

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

The Representation of UN Role in Nepalese Peace Process

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

By

Kalpiti Parajuli

Central Department of English

Kirtipur

January 2010

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Kalpit Parajuli has completed his thesis on **The Representation of UN Role in Nepalese Peace Process** under my supervision. He carried out this research paper from August 2009 to January 2010. I hereby recommend his thesis to be submitted for viva voce.

Dr. Shiv Rijal

Supervisor

Date: -----

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Approval

This Thesis entitled **The Representation of UN Role in Nepalese Peace Process** submitted to Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Kalpit Parajuli has been approved by the undersigned members of research committee.

Members of the research committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head of
Central Department English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I am highly indebted and express my sincere honor to my thesis supervisor Dr. Shiv Rijal, a lecturer of Central Department of English, T.U. for his scholarly guidance, generous help and genuine encouragement to bring this dissertation to completion.

My sincere gratitude goes to Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of Central Department of English, T.U. for allowing me to work with this research.

I am heartily obliged with my venerable teachers Mr. Badri Prasad Acharya, Mr. Pushpa Acharya, Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Mr. Pom Gurung, Mr. Harihar Gyawali and Mr. Tara Lal Shrestha for their precious suggestions and insights.

I am wordless to express my gratitude to my honorable parents N. Raman Parajuli and Moti Parajuli whose constant support and warm affection embalmed me to accomplish this effort.

My thankfulness goes to my friends Surya Prasad Neupane, Jivan Acharya, Jagat Parajuli for their persistent advise, support and encouragement in doing thesis on this virgin topic. I am also credited to all my friends, relatives and good-wishers.

January 2010

Kalpiti Parajuli

Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	
Abbreviations	
Abstract	
Chapter I. Introduction	1-12
a) The Key Objectives of United Nations	4-5
b) The United Nations System	5-12
Chapter II. Concept of Power	13-34
a) Foucauldian Concept of Power	13-28
i) Discourse	18-22
ii) Language, Truth and Knowledge	22-25
iii) Power Relations and Resistance	26-28
b) Gramsci's Notion of Power	29-31
i) Hegemony	29-31
c) Althusserian Notion of Power, Representation and Ideology	31-34
Chapter III. The Role of UN in Nepalese Peace Process	35-59
Chapter IV. Conclusion	60-61
Works Cited	

Abbreviations

FM—For Marx

ISA—Ideological State Apparatus

LP—Lenin and Philosophy

PN—Prison Notebooks

SCW—Selections From Cultural Writings

SPA—Seven Party Alliance

SPN—Selections From the Prison Notebooks

SPW—Selections From Political Writings

UCPN-M—United Communist Party of Nepal-Maoist

UNMIN—United Nations Mission in Nepal

UNSC-United Nations Security Council

UNSG-United Nations Secretary General

TKP-The Kathmandu Post

THT-The Himalayan Times

TRN-The Rising Nepal

Abstract

This dissertation on **The Role of UN in Nepalese Peace Process**-sticking intact with the UN systems and its Charter—when inspected through the lens of ‘power’ unveils its role as mandated by Nepalese people represented by the Government of Nepal and different political parties. The reverence earned by UN while assisting in preserving global peace and various understanding substantiates with its neutral role that intensifies its credibility—without being influenced by different stake holders and concerned authorities. Unlike the ‘hegemonic’ understanding, UN has successfully fueled the ‘ideology’ which adopts completion of responsibilities only as per the understanding. UN discourages the concerned parties from breaching the agreements which leads to the threat of peace as their power representation varies depending upon the power-position. Thus, UN which sticks intact to the agreements and its mandates, encourages concerned parties to comply with all kinds of understandings thereby, the parties other than UN owe more responsibilities for any derail in the Nepalese Peace Process and threat to it.

I. INTRODUCTION TO UN AND NEPALESE PEACE PROCESS

The Nepalese Peace Process, baptized after the ceasefire and signing of

Comprehensive Peace Accord (21 November, 2006) that renounced more than a decade long armed insurgency between the state-authorized militaries and a politically formed combatants highlighted itself as a historical process in the world. The Peace Process with the involvement of United Nations, shared dreams among Nepalese-- to conclude with its mandate initially within a year. But the process leads no where despite UN awaits for fourth consecutive extension of six months tenure until 23rd of January, 2010.

The role of UN in Nepal, through its political mission called United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN) established in Nepal on 23rd of January 2007 under the UN Security Council resolution 1740 is parenthesized--UN involvement is welcomed with certain mandates from Nepal Government and was endorsed under UN System. The UN reception does not portray any offensive legacy. Nevertheless, it is supportive for the apt door to the country's menace of armed insurgency as per the UN system and the government's call. The squeezed condition of UN in Nepal is prevailed in terms of three categories: the verification of People's Liberation Army (PLA) and the arms that commensurate Nepal Army (NA) and its weapons to storage, supervision of its business and monitoring the peace process. Initially it also served as the enhancer to the successful Constituent Assembly election. Now, most debated issue of integration of both the combatants is underway, framed by the agreement reached among political parties. Nevertheless, UNMIN's role in this process is just to mediate and assist the process as the parties agree upon. Hence, UNMIN doesn't have any mandate to formulate laws and force to implement them sneaking the agreement.

Therefore, UNMIN is just like eye witness who can report through description of the peace process but has no authority to take any initiative in correcting the derailed peace process. It has been pushed to more vulnerable and helplessness situation, questioned the UN authenticity because of the instable government of Nepal and the irresponsible political

parties who change their stances on UN role as power changes to them. The political parties of Nepal good at delivering gymnastics of words and assurances are undermining the true spirit of the UN role and their shifting of meaning-interpretation vis-à-vis power representation at the time. Thus, Nepalese perception of UN role and coercive moulding into its interest has questioned the UN history, its need and objectives in the world.

The growing and inevitable nexus among the countries bridged by the development in science and technology, communication and transportation; caught them to realize the need of international organization. Thus formed organization could cement the relationship and promote co-operation among the trapping countries through different fibers of sharing relations.

The world laid the first of its kind in 1648 and christened as the Westphalia Conference which aimed to end the 30 years long religious war through *Theory of Balance of Power*. The second visible step was Vienna Congress, 1815 to conclude the war seeded by the emperor Napoleon Bonaparte. Then Holy Alliance came into existence in 1815 to grip hold in Europe and be the leading international organization. The member states of the Holy Alliance and Britain glued together to form Concert of Europe in 1814.

The Hague System which fetches its meaning from the Westphalia Conference valorized the need of systematic conference and it was accelerated and regularized from 1899 with the First Hague Conference. It also instruments for settling crises peacefully, preventing wars and codifying rules of warfare. It adopted the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes and established the Permanent Court of Arbitration, which began work in 1902.

The forerunner of the United Nations was the League of Nations, an organization conceived in similar circumstances during the First World War, and established in 1919 under the Treaty of Versailles "to promote international cooperation and to achieve peace and

security." But huge gap among the member countries vis-à-vis power and polarization for self-interest resulted into mere dream.

