old and used Indian weapons of the Nepal army that caused the defeat of the army in Pili” (Ghale qtd in Sharma 7). The relation between Nepal Army and India grew colder. The statements of the power holders matters in a nation’s course of actions. Imposing declarations might disrupt the communication of the speakers and receiver leading to the twists and turns in the diplomatic relations.

When the speaker finds one of the speaking partners, it provides the floor to the third speaker. After India turned colder to respond palace had to search for the alternatives:

China could have been an option in the time when Palace or Army was denied the support. China had begun the support to its neighbor due to its good relation with the palace but, a high level of diplomatic mission of Indian Foreign Secretary Shyam Sharan went to china and convinced China to stop the support to Nepal and possibility of China to supply weapons to NA was aborted.” (Sharma 7)

In diplomacy of dealing with the issue of security and conflict, the discursive principles of conversation reveal the power politics. When the third party was ready to grab the floor for positive diplomatic response, again the second speaker himself grabbed the floor and spoke to the third party that it must stop talking to the first speaker. Nepal the first speaker could not get the favor of the third (China) due to the interruption of the second player. Discursive abortion is parallel to its performance. Nepal got no weapon from china due to India’s interruptions. These big level conversations are so powerful that they redirect the nations’ course of actions and relations. The Nepal Army, the only hope for the palace to have cooperative dialogue and its performance, “proved wrong that it could be the most reliable means to control insurgencies” like the Maoist insurgency (Sharma 7).

Similarly the Maoists’ voice of people’s war too began fading down and semiotics of “peace” and “talk” began repeating. “They perceived that to defeat Nepal Army completely was not possible. The Maoist's attack over the army barrack in Khara of Rukum was a big loss. They lost in that fight losing many PLAs (Sharma 6).” “We will win” rhetoric failed.

Terrorism is extreme use of violence to create fear to the majority of people in the respective society. Violence in extreme cases violates all the norms of human life and individual's rights to live is seized and is put into constant fear. Though the end may be good but the use of violence to kill the people can not be denied as terrorism. Violence imposed from the top to the down, for instance of a government upon its people, is even more terrorizing. Why a situation to use violence appears or what creates a situation in which terrorism has to take place is the stake of the today's world. Why did Nepal once known as peace zone be a space for terrorism is most researchable issue in Nepal that is what the research is attempting to do. In this globalized world the issue of terrorism since post 9/11 has been unanimously internationalized, neither the descriptive surface analysis of terrorism in the events of bloodsheds, nor analysis of an individual's motive to involving in terrorism i.e. taking resort to violence can make the causes clear, rather the conflict zone must be re-studied in international context especially by comparing the socio-economic- and political power relation of the country with its neighboring countries and the superpowers through discourses.

There were regional dialogues on the discourse of terrorism after the U. S. declaration on war on terror. Regional organizations like SAARC and the commitments of the member countries in such organization gives a moral as well as discursive strength to an individual member country to achieve the goal. Semiotically to agree and align with the regional organization is necessary. Nepal too renewed he commitment to fight terrorism. Dutta, the expert in Indian foreign policy highlights the need for commitment to fight terrorism for the governments to get international credibility:

The twelfth SAARC summit in Islamabad in January 2004 categorically condemned ‘terrorism in all its forms an manifestations and a challenge to all humanity. It also recommitted itself to the decisions of the SAARC Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism. An additional protocol to deal effectively with the financing of terrorism was also concluded. The 12<sup>th</sup> SAARC summit in Dhaka in April 2006 renewed the commitment to fight terrorism and accepted Indian position that there could be no double standards of the governments in combating terrorism. (Dutt 138)

As a member of SAARC, Nepal too used the language of commitment to fight terrorism. The governments of the countries maintained their subjective position and put all the “terrorists” in object position. At that time people of Nepal were also suffering from the elements of “terrorism” as Maoists were declared “terrorists.” Due to this the Maoists must have regional pressure to stop their “people’s war.” “Yet, [as Dutt writes] all said and done SAARC has not fulfilled its promise. However Nepali ruler most have got some strength from that alliance to fight “terrorist” because it was the same semiotic “terrorist” put on Maoists and the government was fighting war against it. Regionally too it was easier to fight any anti-government forces by labeling them as terrorists. It would gain some organizational and collaborative strength to gain power. While those for instance who were subject to such discourse were to loose the strength at regional level.

Discursive pressures from the regional organizations give the government motivation towards fruitful dialogue. The political parties of Nepal were convinced to give parallel status to the PLA and put both the armies under civilian control. In Mansir 2062 they were agreed to put both the army under the monitoring of United

Nation's or any other reliable international organization. As a result UNMIN was invited. The army could not protect its constitutional and traditional role of preserving monarchy when monarchy was abolished. Once it failed in its political mission. But, it was positive aspect of it to follow the decision of the political parties and to respect the sentiment of the political agreements of the largest political parties and to respect the sentiments of people. The revolution of 2062/63 April was based on the 12-point agreement between the parties and the Maoists. The Nepal Army which has special image in maintaining international peace record in United Nations had to remain under the monitoring of UNMIN.

The discursive illocutions have been shaped by the means of technological means of communication as well. Use of technology has brought diversity in the nature of discourses and their pragmatics. Communication through different means like telephone creates dramatic effect in politics. For instance, a telephone call from Indian diplomats to the then PM of Nepal has made a dramatic twist in Nepal's politics:

“When Jhalanath Khanal [the then President of PCN (UML)] had been to China after giving consent to the then PM, Pushpa Kamal Dahal to replace the army chief Rukmagat Katwal from the post. But when he was in China Indian foreign affair minister had phoned and ordered him to draw back the consent given to the prime minister. So Khanal had to take back his word. The prime minister, Dahal had to resign from the post. The Prime Minister Dahal resigned from the post” (Sharma 18).

It shows the power of communication mediums to facilitate the distant neighbors or the leaders to influence Nepal's politics in an invisible way. Nepali politics bears that



nature where the major actors are not scene in the front but their backdoor voices manipulate the major course of events.

Who should give *order* and control the course of action is the major question in situation of conflict. To decide who should be the most appropriate speaker of the order is discursive process. Therefore, in politics a great deal of time is spent in deciding the one who gives order. Sometimes the one who gives order is less powerful than who chooses the person that give order. Regarding the issue of control in either terrorism or peace, Sudhir Sharma writes, “Who should have the last control of the Nepal army lies in the President? [...] What is clear is that, India prefers the Presidential control over the army to the control of the cabinet (Sharma 21).” Nepal’s most powerful semiotic “army” is under the preference of India.

“It was revealed from the *dispute* regarding the army chief's post being reinstalled by the President. The Indian official opined that "Nepal army should be under presidential control rather than under the government (Priminister) which is more influenced by the political parties and because, now there is the danger of the Maoist's capturing the power. (Sharma 6)

It is India who takes the position of the speaker and uses “should be” most of the time when the object is “Nepal Army.” The speaker has the control over the object because the subject controls the verb. “India seems to be eager to maintain direct links to the army” (Sharma 6). When the discourse is controlled by the certain subject the truth is determined through that subject’s point of view. So, through the control over Nepal army it can not be denied that the course of action to control “terrorism” shows Indian involvement the most. “Due to economic support, training, weapons, artilleries,

international support, and many reasons Nepal army is dependent on India, US, UK, and China. Therefore, India is the biggest supporter” (Sharma 6).

There is competition of several countries to gain the subjective control. The dependency of Nepal army is so important to India. Its subjectivity is subordinate to India because its major source of power is weapon and it has to consult India when ever it has to increase its strength according to the subject verb agreement of “1950’s Treaty.” So, for the weak security system of Nepal that caused the conflict and got name of terrorism, India’s contribution can not be denied.

Subjective control is gained not only through coercive discourse of order but also with polite statements of counsel. “Similarly, India feels it’s necessity to maintain a good rapport to the oldest most structured organization of Nepal, Nepal Army” (Sharma 6). Through the control over Nepal army it can not be denied that the course of action to control “terrorism” shows Indian involvement the most. So, through the control over Nepal army it can not be denied that the course of action to control “terrorism,” in its own words, shows Indian involvement the most. As Sharma puts:

Nepal and Indian army has traditional intimacy as well. They award the honor of General title to each other's army. Even when the attitude of the new leadership changes at times, the army of India has shown sympathetic attitude towards Nepal army. The Army of India had not enjoyed the Indian government's decision to stop providing support to RNA after Ganendra's coup. Therefore, also due to the pressure from the army, only after three months, Delhi started supporting the government RNA again. But, it was stopped again when the Marxists party of India opposed it again. (Sharma 6)

It is clearly viewed that the subjectivity of conflict discourse are also split or dialectic. Indian subjectivity also manifests that nature. Since there are Communists parties as the stake holders in Indian government, sometimes the coherent subjective control is splinted. Sometimes, the communist sympathizer's influence the subjectivity of Indian government and the coercive orders against the communists of Nepal get softened. However, though there are splits, both the spheres of subjectivity either pro-communist or pro-monarchist have dominant role over Nepal.

The coherence intimacy of Nepal and Indian army has been highlighted. How does Indian army looks at RNA can be viewed in this interesting comment of an Indian news papers:

According to Indian Army, the relation established between Indian Army (IA) and Royal Nepal Army (RNA), for about a century has been disturbed due to Indian government's decision to stop the support. According to IA, Nepal army (NA) is a central power center and many good friends of India are also in there in RNA. Therefore RNA should not be weakened but should be strong. (Qtd in Sharma 22)

Thus the critics have highlighted that there was a long term influence of Delhi or IA in NA since IA was included in restructuration of RNA in 2009.” Nationalistic subjectivity in Nepali leaders creates confrontation to the coherent dominant subjectivity of India and results in conflict. “After the nationalistic campaign of King Mahendra in 2017, there was the influence of the critics of Indian policy in RNA; most of them were supposed to be in the lobby to supporting the West” (Sharma 23). Thus, there is constant pragmatic shift of subject choice of Nepali leaders due to the Indian influence.

It is necessary to see the shift from the perspective of India towards the Nepalese political institutions to understand the causes of conflicts and terror. “But after the demise of monarchy, like in other areas, the Indian influence in NA increased. The army behaved the way India wanted during the People's Movement II, declaration of republicanism and in case of the army Chief Rukmagat Katwal's resignation” (Sharma 23). As the historical movements contribute to create a context of shifting of power, India cleverly shifts its preference to the new object; a paradigm shift can be observed. It is not difficult to explore the motive of the shift in international relation because as Man Mohan Singh, the Prime Minister of India defines Indian foreign policy “International relations in the final analysis are the *power* relations”- it is exactly what Michel Foucault would say (Dutt 182). Such interests are also linked with Singh's understanding about diplomacy, he says, “diplomacy has changed and today it is about economics, trade and petroleum” (Dutta 238). C. K. Lal in “Latest Players of the Power Game” asserts that India has been a good partner of the U. S. after September 11 and at the same time he reinforce that India does not even feel the need of hiding its political interests towards/from Nepal” (Gautam 504) which is dominating one. Likewise the issue of weapons and their buying, selling or using them is also influenced mostly by India. RNA makes a shift of its subjective preference the way India wants as highlighted by Sharma:

Why didn't the RNA support the palace in people's movement (Jana Andolon II) and during the declaration of Nepal a republic while it was supporting in 2017 Paush 1 and on 18 Ashoj 2059 and 19 Magh 2061? If it was respecting the people's want for change why did it not support the palace in earlier coups? Actually there were also the external reasons to have RNA maintained its relation to the palace. (Sharam 23)

Though internal reasons can not be ignored the subjectivity of Nepal Army is controlled by India most. “According to a source of RNA, Indian Army chief J. J Singh was assigned to watch if RNA oppressive during people's movement II” (Sharma 6). The distance media “telephone” is a powerful means of communication which helps to maintain influence without notice to the general audience: “Singh through telephone had suggested the RNA chief Payrjung Thapa for not supporting the Palace anymore. So he had gone to the palace and did not accept the Royal-order to suppress the people in Janandolon II” (38). Order of the palace was felt less emphatic than that of India by the army. “The reason why the RNA leadership reached to that conclusion is the historically great participation of people in the people's movement and the future of NA could be threatened and; basically an Indian suggestion was the main” (Sharam 25). The order, tone and gestures of India are insurmountable in the discourse about managing conflict in Nepal.

Thus, the subjective intimacy of the palace and the NA was divorced. NA aligned to the people in surface understanding. Since the Maoists’ agenda of establishing republican system. But, before this by accepting Delhi as the site to draft, prepare and sign the peace agreement the “people’s” representative had accepted the subjectivity of India. Therefore, for India, it was natural to make its object do as per the people’s wish. “When the most reliable source of his power, the NA left him, King Gynendra had to restore the parliament and leave the palace. Most of the experts on Nepal army have openly supported that NA should be more democratized and should be brought under civilian supremacy” (Sharam 25). The control of subjectivity of who *orders* the army is the major issue. The subject of the *order* is the cause of conflict. “Nahrahari Acharya has focused on need of ‘psychological transformation’ of Nepal Army. It was in the royalist-mode of structure and developed under

monarchy”. So, psychologically it should feel responsible not towards the King or dictator but towards the people which was mostly lacking before/during the time Terrorism and Disruptive [Acts Control and Punish] Ordinance against Maoist's insurgency. When the people do perceive that the subjectivity of the fully equipped army with weapons is antagonistic to them, they can not have sense of security but they could be left with a sense of terror, because there will be completely conflicting point of departures towards who the country be controlled by.