Thus, the United Nations Organization (UNO) stepped onto the unfolding red carpet by incorporating the previously ratified treaties and lessons from the experience and took its first breath in the lap of American former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The name "United Nations", coined by the President Roosevelt, was first used in the "Declaration by United Nations" of 1 January 1942, during the Second World War, when representatives of 26 nations pledged their governments to continue fighting together against the Axis Powers.

States first established international organizations to cooperate on specific matters. The International Telecommunication Union was founded in 1865 as the International Telegraph Union, and the Universal Postal Union was established in 1874. Both are now United Nations specialized agencies.

The International Labor Organization was also created under the Treaty of Versailles as an affiliated agency of the League. The League of Nations ceased its activities after failing to prevent the Second World War. In 1945, representatives of 50 countries met in San Francisco at the United Nations Conference on International Organization to draw up the United Nations Charter. Those delegates deliberated on the basis of proposals worked out by the representatives of China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States at Dumbarton Oaks, United States, in August-October 1944. The Charter was signed on 26 June 1945 by the representatives of the 50 countries. Poland, which was not represented at the Conference, signed it later and became one of the original 51 member states.

The United Nations officially came into existence on 24 October 1945, when the Charter had been ratified by China, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States and a majority of other signatories after the defeat of Nazi Germany, Italian Fascism and Japanese militarism. The United Nations Day is celebrated on 24 October each

year. Hence, the researcher debunks the UN system and structure that influences its overall functions and the global reflection.

a) The Key Objectives of the UN

The key objectives of an organization matters the scope, credibility and success in achieving its goals and completion of mission. UN also has its certain key objectives that plays vital role in Nepalese Peace Process. Among them are: to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of the acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principle of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace; to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace; to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

(UN Charter)

b) The United Nations System

There are six principal organizations of the United Nations which have wider coverage of different fields. They are General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Secretariat, Trusteeship Council and International Court of Justice. These six principal organizations and their respected branches categorically eased to dive into the specific working field.

General Assembly:

General Assembly (GA) is the main part of the UN that deals with the future plan, peace and security, budget and new membership to the countries. Two third votes, including veto power countries, decide any issues tabled. It comprises the representatives of the each member state.

The Security Council:

The primary responsibility of the Security Council is to maintain international peace and security. The Security Council shall consist of fifteen Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council. The GA elects ten other members of the UN for two years tenure to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of members of the UN to maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution. The each member of them shall have one representative (one vote).

Economic and Social Council:

The Economic and Social Council comprises 54 members elected through General Assembly. The eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for three years term. Each member of the council has one representative. The council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may recommendations with respect to any such matter to the GA to the members of the UN, and to specialized agencies concerned.

The Secretariat:

The Secretariat comprises a Secretary-General as the chief administrative officer of the organization. The secretary-General is appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

The Trusteeship Council:

The Trusteeship Council comprises the members administering trust territories are elected for three years by the GA. The number of members will be as necessary to ensure that the total number of members of the Trusteeship Council is equally divided between those members of the United Nations which administer trust territories and those which do not. Each member of the council designates one specially qualified person to represent therein.

The International Court of Justice:

The International Court of Justice is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations and it functions in accordance with the annexed Statute, which is based upon the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and forms an integral part of the UN Charter. The each member of the UN is undertaken to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in the case of which it is a party.

The United Nations have carried 63 Peacekeeping Operations since 1948 and 15 of them are being currently run in the different parts of the world and 18 of them are directed and supported by the Department of Peacekeeping Operation .

118 countries out of total member countries are contributing 93,187 UN-uniformed personnel including 79,525 troops, 11,462 police and 2,200 military observers. The international civilian personnel, local civilian personnel and UN volunteers are also serving to peacekeeping.

The main fifteen among the Peacekeeping Operation are: United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO-1948), United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP-1949), United Nations

Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP-1964), United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF-1974), United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL-1978), United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO-1991), United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK-1999), United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC-1999), United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL-2003), United Nations Operation in Cote d'Ivoire (UNOCI-2004), United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH-2004), United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS-2005), United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT-2006), African Union/United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID-2007) and United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT-2007). (Basic Facts of UN 72)

The UNMIN established in 2007, after the signing of Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA) between the then government and the Communist Party of Nepal (CPN)-Maoist in response to the request by both the parties. UNMIN was established as a special political mission with the limited mandate to work until the logical conclusion of peace process and the then main agenda to hold Constituent Assembly election with the first tenure of one year.

The peace process of Nepal as the hotcake--nationally and internationally draws high attention--has evoked various comments and criticisms from various prominent figures from the very outset of the process. In this regard, one of the critics, former Head of United Nations Mission in Nepal and Special Representative of UN-Secretary General, Ian Martin says:

I think there was a big problem which was the tension between the expectations of UNMIN as in some sense an overall guarantor of the peace

process and a mandate that certainly didn't correspond to that expectation but was much more narrowly focused. I do genuinely think that the UN could have been more helpful in the process, and I think it is particularly unfair to attack the UN for not having enabled the process to implement commitments that we haven't been able to assist with. (7)

The ambassador of the United States of America to Nepal, Nancy J.Pawell critiques on the Nepalese peace process as:

I think there will be some concern on some part of the members of the Security Council including my own government, regarding the request for the latest extension, as when the last request was made, there was great fanfare that it would be the final one, there would be a great progress in the issues in which UNMIN is involved. But the record has been almost nothing. This is a concern because, there are costs associated with UNMIN, there are other programs not funded because the money comes to Nepal. There is a growing urgency in the Security Council to see Nepalis take seriously that, as Assistant Secretary of US Blake has suggested, there is no blank cheque here. The US pays approximately a quarter of UNMIN's cost as part of its UN obligation. There is an expectation for me as a taxpayer and my fellow taxpayers that there would be Nepalis who are working on this, that this is not an open ended commitment made by the UN. (7)

Another critic Suman Pradhan writes on the Nepalese peace process and UN involvement:

Ordinary citizens believe that once the U.N. get involved, Nepal's 11-year-old Maoist problem will be resolved in favour of a peaceful democratic state. The local intelligentsia, too, holds similar beliefs. "The U.N.'s role will be to

effectively manage the peace process. It will be difficult initially but we are certain that the U.N. will succeed”, says Narayan Wagle, editor of the influential ‘Kantipur’ newspaper. Such faith is striking considering the U.N. is nowhere near being involved. And even if it does, its recent failures in places like Rwanda, the Balkans and Cambodia give spoilers enough to derail. International observers are encouraging the nation's leaders to form a "political consultative mechanism" that consistently negotiates the outstanding issues. It is hoped that a government of national unity can be formed, which will fortify the peace efforts. (ii)

Asia Report N°163 opined on the UN role in Nepalese peace process and states, Despite successful elections and a lasting military ceasefire, Nepal’s peace process is facing its most severe tests yet. Major issues remain unresolved: there is no agreement on the future of the two armies, very little of the land seized during the conflict has been returned, and little progress has been made writing a new constitution. Challenges to the basic architecture of the 2006 peace deal are growing from all sides. Key political players, particularly the governing Maoists and the opposition Nepali Congress (NC), need to rebuild consensus on the way forward or face a public backlash. International supporters of Nepal must target assistance and political pressure to encourage the parties to face the threats to peace (N°163).