Since India is the subject/doer of all the commands, the responsibility of terrorism in Nepal and the responsibilities to healing of the victims must be shared by India as well. Terrorism in Nepal is partly India sponsored. The U. S. as the super power and the leading country in war against terror must know that. While observing the political scenarios in Nepal the U. S. must know how desperate Nepal is before India's interference. When Baburam Bhattarai had gone to talk to Sher Bahadur Deuba with the fourteen point demands, Deuba was summoned from India and went there to meet Indian prime ministers and the high level diplomats, but the issue of the possible rebellion was ignored, and possibility of discursive resolution was denied. But at the same time the Maoists too diagnosed that only means to make their demands heard was to increase the strength of the demands with its relationally of the weapons, which their demands did not have but the government discourse was based on. So they seemed to have felt that the truth creating power of the discourse was minimized because it lacked the semiotic relation with the weapons. With this realization they had resorted to the violence.

As long as a discourse remains coherent in its subjective, it can easily maintain power. But when the subjectivity is split the power dissolves. Democracy is the system where majority of the people share their subjectivity with the government.

When the rulers have split in personality so do the people. Split in personality is the cause of conflict and weakening of the power. “Also because the multiparty democratic system was indigestible to the royalists as well, the Maoists movement could flourish soon (Bhatta in Sharma 61-79).” One cause of the Maoists movement is the split in the subjectivity of those who were ruling. “It was much difficult for the Royal Nepal Army to understand the multiple dimensions of the people's war and was proved so at last. The democratic elect Prime Minister Sher Bahadur Deuwa was sacked out by the King. The subjectivity of people was forcefully usurped to solidify power. “After the Civil-Military Unified Campaigns Plan, the Nepal army distributed the arms to the local people to combat Maoist in Chulachuli of Ilam and Sudama of Sarlahi in the name of forming local "self defense groups" (Sharma 61-79). With the same token single subjectivity can be fought with multiple discursive subjectivities. With this motive Nepal government created multiple subjectivities equipped with the arms to attack terrorism by other type of terrorisms. To use weapons against other by illegal group to change their subjectivity is terrorism and the legal authorities imposing the local people to take up weapons is terrorism against their subjectivity. So called legal authority encouraging illegal terror is state terror which creates a state of exception where people in general are placed into the bare life. They could be shot by any groups: rebel or the state, because the people are provided the weapons in their hands by a legal government illegally.

Root elements of terrorism in politics has discursive relation to a long history and culture of taking power with new discourse interlaced with weapons or violence in Nepal. In 2028 and 29 B. S. a armed uprising, called Jhapa Bidroha was performed by killing people with local weapons in the name of CPN (Marxist and Leninist), which was brought under control by the then government. But Maoists have defined

their insurgency vastly different from the Jhapa rebellion but Gaurav has accepted that some strategies of that uprising have been adapted to their Maoists rebellion (Gautam 5). B. P. Koirala, the first democratically elected Prime Minister of Nepal under constitutional monarchy, Prachanda, the first elected Prime Minister after Nepal was declared republic and the man with the “terrorists” label with a big bounty on his head during insurgency have shared the similar diagnosis about subjective understanding of Nepal’s political changes. Regarding the similarity in understanding about the use of weapons between Prachanda and B. P. Koirala, Sharma compares:

B. P. Koirala has clearly accepted that "the rulers of the Nepal have gained their power with the barrel of the gun, (Military within Military (1975), B. P. Koirala, in Sharma 117) ... The Indian support to modernize the Royal Nepal Army can be a clever strategy for suppressing the popular rebellion of people by extreme use of force by army as long as it remains under the monarchy. (Koirala, B. P. 121)

Koirala said this to critique the history and for a time being his party formed a people’s army under his party to bring political change, while Prachanda practiced the ‘people’s war.’ Both of them share that the subjectivity of popular rebellion of Nepal suppressed by weapons and that is directed by India. Bhatta writes that the issues of Nepal army should be made more open to study for common people as well.

Researches, debates and open discourse are necessary to democratize it” (Bhatta qtd in Sharma 101). This research is also an attempt to search for the root of why Nepal Army happened to be involved with the rhetoric of “terrorism” basically practiced in the west. Does NA have subjective control or it is in liminal zone of- whom to obey: Nepali or Indian ruler, especially at times when there are two orders: from Nepal or India? The act superior role of India to Nepal is toned since the 1950s peace treaty of



friendship in which Nepal has to maintain the act inferior role because of its servile position.

Weapon is the semiotic, whether using it or talking about its deployment generates discursive power as well. Likewise dysfunction of weapons may be cause of more conflict at least through the blame game. To be a dumping site of discourses is the plight of landlocked and treaty bound countries like Nepal. “In the visit of 2020 B.S The Indian military chief Field Marshal Sham Manex agreed to give SLRs rifles to Nepal which were second hand already used by the Indian Army; the bill was not paid by Nepal according to India till 2066 B. S. that was inquired to Vidya Bhandari, the Foreign Minister's visit to India” (Adhikari in Sharma 152). When the government is in transitional phase of its historical transformation the treaties are used to impose surveillance upon the leaders of Nepal. One treaty maintains superior position over the weaker one and gives power to the benefiter and second time it multiplies the power of the first benefiter and reduces the power of the loser. The nature of conditional beginning of the conversation silences the listener from relying freely through out the conversation. There would have been no point of talking about the treaties made voluntarily when both the neighbors were healthy but the treaties are made in times when the smaller neighbor is sick in the bed, in a transitional phase of national crisis.

In terms of this internalization of rhetoric and semiotics including that of terrorism, one could hardly separate what globalization and imperialism are. The so called democratic forces take it willy-nilly as globalization while the so called nationalists and communists take it more as imperialism. So dissecting of their differences and similarity is also a subjective question. When globalization is appropriated in the business of weapons to the government of Nepal, political and

economic influence of the treaty perhaps, turns to be more imperialistic one. The weapons business has been discussed by Sarad Adhikari as follow:

“In 1990 Nepal had bought anti-air-craft gun' and other weapons from China. India was very angry for doing this without "permission" of it and then Indian imposed economic embargo to Nepal [the landlocked country and three sides locked from Indian]. It was one of the major causes for the failure of active monarchy and 30 years old Panchyat system in 1990. While the people's movement for democracy in 1990 was in surge, India had proposed with a draft of a treaty between two countries. If King Birendra had signed the treaty, India had purposed that it would help the king to suppress the people's movement, but king Birendra did not accept it. The king finally accepted the constitutional monarchy and multiparty system ending the 30 years old no-party system (Kumar qtd. in Adhikari in Sharma 153).

Most of the times it seems that India obstructs free trade of Nepal with other countries, when, Nepal has to buy weapons especially. When it does not like it makes the embargo, and to open the embargo it purposes another treaty to strength its subjective interests and make the Nepal surrender its ego and subjectivity. India puts Nepali subject in dilemmatic situation to say: “yes or no.” Both “yes” and “no” are self destructive. Nepal is plunged in the liminal space between its sovereignty and India’s will. The revolutionary changes of Nepali politics are the products of such liminal moments when India is not in happy talk with the existing ruling power of Nepal and is hopeful to find “act inferior” subjectivity in a new Nepali leadership before India.

According to the treaty 2021 BS (1965) "Nepal India Security Support Treaty 1965" assumed that Nepal should buy weapons from India and; from USA and UK in consent of India only. As an Indian foreign policy expert V.P. Dutt's explains:

For the long years, India's relations with Nepal were governed by the Treaty of Peace and Friendship that India signed with Nepal on 31 July 1950. The treaty provided that neither government shall tolerate any threat to security of other by an aggressor and enjoyed upon them to consult each other and devise effective counter measures in case of any such threat. The Treaty also provided that Nepal would consult India.

(Dutt 50)

Dutt's interpretation shows that the relation between the two countries was governed by the treaty. Then almost all the discourses made between Nepal and India must have been including that of terrorism, influenced by it since it is most close to the idea of security and governance. In the same book he has mentioned that, "Of course the time-old consideration to secure peaceful borders and deter any aggression from abroad remains the chief objective of a country. To this has been added a new element: terrorism, cross-boarder-terrorism, international terrorism" (Dutt 142). Thus "terrorism" seems to be something added to or as a continuation of the older sensitivities as well.

The US emerged as a big power from outside world (beside the neighboring countries India and China) is sometimes bandwagoning and sometimes conflicting with India's interests in relation to Nepal. Its influence was increased when President declared global war against terrorism and Nepal's conflict was also labeled terrorism by the Palace, India and the U. S. Its interests to empower the army and support to the palace were obvious. "During the Maoist insurgency, targeting Maoists in Chhaunui

Kathmandu Mahabir *Gan* was established in support of the U. S. The *Gan* was modeled in the way American Special force” was, to collect information and conduct counter-terrorism operations (Sharma 152). It seems that the security sectors of Nepal especially army had to be more loyal to the palace and to the supporters from outside to the people in the country; the ode to the bread. Due to this people had more frustrations towards it; and the army too had disbelief in its people so many of the casualties killed during the conflict were from the government” (Sharma 157).

Sibling rivalry of Nepal’s neighbors could be visible in their diplomatic communications in relation to suppressing the insurgency. “In 2058 BS, the U. S. foreign minister Colin Powel had come to Nepal and agreed to provide 2 attack-helicopters to NA but India opposed it. So, the agreement was dissolved” (Sharma 157). It shows that in case of south Asia, especially, in Nepal’s case the American triumphalism is somehow curtailed by Indian influence. Thus, the U. S. and Indian interests at times clashes and at times they cooperate in countering insurgency, or what they called terrorism in Nepal.

Overthrowing of the Monarchy was regarded as one of the most important achievement of Nepal by Leftists as well as Democratic parties. Purna Basnet in his "Maoist Army: Origin, Development and Expansion" writes, “it is not surprising for the Maoists to claim for greater credit of over throwing monarchy and establishing republican system, since they had politically defeated Nepal Army from its mission of protecting the Monarchy (Basnet in Sharma 164). The discursive victory of republicanism over monarchy was implemented.

It was not only the Nepal Army or Nepal police which gained international support but there were also communications of the Maoists too to the legal or illegal international organizations. To gain contextual relationality of the discourse with

other forms of power they formed people's Liberation Army and adopted several organizational as well as tactical approaches. They took help of the semiotics of weapons that clashed with the weapons of government. People knew of more verbal clash about weapons through several media than the actual clashes in comparison. The verbal clashes, real and imaginary shaped the imaginaries of the people, and people slowly and gradually began to sense the weight of equality between, as referred by 'monarchy' and 'republicanism.' The clashes of the ideological semiotics plunged the country into vicious conflict inviting terroristic elements. Basnet mentions about Nepal India cooperation about military trainings; he shows, "The Maoists had conducted military training of its cadres in Nepal with the help of the trainers from the People's War Group of India. At that time they had been able to bring some weapons from India as well" (Basnet in Sharma 176). Though the sight of performance was Nepal mostly, the semiotics and rhetorical performances were conducted in India as well in the form of meetings or planning. "The fourth expanded meeting of CPN (Maoist) was held in Hariyana of India. In 2054-55, to defend from the state oppression some trainers were invited from Indian Maoist Communist Center" (Basnet in Sharma 177). Despite several incidents of clash, some deadly incidents of terrorism occurred from Maoists side as well. "In 2062 Jestha 23 Chitwan Madi, Maoist ambushed a public bus and 38 people were killed and many other were injured (Basnet in Sharma 191). Though the Maoists leadership claimed to be a technical mistake and beg for the pardon, it was the product of their belief in the weapon to bring change through weapons.

How verbal semiotics, despite the hollowness of its referent, is powerful can be viewed in the speech of Prachanda. "In 2061 Bhadra 16, Prachanda claimed that there were 1 lakhs of PLAs but it was proved wrong (Basnet in Sharma 196). Yet, the

speech had performative aspects. Actually UNMIN proved that “Maoists had only 19, 602 PLAs” (Basnet in Sharma 199). The performative function of the discourse can further be revealed as, “in 2066 Baishakh, Maoist's chairman Prachanda's video revealed that they had only 7 to 8 hundred PLAs only. Nepali congress pleaded UNMIN to re-ratify the original Maoists PLAs” (Basnet in Sharma 204). Audio visual texts too have much communicative effects. But due to the actions performed equal to the height of the full security forces of Nepal, earlier times people had to believe in Maoists that they could have greater number of fighters. So, discourses have impressionistic powers to make audience feel threatened enough.

Maoists had said that they had been fighting for national independence from all forms of international influences. Against what Maoists had declared- that is to chase away “American Imperialism” but contrary to it, the foreign influence grew higher due to ‘war on terror’ rhetoric. The following narrative throws light upon the influence:

Colin Powell, the Foreign minister [Secretary of State] of USA, went to Bhadrakali barrack and consoled the NA that America is against the Maoists and for the NA. Similarly the Indian Foreign Minister Jaswanta Singh tagged Maoists of Nepal as terrorists and offered NA with 8 arba military support in 2058. In 2066, 45 American military officers gave training to NA and with 8, 000 M-16 rifles were given to them.

Likewise 9...?) Number of Insas rifles was brought from India. Chinese government too called the Maoist "anti-government forces" and provided the NA with military equipments for communication.