Hence, many writers as well as concerned authorities are found advocating different interpretations in relation to power-politics but none of them has penetrated through the spectacle of UN role involving for the sake of peace and power with the dimension of representation. When we scrutinize the pensive expression in documents on Nepalese peace process, the political parties, *UN Charter*, UN nature of bracketed agency--compelled to act as the Nepalese government decision rather than enforcing UN knowledge and power--the entire derail and reluctance in the Nepalese peace process. As the result, UN role in Nepal is

submissive with bracketed mandates in relation to the instable government and fluctuating mind in understanding UN role determined by the power representation of the government and also the political parties. Thus, deliberate offering of trapped role and ill attempt to impose individual interest, undermining the significance of UN agreement for its invitation, leads Nepal no where from the war menace.

To deal with this notion, this dissertation has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents an introductory outline. A synopsis of the entire work is figured out in this chapter. The second chapter of this study will be devoted on the discussion of theoretical modality that is to be implemented in this research i.e. the power politics and its representation—with regard to the UN role in the Nepalese Peace Process, political scenario and inevitability of logical conclusion to the Peace Process. The third chapter will be the analysis of the text in considerable length in the light of the concepts developed while setting up the theoretical modality. The texts comprise UN Charter, Tripartite agreement, related resolutions tabled on the UN Security Council and other available reports and interviews published from 8th of December 2006 to the 7th of December 2009. Some extracts from the text will be taken out as evidences to prove the hypothesis of the study. The fourth chapter will sum up the research based on the textual analysis of third chapter; it will conclude the explanations and arguments and will show the inseparable role of UN in shaping Nepalese Peace Process to the logical conclusion.

II. Concept of Power

Here the researcher dives into different perspectives on power and its representation that different philosophers and thinkers have appealed to join the cheers. The prominent thinkers like Michel Foucault, Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, however, have pondered into the power dynamics.

a) Foucauldian Concept of Power

Michel Foucault, one of the most noted French philosophers and historians, is renowned for his historical studies that reveal his thought over power, truth, language, discourse and knowledge. Foucault draws upon an anti-Enlightenment tradition that rejects the equation of reason, emancipation and progress arguing that an interface between modern forms of power and knowledge has served to create new forms of domination and power. Foucault being preoccupied with power, finally came to an understanding of it which is largely inspired by Nietzsche's notion of 'the will to power'. Nevertheless, in his searching for the particular and concrete locus of the generation of this power, the seminal manifestation of particular power eluded him.

Michel Foucault, in most of his books, has sought to show that western society has developed a new kind of power which he calls bio-power-that is a new system of control that traditional concepts of authority are unable to understand and criticize. Rather than being repressive, this new power enhances life. Foucault encourages people to resist the welfare state by developing individual ethics in which one turns one's life into something that others can respect and admire. Paul Rainbow writes about Foucauldian concept of power in the following way:

Foucault calls a new regime of power 'bio-power': he explains that bio-power brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and mode of knowledge and power became an agent of transformation of human

life. He further describes that the other pole of bio-power is the human body: the body approached not directly in its biological dimension, but as an object to be manipulated and controlled. (17)

In “Truth and Power”, Michel Foucault revisits the major theoretical trends and questions of his career. He is a thinker who knows no bounds of subjects or field. His ideas stretch from literature to science, from psychology to labor. He deals with a currency that is accepted everywhere: ‘Truth and Power’. Foucault spends much of his career tracing the threads of truth and power as they intertwine with the history of human experience. He especially loves to study asylums and prisons because they are close to an encapsulated power structure.

Using techniques gathered from psychology, politics, anthropology, and archeology, Foucault presents a highly politicized analysis of the flow of the power and power relations. He further says about the power exercised method in his essay ‘Truth and Power’ as:

The way power was exercised-concretely and in detail-with its specificity, its techniques and tactics, was something that no one attempted to ascertain; they contended themselves with denouncing it in a polemical and global fashion as it existed among the ‘others’, in the adversary camp. (1137)

Foucault sees every action and historical events as an exercise in the exchange of power. He has spent a large bulk of his career analyzing the ebb and flow of power in different situations and with relevance to different aspect of human life. Structure organizes and broadens the web of power.

The overall volume of power rises with every individual’s involvement in the play. The society is a huge web, and much of the power tends to be concentrated towards the higher echelons. Foucault sees the exchange of power in very active terms: “isn’t power simply a form of war like domination?” It is difficult to sort out just who is fighting the war, since Foucault seems to lean toward the war of all against all notions. Power flows

simultaneously in different directions and different volumes according to various forms of “power relations” in the “network” of power exchange. Regarding power and truth Foucault states:

Now I believe that the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientific or truth and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false. (1139)

For Foucault, repression is negative conception of power. And as such, it is incomplete. He further states that power is not only repression it is something positive. Sometimes power need to prohibit unnecessary and negative things. To control bad manners and attitudes power is necessary. By applying power positively order, justice and equality can be created in the society and country. Similarly if the power is forcefully applied it eventually turns into domination and therefore may result in violence and disorder. He further says:

In defining the effects of the power as repression, one adopts purely juridical conception of such power, one identifies power with a law which says no power is taken above all as carrying the force of a prohibition. [. . .] what makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasures, forms knowledge, produces discourse. (1139)

Power, according to Foucault is a creative source for positive value and it is always practiced under the influence of hegemony. It is in fact not top to bottom flow and is never used vertically to dominate others. Unlike other theorists, his power theory is not compatible to the repressive hypothesis that sees the functioning of power in the trend that confines power into

a small group of society. He argues that power is not just the ruthless domination over the weak by the stronger.

The true role of UN can't prevail without the consent of at least seven major political parties, either they are in ruling coalition government or out side the government. Foucault does not mean 'power' as a group of institutions and mechanisms that ensure the subservience of the citizens of a given state. He does not mean power as a mode of subjugation which, in contrast to violence, has the form of the rule. He also does not mean by it a general system of domination exerted by one group over another, a system whose effects through successive derivations pervade the entire social body or in other words a system of domination in which there are rulers and the ruled. Rather, he says: "Power must be understood as a multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization" (92).

Foucault views that power is not something that is acquired, seized or shared, or something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; rather he believes that power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations. Another indispensable thing in his power theory is 'resistance'. Foucault believes that where there is power, there is always resistance. Resistance is never exterior in the field of power relations. He says:

Resistances do not derive from a few heterogeneous principles; but neither are they a lure or a promise that is of necessity betrayed. They are the odd term in relations of power; they are inscribed in the latter as an irreducible opposite. Hence, they too are distributed in irregular fashion: the points, knots, or focuses of resistance are spread over time and space varying densities, at times mobilizing groups or individuals in a definitive way, inflaming certain points of the body, certain moments in life, certain types of behavior. (96)

The different form of 'resistance' appears in different forms including the gestures of an individual or a certain party. Everywhere, resistance is seen as power locates in every corner but such resistance is dominated and tries to out burst in the form of 'behavior'.