(Sharma 199)

Maoist's rhetoric of 'people's war' made Nepal very exposed to the international interests. They won the war against monarchy but not against the "expansionism" and "imperialism." "Maoists had to give up hope of capturing Kathmandu by fighting due to Indian and American Support to the NA" (Purna Basnet in Sudhir Sharma 199). They could never maintain cooperative context to have happy dialogue with America nor America could, but India managed it at last by accepting the Maoists as an authentic political actors. America still remained antagonistic openly by maintaining the Maoists in its 'list of international terrorist organization.'

Dialogue becomes most fruitful when the addressor and the addressee have trust to each other and follow the cooperative principles. Though they could maintain some level of conversation and agreement when the seven party and the Maoists maintained reluctant talk, especially in pressure of an organizer, India, in Delhi, they still had mistrust so they needed a mediator. "Through the dialogue and according to the article no 3 of the 8 point agreement between the 7 parties alliance and the Maoist, in 2063 Magh 9, UNMIN was established in Nepal to monitor the army and weapons of both the sides and to supervise for the free and fair election of the constituent assembly" (Basnet in Sharma 204). The dialogue and then agreement was possible when both the sides perceived that the discourse Maoists had raised had backing of relationality of other objects and events (people's expectations and its party carders, weapons etc.) equal to that of the discourse of peace put forwarded by the government having relationality to other events and objects (police, army, U. S. Support etc.). Discursive powers and their back ups were equated to each others. "Being the follower of thoughts of Mao in Nepali context, Maoists did not hide that anyone who wants either to maintain the regime or wants to snatch power has to have a strong army" (Basnet in Sharma 204). They consciously or unconsciously seem to have

understood that discourse needs subjective and objective power, for which they fought for ten years to achieve with some elements of terrorism. “It was *not easy* for Maoist to break all the fronts of army which was strongly backed up by the international powers” it was more discursive success to make other convinced that they might (Basnet in Sharma 177).

Regarding growing foreign interest in Nepal, Geja Sharma Wagle, a security critic, comments that “not only the interest but also the political interference can be there in Nepal from the foreigners, if diplomatic balance could not be maintained in the post monarchy era” (Sharma 236). There were worries and complains from foreign powers towards Nepal’s government. Wagle reveals the increasing complaints of the foreigners:

India has been complaining Nepal that the anti-Indian activities are increasing in Nepal. Similarly China too has shown much concern about the anti-Chinese activities in Nepal especially in the name of free Tibet. America which has lost its most reliable institution monarchy is seeking a stable political power in Nepal on the one hand and fearing that the Maoists might be influential in Nepal. The influence of the US, the Super power in post cold war world marks special importance in the Nepal which has strategically geo-political location between the two Asian giants. Since US has made India as a collaborator in nuclear weapon development as well, US interest in Nepal can grow further in future. The US does not want to reduce its influence in Nepal. (Sharma 236)

The rhetoric of the neighbouring countries reported in the above extract shows that all the power players are worried about the future of Nepal.



Discourse has an important function to have control of future. How can the discourse control the future? They can control it through claims, speculations or plans for future. Discourse of conflict and terrorism are also of that nature. By showing the constant fear in the future they prepare the mass psychology that the subjects/actors need there to save the objects/people. The country like India, the U. S. and China as mentioned are using the discourses to have control of Nepal in the future, how far they can. The U. S. especially maintains it by still tagging the Maoists as terrorist, which shows that it may have to come physically to fight war on terror if required.

Maoists too, have the rhetoric of what “need to be done”, “will have” and “will be” done refer to attempts for future control? The need to be done list may be long but, here, in security matter, Barsha Man Pun Ananta in "Maoist Perspective on Integration of Armies", has stated that the integration and "professionalization" of the PLA and NA helps to ‘democratize’ them. He has said that the army should be more ‘inclusive.’ Since as he says the Nepal Army was developed in the mindset of protecting monarchy it has many records of human rights abuse. Similarly, the PLA, which fought for the party, was ideological in the past. So, both the army *need to be democratized* and *professionalized* along with their integration. Regarding the foreign relation of the Army he says that the new Army *will have* different forms of international relation. He only says that the army that supports the economic, political and foreign relation *will be a new army* (Sharma 249-54). These rhetorical strategies show that their party need to be there (maybe in power) to do the “*need to bes.*” While, the supposed to be *neutral* critics as mentioned in this research to have their own rhetoric of neutrality. They tried to maintain it through the ideology of inclusiveness, transparency so that they will have their say in the future necessary for

both the sides. They for instance Dhurba Kumar and Kulchandra Gautam have highlighted the need of resolving conflict to gain international support.

Thus, it can be seen that the “fight” between the Maoist party and the “Nepal government” was multifaceted. It was also a fight among the nations through the diplomatic *communication* to promote or restrain their supply of weapons in Nepal (my emphasis). Since India is the subject of command of almost all the biggest political decisions regarding Nepal, especially in security control, India is must to bear the responsibility of arms struggles and state terrorism and weak state mechanism in Nepal. The victims of the conflict of both the sides are affected by the behaviors of the Indian government, says, “Ok, take weapons” or “now no more weapons to Nepal”, in supplying military requirements, political orders on the one hand. It also says, “Maoists are terrorists” and they are having link with the Indian Maoists but at the same time gives shelter to them in India on the other hands. Nepal's conflict is byproduct of Indian dual policy. The U. S. as the leader country in its global ‘war on terror’ must know that India is to a greater extent responsible for "terrorism" in Nepal.

A significant element of terrorism in the Maoists insurgency in Nepal can not totally be denied. The representation of conflict was full of semiotics about the use of arms, attacks, torture, forceful eviction of some houses and areas, killings, rape, retributions, fear, hostage takings, disappearances, bombs, guns, dead body, unidentified objects, threat ‘to capture power’ and so many other frightening images. They produced terror somehow or the other, and were motivated either to overthrow or to maintain their own political power. So clearly, there was political motive in representing each other with such semiotics of the violence which correspondence with the real events as well. Reports in the texts of Human Rights organizations show

that almost twice number of human rights violation have been done by the state.

Therefore, if we take theories of Human Rights and called the abuse of human rights seriously as terrorism, Nepal's conflict was more state terrorism than the rebels' one.

The act of terror caused by the state was significantly supported by the revenue and the foreign aid. Finally when thousands of weapons could not reduce it, the conflict was significantly reduced by the dialogues. There is an adage that thousands of useless meetings are far more beneficial than a war. So, the research highlights the need for communicative discourse to resolve conflicts.

## **VI. Conclusion: Foreign Hegemony through “War on Terror”**

Nepali political discourse on the Maoist conflict and counter-insurgency is found to have highly affected by the western rhetoric of ‘war on terror.’ The ruling parties of Nepal felt that whatever the west and India have adopted to fight terrorism could aptly be applied to suppress the insurgency in Nepal. Therefore, without much ado, they declared the Maoists as terrorists and borrowed the policy to counter the insurgency. Their discursive practices are found to have highly affected by the context of ‘war on terror’ led by George W. Bush, the then US president, shaped up after the 9/11 terrorist attack in the US. The imitation of the discourse of counter-terrorism performed in Nepal did not fully work to suppress the insurgency so the mainstream parties followed the rhetoric of need for reconciliation, constituent assembly and new democracy devoid of Monarchy. While so doing, they all accepted to accept Nepal as a republican state that the Maoists, also called ‘terrorists’ had fought for.