Hence, it becomes quite clear now that in his concept of power, Michel Foucault's main idea was against the hierarchical notion of power. He sees power not simply as a repressive tool of scheme, but as a complex force that produces what happens in society. It is not wielded by somebody because one is himself or her-self caught in certain discourses and practices that wholly constitute power.

i) Discourse

When we probe deeply in Michel Foucault's conception of discourse we find that his usage of the word 'discourse' is not generic. His employ of the term is derived from the epistemological and linguistic speculations of the ideologues, Condillac, and Locke. "Discourse" is language which strips from itself all self-reliance, all inner play, and all metaphorical distortion. Its role function is to serve as a transparent representation of both the ideas and things which stand outside it. Therefore, discourse and language (langue) are adversely and antithetically poised. In language, the "direction of meaning" is wholly inward, for language hypothesizes a direct correspondence between signifier and signified; it pretends itself to mimetic of the world. Conversely, discourse is entirely outward, recognizing itself only as a mere representation of the world with only an arbitrary nexus existing between signifier and signified. As the pretense of "language" disappears, all that remains is its "function as representation: its nature and its virtues as discourse". Should language return, then discourse must again dissolve into vacuity.

In *Language, Counter-Memory and Practice*, Foucault continues his definition of discourse in terms of its effect. More than being merely a simple speech-act, he interprets discursive practices as both verbal and non-verbal means of manipulating and defining the

hierarchy of power within a society. They are both tools and weapons. In Foucault's view, all evidences of discourse must confess their pretense of feigned naiveté and innocence:

Discursive practices are not purely and simply ways of producing discourse. They are often embodied in technical processes, in institutions, in patterns for general behavior, in forms for transmission and diffusion, and in pedagogical forms which, at once, impose and maintain them. Power is the operative element in maintaining a political society and discourse is the medium through which power is exercised. (86)

Foucauldian theory of discourse is developed in relation to the power structures operating in the society. His main concern is that discourse is involved in power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operate through discourse. The discourse, therefore, is inseparable from power because discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institutions to exercise power and dominate. Those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude others who are not in power.

M.H. Abrams in his book *Glossary of Literary Terms* writes:

Discourse has become the focal term among the critics who oppose the deconstructive concept of a "general text" that functions independently of particular historical condition. Instead they conceive of discourse as social parlance, or language-in-use and consider it to be both the product and the manifestation of a timeless linguistic system, but of particular social condition, class-structures, and power-relationships that alter in the course of history.

(241)

Discourse is the way of presenting something. In straight sense, it is talking and communicating using signs to designate things. It also shows implication for speech and the relationship between signifiers and what they signify. But, in broad sense, it can help us to

interpret many slices of our social and political systems that we have never even considered before. It also helps to illuminate part of the ordinary world that is controlled by the expert in the society. Thus, discourse is a major point in society that effects how we can speak act and interpret things. As Michel Foucault views:

Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth: that is the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statement, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who changed with saying what counts as true. (1144)

In his *The Archeology of Knowledge* Foucault says: “A discourse is a ‘series of sentences or propositions’ and that it ‘can be defined as a large group of statements that belong to a single system of formation’ - a so-called discursive formation (125)”. The working of power is always through discourse; acknowledging this fact Hans Bertens says:

In any case, power works through discourses and discursive formations. In its policing of abnormal behavior, the power human sciences derive from what they claimed to be knowledge; it derives from their claims to expertise. Such a cluster of claims to knowledge is what Foucault calls a discourse. To be more precise, a discourse is a loose structure of interconnected assumptions that makes knowledge possible. (154)

Discourse is not merely a sign but it is a set of practices that constitute the object in which it is speaking of. Most importantly, it is a system of constraint or exclusion which sets boundaries for what can and cannot be said or done in our everyday lives. The experts define the situation and then divide the line between reason and unreason for society. And it determines for us what is proper and improper through the eyes of the experts. In most

societies, it has never been a matter of what you do. The only thing that really matters is what is thought about it according to what can and cannot be said. The system of discourse in regard to everything constantly changes within years, decades and centuries according to who has the power. And power holders use the discourse according to their benefits.

In any society, the production of a discursive act is always controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to modes or social conventions whose role is to avert its power and its dangers, to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality. Individual freedom of expression is surrendered to a particular, exterior, determining demeanor acting interiorly within the whole of society. Logic shows that this is good: without these governing procedures anarchy will reign. It is the characteristic of these procedures that they are not affirmative, but they rule by exclusion. They speak to a society in terms of what is prohibited to do

While talking about discourse it becomes essential to acknowledge the fact that discourse is the site where power and knowledge are joined together; and because of this reason discourse must be conceived as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable. To be more precise one must not imagine a world of discourse divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse, or between the dominated discourse and the dominating one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies. It is this distribution that we must reconstruct with the things said and those concealed, the enunciations required and those forbidden, that it comprises; with the variants and different effects – according to who is speaking, his position of power, the institutional context in which he/she happens to be situated – that it implies; and with the shift and reutilizations of identical formulas for contrary objectives that it also includes.

Discourses can be an effect or instrument of power but they may also be a point of resistance. Throwing light on this fact Foucault says:

There is not, on the one side, a discourse of power, and opposite it, another discourse that runs counter to it. Discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; they can, on the contrary, circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy. (102)

According to the Foucauldian theory, following propositions can be drawn about discourse: discourse is a group of statements which provide a language for talking about, and “repressing” a topic or in other words it is a discursive formation; a discourse refers to the rules of formation of statements which are accepted as scientifically true; a discourse is a question of what governs statements, and the way in which they govern each other; a discourse is about production of knowledge through language, and through practices; a discourse is used as a means to gain or sometimes even to subvert power.

ii) Language, Truth and Knowledge

Language shapes the way we think, and what it is possible to communicate. It also allows us to convey information from one person to another. During the twentieth century two conflicting pictures of the relationship between language and reality has developed. According to one, language represents a reality that exists independently of it. While language may color or distort reality, it remains responsible to it. Truth is a matter of correspondence to this reality, it remains responsible to it. Truth is a matter of correspondence to reality. According to other picture of the way language works, language constructs the reality that we are able to represent. There is no language independent reality and truth cannot be correspondence to it. That is, there is not one to one correspondence

between language and the meaning. This leads to the conclusion that language is not politically neutral, for the language we speak constrains what we can think and the world we experience and the mechanisms behind the formulation of language are enmeshed in institutionalized forms of power.

In any society, there are many systems that people practice and language is interwoven with social practices by the circulation of power. Power that diffuses itself in systems of authority has the effect of truths, which are produced within the discourses of knowledge but the discourse are neither true nor false. The truth is related with power and it changes with the change of power. Truth is like sliding ground which is not possible in the lack of power. It includes regular effects of power. Each and every society has its regime of truth. What power does is conceived as truth, it cannot be condemned because it functions as true and fact by the types of discourse and with the mechanisms and instances, which enable one to distinguish true and false statements. Language is nothing but the system that operates within itself. Power has profound and deep rooted relation with systems and it changes as the systems change. It circulates through society and literary cultural texts that are a part of it. Interpreting the power-truth relationship, Foucault in his essay 'Truth and Power' says:

The important thing here, I believe, is that truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power: contrary to a myth whose history and myth would repay further study, truth isn't the reward of free spirit, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. (1144)

Because of this, Foucault sees the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of 'science' and 'ideology', but in terms of 'truth' and 'power'. The question of how to deal with and determine truth is at the base of political and social strife.

Foucault goes on serving his critical views on crucial inter-relationships between power, discourse, truth and knowledge, in his own words as:

[. . .] knowledge is an “invention” behind which lies something completely different from itself: the play of instincts, impulses, desires, fear and the will to appropriate. Knowledge is produced on the stage where these elements struggle against each other; [. . .] its production is not the effect of their harmony or joyful equilibrium, but of their hatred, of their questionable and provisional compromise, and of the fragile truce that they are always prepared to betray. It is not a permanent faculty, but an event or, at the very least, a series of events; [. . .] knowledge is always in bondage, dependent and interested (not in itself, but to those thing capable of involving an instinct or the instincts that dominate it; [. . .] and if it gives itself as the knowledge of truth, it is because it produces truth through the play of a primary and always reconstituted fashion, which erects the distinction between truth and falsehood. (48)

Michel Foucault considers knowledge to be nothing more than an artificial “invention”, and as such, devoid of any natural ontology. As a human construct, knowledge is the produced fruit of humankind’s conflict. Therefore, as conflicts arises and are squelched in political society, so also is knowledge in a perpetual current of flux in epistemological formulations. As knowledge is the effect of power, the conscious control or manipulation of power dictates wherever presumed knowledge is or is not taboo within that society. As Foucault says:

‘These power-knowledge relations are to be analyzed, therefore, not on the basis of a subject of knowledge who is or is not free in relation to power, but, on the contrary, the subject who knows, the objects to be known and the modalities of knowledge must be regarded as so many effects of these

fundamental implications of power-knowledge and their historical transformations.’ (66)

Therefore, it can be said that power is the necessary condition for the construction of knowledge. And ultimately, through the assertion of power which defines knowledge, “truth” emerges as a temporary non-absolute thing, relative only to a particular moment in history and to particular exercise of power at that moment.

iii) Power Relations and Resistance

One of the perennial issues of social and political philosophy is the matter of power that some people have over others. Many of our relationships, indeed our very ways of living, can be characterized as relations of power; teacher and student, parent and child, owner and worker, ruler and ruled, with the governing authority and without the governing authority, and it goes on indefinitely. Our lives are enclosed by power-relations which are not arbitrary. They inevitably serve to maintain the social structure in which they occur. For example, why does a teacher hold power over the student? It is the student who pays tuition fee that makes the teacher’s salary. Why the political parties in the government rule over the other parties and the people? It is the people and opposition parties who pay taxes and give mandate to be governed. Hence, it is worth noting that it is not the particular government and people who determine the relation, but the power relations are built into the institution of state system.

Michel Foucault’s notion of power is in the form of power relations, rather than understanding power as an absolute term and concept. He sees power relations as more complicated and sophisticated than the ruler-ruled relation. Delving into the concept of power relations, he says: “what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action which does not act immediately and directly on others. Instead it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or future (103).”

Similar to Foucault, J. Forester sees power as political communication and concludes:

Power works through the management of competence, or obfuscation; of trust, or false assurance; of consent, or manipulated agreement; and of knowledge or misrepresentation. Each of these three modes of power works in this way, either to thwart articulate democratic participation and encourage positivity, or to encourage articulate political action and the rationalization of a democratic planning process. (45)

Forester, following the argument of Foucault, argues that these three modes of power derive their effectiveness from differential levels of knowledge existing in society.

Essentially, 'power' is existential. Power creates and is created by organizational attributes, social or cultural attributes and individual attributes. A power relation occurs where there is the potentiality for resistance, that is to say it only arises between two individuals each or who has the potential to influence the actions of other and to present resistance to this influence. Resistance is the sine qua non condition for power as Foucault suggests, "Where there is power there is resistance (95)." The power relationship can be challenged or modified. Social relationships, he argues, not only exist as attraction but also generate resistance.

Foucault has discussed in his works that power is affected by differential levels of knowledge existing in society. He argues that power is inseparable from knowledge and since knowledge requires records and a system of communication, it in itself is a form of power.

He says:

Power and knowledge directly imply one another. There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. These power-knowledge relations are to be analyzed, therefore, not

on the basis of a subject of knowledge who is or is not free in relation to the power system, but, on the contrary, the subject who knows, the objects to be known and the modalities of knowledge must be regarded as so many effects of these fundamental implications of power-knowledge and their historical transformations. (98)

Power, as well as other forms of social practices, is jointly constructed through a complex of interactions and a variety of discourses. Foucault suggests that it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together. And for this very reason, we must conceive discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable. As discourses are not only about what can be said, and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority. Discourses represent meaning and social relationships; they form both subjectivity and power relations.

Viewing this nature of relationship between power and subject position, we can ascertain that they are ever resisting and defending for the ultimate goal of power seizure. In modern society people by participating in multiple discursive practices, where they can be positioned differently in relation to knowledge and power, and indeed can be active in shifting the discourse from one in which they are less powerful into another, in which they are positioned more powerfully. The discourse already created—the ruling parties who represent the government are more powerful than the opposition—can create its more powerful position through discourses and the Maoist party, shifting down from the ruling authority may possess less power.

b) Gramsci's Notion of Power and Hegemony:

Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci traces out both the power relations that maintain their sub-ordination and the cracks and fissures that could potentially lead to their overcoming it. Gramsci ponders on power relations can be seen as occupying a continuum

with direct coercion through brute force at one pole and willing consent at the other. He questions that what keeps the subaltern, and how might their subalternity be overcome?

Gramsci, however, devoted himself so much in space in the prison notebooks to the culture of peasant and other subaltern people. Not that Gramsci did not have respect for the kind of peasant culture that he himself had grown up in, but at the same time, probably precisely because he knew it so well, he was never sentimental about it, seeing it both as narrow and parochial, and needing to be transcended; but also as possessing a certain hard-nosed realism about the nature of power. Contained within the chaotic eclecticism of popular 'common sense', as he put it in 'Relation between Science, Religion and Common Sense'. To understand Gramsci's notion, we need to see what his term "hegemony" mean.

i) Hegemony

Exactly what Gramsci meant by hegemony has been much argued over, but what is not in dispute is that it is a concept that Gramsci uses to explore relationships of power and the concrete ways in which these are lived. Hegemony, initially a term referring to the dominance of one state within a confederation, is now generally understood to mean domination by consent. The realities of power are central to Gramsci's theorization of subaltern culture and consciousness. For him that consciousness could not but be an impoverished and 'unsystematic' one, precisely because of the subaltern's relative powerlessness. Here, in a note to which we shall return, we find Gramsci arguing for folklore to be approached as a way of discovering how the subaltern sees the world:

One can say that until now folklore has been studied primarily as a 'picturesque' element. Folklore should instead be studied as a 'conception of the world and life' implicit to a large extent in determinate (in time and space) strata of society and in opposition (also for the most part implicit, mechanical and objective) to 'official' conceptions of the world (or in a broader sense, the

conceptions of the cultured parts of historically determinate societies) that have succeeded one another in the historical process. (Hence the strict relationship between folklore and ‘common sense’, which is philosophical folklore.) *This conception of the world is not elaborated and systematic because, by definition, the people (the sum total of the instrumental and subaltern classes of every form of society that has so far existed) cannot possess conceptions which are elaborated, systematic and politically organized and centralized* in their albeit contradictory development. (SCW:188-9)

Gramsci emphasizes on the conception of the world that guides the spectacle to see at subaltern people. Thus, perceived lens depends upon the strata of people and their correspondent environment. For instance, how Maoists of Nepal who claim to represent ‘marginalized and backward working class people’ are seen through the UN that represent scores of countries including veto-power countries.

The position in politics is, however, influences the social power that posits a mass of people for and against certain notion. This is further evident when Gramsci criticizes a book by Daniel Halevy:

For Halevy, ‘state’ is the representative apparatus; and he discovers that the most important events of French history from 1870 until the present day have not been due to initiatives by political organisms deriving from universal suffrage, but to those either of private organisms (capitalist firms, General Staffs, etc.) or of great civil servants unknown to the country at large, etc. But what does that signify if not that *by ‘state’ should be understood not only the apparatus of government, but also the ‘private’ apparatus of ‘hegemony’ or civil society?* (SPN 261)

He makes the point, prefacing it with the very helpful clarification that the distinction between political society (force) and civil society (hegemony) should be seen simply as a methodological one. The state and civil and civil society, that is, do not represent two bounded universes, always and for ever separate, but rather a knot of tangled power relations which, depending on the questions we are interested in, can be disentangled into different assemblages of threads. It should also be stressed that for Gramsci, just because civil society in general represents consent rather than force, it by no means follows that civil society is, therefore, necessarily benign. This is particularly important to stress in the contemporary political climate.

C) Althusserian Notion of Power, Representation and Ideology:

Louis Althusser, a prominent contributor to the literature and cultural studies by foregrounding his theory of Ideology dwells upon his claim that ideology constitutes our 'lived' relationship to historical reality, or our 'world' itself. So, his main argument on his essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" (1969), in which he advances his claim that ideology 'intellectuals as subjects' is given prime focus in this dissertation. Defining the ideology Althusser says:

Ideology is indeed a system of representations, but in the majority of cases these representations have nothing to do with 'consciousness': they are usually images and occasionally concepts, but it is about all as structures that they impose on the vast majority of men, not via their 'consciousness'. They are perceived-accepted-suffered cultural objects and they act functionally on men via a process that escapes them. (FM: 233)

Ideology is imaginary version, the represented version. So the real world becomes not something that is objectively out there, but something that is the product of our relations to it. Ideology becomes a determining force shaping consciousness, embodied in the material

signifying practices of ISAs. For Althusser, the state apparatus in fact consists of two overlapping but distinct sets of institutions. He writes:

The state Apparatus (SA) contains: the Government, the Administration, the Army, the Police, the Courts, the Prisons, etc., which constitute what I shall in future call the Repressive State Apparatus. Repressive suggests that the State Apparatus in question ‘functions by violence’ – at least ultimately (since repression, e.g. administrative repression, may take non-physical forms). (LP: 136)

The above are the state mechanisms which promote the coercive use of force, rather than diplomatic or preventive measure to bind into state systematic governance. For them calls the ‘Ideological State Apparatuses’ (ISAs). These are apparently distinct and specialized institutions such as: the religious ISA, the educational ISA, the legal ISA, the political ISA, the trade union ISA, the communications ISA, the cultural ISA. Crossing the boundaries of apparatus, Althusser unravels on the ideology which has material existence farcified with context and position.

Althusser means that the ideological State Apparatus logically precedes the individual member of it. It is not because we hold certain beliefs that we construct ISAs; rather, it is because ISAs have been constructed that we hold certain beliefs. The material apparatus – the institution, with all its practices and rituals – governs the beliefs of its members. Ideas are not the property of individual subjects, Althusser argues, but the result of the situation of those subjects, in class society, within a set of ISAs. He adds that how ideology interpellates individual as subject:

Ideology ‘acts’ or ‘functions’ in such a way that it ‘recruits’ subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or ‘transforms’ the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by that very precise operation which I have

called *interpellation* or *hailing*, and which can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing: ‘Hey, you there!’

(LP: 162-63)

Ideology addresses me, as it were, before I am even born, as I grow up and throughout my life, as an “I”, as a subject, as a site of identity, thought and action. This is what Althusser means by the term ‘interpellation’: ideology calls me into being as a subject, as if it were calling me by name in the street. It causes me to believe that I am a subject, although in the reality of the capitalist mode of production, I have none of the attributes of that ideological concept.

Thus, ideology, Althusser mean is the name of all the discourse in society that does not, like science, represent the reality of that society. It is the way in which men and women ‘live’ their relationship to reality; it represents ‘the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. In his most influential essay, Althusser argues that ideologies exist materially as a set of practices within an institution, an Ideological State Apparatus, or ISA., Althusser argues, is an institution that functions primarily by ideology, and primarily by the ruling ideology in a given society.

Thus, Foucauldian notion of power that the power comes from everywhere and discourse creates power reflects Nepalese power-game through representation. For instance, the UN highly powerful and credible in the global sense can’t go beyond Nepal Government’s mandate as per the UN system but the government as well as the political parties of Nepal by creating discourse and imposing power drawing UN in the wrangling debate. Similarly, Gramsci’s notion of hegemony epitomizes how people are surrendered through power. For example, the Maoists who wanted to establish their communism via arms gun-down to welcome UN. Similarly, the government who tagged Maoist fighters as the ‘terrorist’ agreed to integrate them in the national security force. Also, the Althusserian notion

of ideology reveals the Nepal's political parties dying for power and their quest for it through subjectivity. Hence, the tool used for exploring the dimensions of power embedded in the representation aptly present the Nepalese Peace Process in relation to the UN.

III. Representation of United Nations' Role in Nepalese Peace Process

Different texts published during 21st of November 2006 to 20th of November 2009 have reflected UN role with different angle. The texts among them are UNMIN publications, *The Kathmandu Post*, *The Rising Nepal*, *The Himalayan Times*, all the reports and resolutions tabled on the meeting of Security Council of UN in New York, interviews of the concerned people, UN Charter and press releases and other related documents published within the above time frame shows the UN role in Nepalese Peace Process is largely decided by Nepal Government and the political forces in Nepal. The UNMIN has secondary role as it was established in request of Nepal government.