The discourse of terrorism and war on terror or countering terrorism reveals that the relation of Nepal with India and the U. S., though seems smooth at surface is actually full of contradiction and one of the reasons of it being smooth is "act inferior" speeches of the Nepali leadership. Act inferior refers to behaving and using language as the inferior in rank and position. Whenever any political forces appear to be “act equal”, for instance the Maoists for a time being, it turns to be a transgression and the politeness principles are violated. Then the country plunges into the war or violence, and the powerful nations first name it as "terrorism." The unequal relationship between the Nepal and India at various discursive levels is one of the most prominent causes of conflicts in Nepal. How do the people of that nation enjoy democracy when the country is not free to use its natural resources, maintain its international relational relationships freely?

In this research the nation-states, personified as an individual and as the major participants of the conversation, in discourse analysis, their responses and behaviors put in the context reveal that the U.S. and the India acted as the commander while Nepali regime with monarchy seemed to be the polite receiver of the command, so far observed from the perspective of pragmatics/speech act rules. But, the voices against “expansionism” or “imperialism” broke the established politeness principle of act-inferior; therefore, the Maoists appeared to have transgressed the speech acts rules by claiming equal status of Nepal. Such transgression characterizes communication break, and then it leads to the violence. Such transgressive violence is named as terrorism.

There could have been other non-violent rhetoric and their performance that could address and achieve the objectives the Maoists were fighting for, however Maoists could not make the discourse for change heard without resorting to actual performance of ‘people’s war’. First of all either the state did not listen to their demands, or their voice was not pragmatic enough, so they might have resorted to the violence. Whenever they came to the power, Maoists too started to maintain ‘act inferior’ before the foreigners popularly *Bidesi Prabhus*, in Maoists words for the U. S. and India, and the Maoist party was still listed terrorist by the US. The day they say that “we” (Maoist) will obey “you” (US and India) and prove it by gestures and performance of the discourse in events and actions, and then it seems possible that they will be out of the list of "terrorist organization."

In fact it was the rhetoric of binary opposition between "War against imperialism and Expansionism" versus "War on Terror" with visible ideological conflict infused with their own national interests that turned the country into the vicious conflict. Both the Bush’s ‘global war on terror’ rhetoric and Maoist’s rhetoric

to 'win the world' were extreme lines of thought that clashed. Bush used discursive power to gain the support from the "world" since it was already the super power, while the Maoists could not garner the international support for a time being as long as they resort to weapons. For the country which has already established the relationship with more than 150 nations and been the member of United Nations, Monetary Fund, World bank, maintains open boarder with its neighbors, and has sent millions of its youth abroad for employment, was impossible to completely defeat 'imperialist policy' intertwined with the "war on terrorism."

This research asserts that the violence in the rural territories of Nepal was an intermesh of violent rhetoric imposed not only by the Maoists who raised 'people's war', but also by the state apparatus that got its support more from the foreign aid especially by India, the U. S, India, China and European nations than the people within the country. The rhetoric of "war on terror" in Nepal was a more a hegemonic appropriation of the repressive western discourse against the people's rhetoric for change. The 'people's war' that began to check the international influence, ironically, ended by asserting the international influence when the Maoist formally signed the peace agreement under the witness of India whom they had named as the 'expansionist enemy.' They were also agreed to formally invite the U.N. Mission. Also, the label "terrorist organization" to the Maoist still remained in the list of the U. S., the super power. Even after the peace agreement, discourse about Nepal into a geopolitical site of imperial power players remained dominant. Nepal, among the international big powers, is in a state of bare life, in between the legal and illegal state as long as the Maoists are labeled as terrorist and they lead the government with the label on them. A state of exception has been imposed through the "war on terror" against Maoist which can be against Nepal since they have the largest number of

members in the Constituent Assembly of Nepal." Though uneven, the 'people's war' reached Nepal as a power player, at least at discursive level, in international arena, however weak it might have turned internally. One can acknowledge that whether "globalization been replaced by the rhetoric of global war against terror with active responsibility of the U. S. after 9/11 (Dasgupta and Kiely 283)?" Is cosmopolitanism emerging globally or not is another question. Nepal's importance as a 'strategically/geopolitically' important nation in international power politics is now acknowledged openly, yet leaving its people in a state of bare life through imposition of "war on terror", rather than "active responsibility" to uplift their life condition.

To analyze the discursive relation of war on terror and Maoists conflict in Nepal, it can be acknowledged that a newer research on whether Nepal is an independent country or not seems necessary. Through discourse analysis it is found that, when a country is bound up by a treaty to remain subjugated to the other bigger country under the condition of obligations "musts," "dos and don'ts" and "should," that country is never going to have a better off position to pull its people out of poverty, fulfill their basic needs and keep them well disciplined. When there is an agreement between a more powerful and the less powerful nation in terms of power, the language of the more powerful one is always the "musts" and the servant is mostly "yes", "ok." When the weaker says "no" there is transgression of the treaty or agreement so the transgressor is labeled "aggressor" or traitors or the "terrorist." In Nepal's international relation India from the 1950s treaty and the U. S. after tagging the Maoists with "terrorists tag" assume either as the big brothers or the commanders role in language production. They say "must" and Nepal has to say "yes". There is non-cooperative principle working in Nepal's communication while maintaining international relation, as shown in the discourse analysis. Since many other causes have

been analyzed by other critics, my finding is that, as the leading country in war against terror the U. S. can support Nepal by convincing India to abolish the unequal treaties including that of 1950s and help Nepal be free and independent from the situation of in-betweenness or 'indistinction' of sovereignty or dependency, legality or illegality and to help it come out of "bare life." Poverty and having discursive power is one of the roots for manifestation of terrorist rhetoric which has also been put into an overlap with the Marxist-Maoists' rhetoric of class struggle.

The state of declaration of terrorism to a conflict creates the difficulty, as Townshend, here, has highlighted, "Although the governments are likely to come under pressure of public to do something' rather than to take a minimalist line, they have a fair bit of freedom in deciding whether to adopt an essentially legal approach or to step outside the laws" (123). Furthermore, special emergency laws, abortion of civil liberties for a time being to provide the security greater power of surveillance, search, detention of suspects etc are the measures. But, they are against democratic norms of a liberal society. Then what to do or not to do any thing becomes a discursive dilemma. Civil military co-ordination has been an ideal but never achieved option (Townshend 123), because of lack of cooperative principles of communication among the actors.