The present report is submitted pursuant to the Security Council's presidential statement of 1 December 2006 (S/PRST/2006/49). The statement welcomed the signing on 21 November 2006 of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Nepal and welcomed and expressed support for my intention to send a technical assessment mission to Nepal, with a view to proposing a fully developed concept of operations, including a United Nations political mission to deliver the assistance requested by the Nepalese parties to the peace process, and to dispatch an advance deployment of essential personnel of up to 35 monitors and 25 electoral personnel. The Council expressed its readiness to consider my formal proposals as soon as the technical assessment mission was complete.(S/2007/7, UNSC, 9 Jan,2007)

Dr. Trilochan Upreti writes in *The Kathmandu Post* that the UN role in Nepalese Peace Process is just to monitor and do as per the agreement. He further says:

Unlike in other countries, where the UN played a major role from the beginning of the peace process to its execution, the peace accord in Nepal has been hammered out by the Nepalis themselves and the UN has been involved only to monitor and implement a part of the broader agreement. [. . .] what is

required first and foremost is mutual trust, together with the political will and determination of our leaders to make a new Nepal. (21/11/2006, TKP)

The UN has global power and at the same time it can't go beyond its mandate from the respective member state. Here, UN was invited by Nepal and its mandate is not other than the Nepalese consent. Therefore, Nepal and its political parties are responsible more than the UN for the future of Nepalese peace Process.

Govinda Bhattarai and Liladhar Upadhyaya jointly opined in *The Rising Nepal* that the UN, the government and the Maoist rebellions are framed within the agreement reached among them, thereby, Nepalese Peace Process paved green signals through the agreement. They add: "Nepal government and CPN (Maoist) have signed the much awaited tripartite agreement paving the way of the United Nations to monitor and management of Maoist combatants and their weapons" (29/11/2006, TRN). They also have anticipated the UN with its 'power' in the form of 'surveillance' so that the presence of UN is sufficient for the 'control' " in order to monitor the weapons storage site, the UN will install a 24-hour surveillance camera and make arrangements of automatic switching off floodlights during hours of darkness" (29/11/2006, TRN).

Kofi Anan in his statement from New York based Security Council favoring the Nepalese Peace Process confirmed on UN's presence in Nepal under political mission. His statement speaks: "The Security Council has also expressed support for the intention to send a technical assessment mission to Nepal with a view to purposing a full developed concept of UN operations, including a United Nations political mission to deliver the assistance requested by the Nepal Government" (01/12/2006, UNSC, NY).

Similarly, *The Rising Nepal* has reported on the tripartite arms management accord which UN has posited its role with the policies that are to be meet by UN system. It states:

The representative today inked the final copy of the arms deal with some of the minor amendments made as per the suggestion of UN Legal Department. The provisions included in the agreement are the same as before but some of the technical words have been substituted as per the UN policy. (09/12/2006, TRN)

The UN has been creating a power through discourse in the name of its suggestions from its department concerned to legal system. UN tries to exercise its power as its system of incorporating the global authenticity.

Tilak Pokharel of *The Kathmandu Post* quotes James F. Moriarty, the then ambassador to Nepal who speaks on the UN role and arms management of Maoist in Nepal. He says:

When we talk about complete and transparent process, [w]hat we mean is you really do end up with mainly combatants in the cantonments and really do have a bulk of weapons in the containers. And, the UN knows what's the bulk of the weapons are. [. . .] If you (UN) don't need to run a count, you do need, at some point, to say we are coming to that goal. You don't media people seating around containers recording what is going on...but you do need the Maoists to really handover the bulk of their weapons. (20/01/2007, TKP)

The UN has been valorized and UN 'legacy' is tried to impose in the Nepalese case where UN understanding and dealing is authentic. The 'hegemonic' conception which undermines the socio-political context and the universal notion of UN is vested everywhere equally. Therefore, Moriarty has expressed his understanding that Maoist should handover all the arms and ammunitions to UN.

The UN Security Council praises the initial quick response by the Nepal Government as well as the Nepali political parties. The UN Secretary General in his statement writes:

Reaffirming the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Nepal and its ownership of the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and subsequent agreements, [. . .] *Expressing* its continued readiness to support the peace process in Nepal in the timely and effective implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and subsequent agreements. (S/RES/1796(2008))

The 'discourse' created by the UN Secretary General seems encouraging the Nepali political parties but at the same time it appeals for the servility of Nepal and its political parties to come under UN System. Such, valorization of UN fetches its power from every corner either they are visible or invisible. Praising the parties to work under UN System is self-glorification.

Likewise, the security council resolution adopted on authorizing establishment of United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN), further states:

Taking note of the request of the parties of United Nations assistance in implementing key aspects of the agreement, in particular monitoring of arrangements relating to the management of arms and armed personnel of both sides and election monitoring, [. . .] to monitor the management of arms and armed personnel of both sides, in line with the provision of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. To provide technical support for the planning, preparation and conduct of election of a Constituent Assembly in a free and fair atmosphere in consultation with the parties. (S/RES/1740(2007))

The 'ideological interpellation' which creates the discourse of 'power' in ideological level through the establishment of UN political mission in Nepal. Here, the UN presence is ideological rather than physically performative. Therefore, UN has constructed ideology of domination in the name of technical and political consultation. The political consultation with

the Nepali political parties shows UN is guided with the ideological notion that it should not go beyond the consent of Nepalese political parties while assisting them.

Indra Karki in his article entitled UN Full Mission in Nepal: History in the Making writes:

The full UN political mission in Nepal has been mandated by the UNSC to support the Peace Process in Nepal as envisioned in the November 21 Comprehensive Peace Agreement; monitor the management of arms and armies of both sides, including management of improvised explosive devices as designated in the accord; assist with the registration of combatants and their weapons; assists the parties in implementing their management of arms and armies through a Joint Monitoring Committee, that is, in accordance with the agreement, the chairman of which is to be appointed by UNMIN; assist in the monitoring of the cease-fire, including cases of human rights violations; provide technical support for carrying out the election of CA in a free and fair environment; and to pay special attention, while executing the above task, to the needs of women, children and traditionally marginalized groups in the country. (01/02/2007, TRN)

The UN political full mission has to work in accordance to the agreement reached among the government of Nepal, Nepali political parties and the UN. The Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) which comprises of representatives of these three sides; believes in the understanding that equally represents the 'power'. The JMC approves any decision and the major responsibility is seen with the government and the Nepali political parties because they represent majority of votes as UN being one side. The Constituent Assembly (CA) election that was mandated to support in accordance to the decision of JMC, the Nepalese political

parties through their representation in the JMC has shown its power domination through ‘representation’.