The grievances in the conflict discourse reveal that the people of Nepal neither want their resources be sucked up by a big neighbor India and make them docile before it nor they want to fight a war against it, though some Maoists leaders may want. But the incomprehensible biting and sucking of Nepalese has made them terrorized because when the source of pain is unidentified the individual or a nation reacts abnormally throwing hand and feet all around. "Nepal can not remain stuck to its identity semiotic "as a poor nation in global context" for ever and it is just a day



dream to bring about improvement in other sectors unless the security matters are well maintained (Bashnyat 151). The backwardness of Nepal is caused in the pretext of security of the neighbors than its people. The backwardness and position of under the poverty line of majority of the population is – the paradox: the uneven and unequal relation of these equal nations.

As revealed in the analysis, the biggest paradox of the U. S. in Nepal during conflict was that it advocated for democracy but it always shared the subjectivity with the royal regime. By "People" I do not mean the one who fight for "communism" but those who wanted real structural change in socio-political scenario and in the basic needs of their lives to come out of penury. Had the U. S. accepted the rebel's demands as the political ones and made more efforts to have communications with the people in rebel's side than moving around the royal palace, it could have better been informed about the causes of the conflict. So called informed intellectuals from Nepal, who always moved around the palace or parliament without mingling among the people, have misinterpreted/ misrepresented the causes of conflict to the American representatives in Nepal so perhaps it viewed Nepal with the similar lens to that of Al Quada while labeling the insurgents "terrorists."

To analyze the speeches of the American representatives for Nepal, it does not seem that America wanted to impose its power directly but tried to maintain the usual status quo of parliamentary democracy with monarchy in Nepal. It must be stated that its biggest mistake was to hold up the monarchy. The so called foreign relation intellectuals as manifested in the discourse mostly could not introduce the root causes of conflict but helped in persuading India and America with only the violent activities of the Maoists. Girija Prasad Koirala, and some leaders, at least, understood lastly that Maoists extremisms can be minimized not by weapons but by dialogue/discourse as

Foucault would have called power lies in discourses. The parties of Nepal allied with the rhetoric of "war on terror" after 9/11 so that they would suppress the 'people's war' but since the king too was on the side of "war on terror", the parties finally chose the side of those who fought "people's war" strategically, though it was named "terrorism." In one sense it can be said that they sided with once "terrorists" than to terrorism. It was a nice example of code switching and change in point of departure in discourse.

Since Nepal is not free to perform the discourse called sovereignty for free international relation with other countries, it has little scope for strengthening its economic condition in the globalized world, as long as the restrictive text of the treaty of 1950, the text in my discourse analysis, performs between the two semiotics "Nepal" and "India." The first five points that Baburam Bhattarai listed as the cause of armed struggle in the text of the 40 point memorandum, are related to the "unequal treaty." But the same party after a decade long insurgency that claimed lives of more than 14,000 made an agreement in Delhi to end the armed struggle and then remained almost silent about the unequal treaties (text) which has sucking effect in Nepal's economy in his own interpretation. Though the Maoist struggle came to halt, the root causes of Nepal that causes poverty particularly emanated from the unequal relation to its neighbors have not been addressed. Nepal is still a most fertile ground for rebellions or if followed the labeling trends of the past terrorisms because the violent rhetoric is still attractive.

The third world landlocked nation like Nepal who's the insurgencies are called "terrorisms" especially by the powerful nations are in indistinct position of sovereignty or subjugation. They officially are the sovereign countries but their status is manipulated through discourses: One of the most dominant ones in the 21<sup>st</sup> century

is “war against terrorism.” Such nations and people are not in a comfortable position to enjoy democracies because of the discourses imposed by the richer and powerful nations. When the countries are under subjugation, the people’s voices are bare voices without any effect. Poverty, hunger and despair grows high and what it breeds can be nothing other than terrorism. Nepal among its neighbors and super power turned to be a *homo sacer*, to elaborate, a state (and its people) that can be killed but not be sacrificed. Nepal and Nepali’s loss are counted insignificant before global or regional security or stability, in other words, before the interests of the fighters of “people’s war” and “the war on terror.” Third world nations in the performance of discursive “era of global war on terror” are equal to *homo sacer*. Their existence is indistinct or in between sovereignty and subjugation or subject and object. They may have voice but it does not matter whether it is heard or not. In this despair they are named “terrorists” harboring nations by powerful ones. Thus the discourse of terrorism and counter terrorism of the U. S. not only becomes confluent with the counter insurgency hegemonically adopted to defeat the Maoist’s people’s war but turns into a tool having the hidden politics of intervention of the U. S. and India to have control over Nepal’s political future. Nepal remained in the war with words and the discursive war still continues with the foreign powers along with the insurgency.

## Works Cited

- Acharya, Narahari. "Nepali Sena." *Nepali Surachhya Chhetra: A Collection*. Ed. Bishnu Shapkota. Kathmandu; Nepal Peace Campaign, 2066. 164-86.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stand Ford UP, 1998.
- . *State of Exception*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 2005.
- Appadurai, Arjuan. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Bakhtin, M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Carylmeron and Michael Holquist trans. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Basnyat, Prem Sigh. *New Paradigm in Global Security*. Kathmandu: Bhrikuti, 2004.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *America*. Chris Turner Trans. London and New York: Verso, 2000. 10.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *The Spirit of Terrorism and Other Essays*. London: Verso, 2005. 87-8.
- Bhatta, Deepak Parkash. "Major challenges of Democratic Control of [Nepal Army]." Ed. Sharma, Sudhir. *Nepali Sena. (Challenges over Control of Nepal Army)* Kathmandu: Martin Chautari, 2010. 61-79.
- Bhattarai, Baburam. *The Problems and Prospects of Revolution in Nepal*. Nepal: Janadisha Publication. 2004.
- Billig, M. "Preface: Language as Forms of Death." *At War With Words*. Eds. M. N. Dedaic and D. N. Nelson. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. vi-xvii.
- Bergen, P.. "Bin Laden: The Long Hunt for Osama." *Atlantic Monthly*. October, 2004.

Blommaert, J. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Burger, Mark T. "After the third World. History, Destiny and Fate of the Third Worldism." *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 25 NO.1. 2004.

Bush, G. W. "Speech at a Republican Party Dinner in Saint Louis." Missouri, March 19, 2002. Available at

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/03/20020319-5.html>.

--- . "Press Conference in the East Room of the White House." 2006, July 28.

Available at

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/07/20060728-1.html>.

Chilton, P. *Security Metaphors*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.

--- . *Analyzing Political Discourse*. London: Routledge, 2004.

--- . "Missing Links in Mainstream CDA: Modules, Blends and the Critical Instinct."

*A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. Eds. R. Wodak and P.

Chilton. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005. 19-51.

Chilton, P. and Lakoff, G. "Foreign Policy by Metaphor." *Language and Peace*. Ed.

C. Schäffner and A. Wenden . Aldershot, Dartmouth, 1995.37-60.

Chomsky, Noam. *9/11*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2001.

--- . "Preventive War: 'The Supreme Crime.'" *Z Magazine*. 2003, August 11.

Available: [www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=4030](http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=4030).

--- . *Understanding Power*. Ed. Peter R. Mitchell and John Schoeffel. New York:

Penguin Books, 2002.

Chouliaraki, L. ed. "Special Issue: The Soft Power of War: Legitimacy and

Community in Iraq War Discourses." *Journal of Language and Politics* 4(1),

2005.

- Collins, J. and Glover, R. eds. "Collateral Language: A User's Guide to America's New War." New York: New York University Press, 2002.
- Dasgupta, S. and Kiely. *Globalization and After*. New Delhi: Sage, 2006.
- Dedaic, M. N. and Nelson, D. N. eds. *At War With Words*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.
- Doran, M. S. "Somebody Else's Civil War. In How Did This Happen?" *Terrorism and the New War*. Ed J. Hodge and G. Rose. Oxford: Public Affairs, 2001. 31–52.
- Dutt, V. P. *India's Foreign Policy: since Independence*. Delhi: National Books Trust, 2007.
- Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989.
- Foucault, Michael. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock, 1972.
- Foucault, Michael. "The Ethics of Concern for Self as a Practice of Freedom." *Michel Foucault: Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth*. Ed. P. Rabinow. New York: The New Press, 1977. 281–301.
- Gautam, Bhaskar et. al. eds. *Maoist Struggle: The Period of Armed Struggle*. Kathmandu: Martin Chautari, 2007.
- Graham, P., et al eds. "A Call to Arms at the End of History: A Discourse-Historical Analysis of George W. Bush's Declaration of War on Terror." *Discourse and Society*, 2004.15 (2- 3): 199 –221.
- Gramsci, Antonio and Joseph A. Buttigieg. eds. *Prison notebooks*. New York City: Columbia UP. (1992). 233–238. ISBN 0-231-10592-4. OCLC 24009547.
- Hagen, Toni. *Building Bridges to the Third World: Memories of Nepal 1950-1992*. Trans. Philip Pierce. New Delhi: Book Faith India, 1994.

- Hoffman, Stanly. "America Goes Backward." *The New York Review of Books*. Vol. 5, No, 10 June 12, 2003, p 80.
- Hall, Stuart. "The Problem of Ideology - Marxism without Guarantees". *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10 (2): 28–44. 1986. :10.1177/019685998601000203.
- Hodges, A. "Framing Terror: Ideological Struggle Underlying the Characterization of Terrorism." Paper presented at Crossroads 2004: Fifth International Conference of the Association for Cultural Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2004. June 25–28.
- Horkheimer, M. *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*. Trans. M. J. O'Connell. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- INSEC. *Fact Sheet: Name of Victims Killed by State and Maoist: in Connection with the People's War (12 February – 31 October 2006)* 2008 b. Kathmandu: Informal Service Sector Center, 2008.
- Jackson, R. *Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics, and Counter-Terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- Jones, Steve. *Antonio Gramsci*. Routledge. London and New York, 2006.
- Khanal, Yadukanta. *Nepal's Isolationist Foreign Policy*. Kathmandu: Satyal Publications. 2000.
- Kunwar, Rajeev. "On political Seduction: An Inquiry into the Nature of Politics in the Least Developed Asian Country with an Analysis and Illustration from the Case of Nepal." A Working paper. 2009.
- . "Vignettes of Contemporary International Relations: Nepal's Standpoint." *NCWA* 2007-8). p 5- 17.

- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Lakoff, G. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." *Metaphor and Thought*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ed. A. Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 202–251.
- . "Metaphors of Terror." *The Days After*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2001, September 16. Available:  
<http://www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html>.
- Machin, D. and Van Leeuwen, T. "Computer Games as Political Discourse: The Case of Black Hawk Down." *Journal of Language and Politics*. 4 (1) 2005. 119–141.
- Marcuse, H. *One-Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. London: Rutledge. 2002 [1964].
- Martin, J. R. and Edwards, J. eds. "Special Issue: Interpreting Tragedy: The Language of 11 September 2001." *Discourse and Society*. 15 (2–3) 2004.
- Maybin, J. "Language, struggle and voice: The Bakhtin/ Volosinov Writings." *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. Eds. M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S.J. Yates. London: Sage, 2001. 64–71.
- McDougall, W. *The Group Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1920.
- Moriarty, James F., "Nepal- US Relationship." *NCWA 2007-8*. Kathmandu: NCWA, 2008. 18-21.
- National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States. *Executive Summary of the 9/11 Commission Report*. 2004. Available at  
<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/911/pdf/execsummary.pdf>.



- Nelson, D. N. "Conclusion: Word Peace." *At War With Words*. Eds. Dedaić, M. N. and Nelson, D.N. 449–468. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.
- "Nepal Regime, India Target Maoist Leaders." *Revolutionary Worker*. 1214, October 5, 2003. <http://www.rwor.org>
- Pudasaini, Som P. "Need for a Paradigm Shift in Foreign Affairs in Nepal." *NCWA* 2007-8. 28-35.
- Sharma, Sudhir ed. *Nepali Sena. (Challenges over Control of Nepal Army)* Kathmandu: Martin Chautari, 2010.
- Shrestha, Chuda Bahadur. *Coping With Maoist Insurgency*. Kathmandu: Chetna Lokshum, 2004.
- Tajfel, H. *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Taylor, C. *Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Tilounine, Marie Lecomte . *Hindu Kinship, Ethnic Revival, and Maoist Rebellion in Nepal*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Townshend, Charles. *Terrorism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Van Dijk, T. A. "War Rhetoric of a Little Ally: Political Implications and Aznar's Legitimization of the War in Iraq." *Journal of Language and Politics* 4 (1) 2005. 65–91.
- Van Leeuwen, T. "The representation of social actors." *Texts and Practices – Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Eds. C. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard . London: Routledge. 1996. 32–71

--- . “Visual Racism.” *The Semiotics of Racism – Approaches in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Eds. M. Reisigl and R. Wodak Vienna: Passagen Verlag, 2000.  
333–350.

--- . “Three Models of Interdisciplinarity.” *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. Eds. R. Wodak and P. Chilton. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005.  
3–18

Virilo, Paul. *Information Bombs*. Trans. Chris Turner. London and New York: Verso.  
2000. 10.

Von, Clausewitz, C. *On War*. Eds. M. Howard and P. Paret. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976. website: <http://www.ashgate.com>

Weinberg, Leonard. ‘Turning to Terror: The Conditions under Which Political Parties Turn to Terrorist Activities.’ *Comparative Politics*. 1991. 23, 4.