The report in *The Rising Nepal* on the Nepali political parties that have tried to dismantle the UN presence undermining the poor agency of UN. The report further states: “About 100 cadres of Madhesi Janadhikar Forum attempted an attack on UN arms monitoring team Monday three kilometer away from Pidari Chowk of Janakpur municipality. The UN team was going to the second division main camp of CPN (Maoist) at Dudhauri VDC of Sindhuli district for monitoring purpose” (06/02/2007, TRN). The poor UN presence in Nepal is shown with Nepalese political parties wanting to impose their power and weaken the UN role in the Peace Process. The attack by Madhesi Janadhikar Forum to the UN monitoring body visualizes the rampant activities by different political parties including the regional parties. But opposing such attack on UN, the UN monitoring team leader spoke: “If we are not allowed free movement, it would be difficult to complete our mission. [. . .] the ongoing violence in the east have slackened the verification process” (06/02/2007, TRN). The weak agency of UN which can’t do anything without the consent of the political parties in Nepal, shows its resistance force and warns the political parties to stop such attack to UN body. The ‘hegemony’ that is created with the UN presence that if UN is attacked it may withdraw from Nepal and the Nepalese whole Peace Process is derailed.

The Kathmandu Post attributing the Maoist Chairman Prachanda on the Maoist strength out side the cantonment states:

Maoist Chairman Prachanda said on Monday that thousands of his party`s combatants and weapon are still outside the cantonments as they couldn’t meet United Nations standard to be registered with the latter. Stating that they had troubled storing a large number of weapons inside the cantonments, Prachanda also disclosed that Maoists still have “technical human resources” out side the

cantonments who have the ability to launch “massive attacks” simultaneously at several places on a single night. [. . .] “we launched our movement with just two 3-0-3 rifles and home made weapons. Now we have registered the weapons as per UN instruction”, Prachanda said.(13/03/2007,TKP)

The Nepalese political parties including major rivalry force which was represented by CPN (Maoists) tried to impose ‘power hegemony’. The Prachanda’s statement which claims their strength outside the UN control as the Maoists are capable of having ‘resistance’ and at the same time they defy their own consents given to the UN. Such hegemonic ‘discourse’ that attempts to prove grown up ‘power’ which initiated with small representation. That is, the Maoists commenced their optimistic political insurgency with very few warfare techniques and arms including home products.

The Kathmandu Post reporting the press meet organized by UN in Nepal shows that every party should comply with the agreements. The breaching of the agreements violates not only the understanding but also fails to commensurate the need of time the UN representative Ian Martin is quoted as:

The head of United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN), Ian Martin on Thursday accused the CPN (Maoist) of producing “substantial” number of the under aged for registration at the UN monitored cantonments. [. . .] “I have made clear to the Maoists leadership that UNMIN believes that there are substantial number of minors in the cantonments as well as persons who were recruited after 25 May 2006,” said Martin, who is also a representative of UN Secretary-General in Nepal, adding, “I have asked for their cooperation regarding their discharge, as the (arms) agreement requires.” (23/3/2007, TKP)

The United Nations representative in Nepal shows his commitment on the agreement and asked the political parties not to misinterpret or mislead the understanding. While showing

this the representative posits its position in the balance of ‘power’. It has resisted the submissive representation as per the agreement that UN should not be misused in the name of domestic domination of power. The Maoist effort in violating the agreement by forcing to verify the numbers of minors who were deprived of requisition was against the agreement reached among the parties. These minors and disqualified combatants should be rehabilitated in their respective society as provisioned in the agreement.

Professor Mohan Prasad Lohani under the title “The UN role in present peace process” opined in *The Kathmandu Post*:

The UN involvement in Nepal’s peace process is limited to the mandate that the UNMIN has received from the Security Council. Its job is to register the arms and armies to both the sides (the Nepal army and the Maoist militia) and verify them the first phase is over. [. . .] The mission is expected to be a focused mission of limited duration, as stipulated in the Resolution that is, for twelve months only. Ian Martin, SG’s special representative, has been coordinating the UN effort in support of the peace process, in close consultation with the relevant parties and in close cooperation with other international actors. (24/3/2007, TKP)

The ‘discourse’ that the UN as a global organization is supported by bringing the UN role along with the context of international actors. The mention of the ‘special representatives of UN Secretary General’ the UN position is seen valorized but at the same time the UN is narrowed down by saying that the UN can’t go beyond the mandate of Nepal and its people. It clearly speaks on the dominated and secondary position of UN in the Nepalese Peace Process and the political parties and Nepal Government holds the primary position. The discourse creates balanced resistance on the basis of promoting and at the same time dominating the UN in relation to the Nepal Government and its political parties.

The Rising Nepal reports on UN statement regarding the Nepalese Peace process and the report reveals the upcoming challenges. It states:

UN News Service reported Tuesday that Mr. Ban in his latest report to the Security Council, said Nepal stands at a cross-roads with the political parties having made significant progress amid persisting and serious difficulties. The Peace Process in Nepal is facing its most difficult challenges to date. [. . .] The parties need to jointly and expeditiously identify the main issues that are of critical importance for the success of the Peace Process. They should engage in a debate on these issues, allowing for adequate public participation, and arrive at a broad road map to carry forward the Peace Process. [. . .] The overall situation has grown more worrying with increasing violence and instability in parts of the country. (25/10/2007, TRN)

The Secretary General of UN tries to impose its position by blaming as if the sole responsibility of the Peace Process is in the hands of Nepalese political parties. The report tries to create UN on the upper hand position with its instruction by Mr. Ban who terms that the Nepalese Peace Process faces most difficult challenge. He does not speak on what is that challenge but the report shows the UN representation wants the stronger and more powerful representation by creating the discourse that the political parties should do what the UN believes to be done for the successful completion of the process. The UN directives, as the report states, the Nepalese political parties should ‘engage’ in creating resolution and at the same time they should let ways for ‘public participation’ by shaping for ‘broad road map’ further intensifies the risk of lingering the peace process. The UN ‘power position’ committed in the name of worrying for ‘violence and instability’ unravels the UN ‘hegemony’ as well as the resistance against the narrower UN role mandated by the government and the political parties.

Prakash A. Raj writes in *The Kathmandu Post* under the title ‘Role of UNMIN in Peace Process’ about the UN mandate along with its role with possible expansion of the earlier tenure of six months. He further says:

United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN) started working in accordance with Security Council Resolution 1740 adopted in January 2007, its primary mandate was to monitor cease fire between Nepal Army and the Maoist’s PLA and to assist in election of Constituent Assembly. [. . .] The agreement on monitoring of the management of arms and armies was signed by the two sides on December 08, 2007 and was witnessed by Ian Martin, Personnel Representative of the Secretary General. The preamble of agreement envisaged peaceful democratic interaction based on Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed between the government and Maoists in November 2006. [. . .] As there is no exit strategy for UNMIN at the present time, it is possible that it may eventually be in Nepal for longer than six months, the date of its proposed extension at the present time. It is quite likely that pressure from India persuaded both the government and the Maoists in opposing increasing role for UNMIN as proposed. (20/11/2007, TKP)

The writing deals with how UNMIN was introduced in Nepal and shows its initial mandate to assist in the election of the Constituent Assembly as per the agreement reached among the then government of Seven Party alliance, Maoists and the UN. This not only attributes the bracketed power of the global organization but also a talk about the role of UN is ‘monitoring the cease fire’. He predicts in his writing that UN can’t go beyond the spirit of Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA) which refers that UN is docile to the Nepalese parties and it can’t demand for the extension of UN role in Nepal. By creating the discourse that Secretary General’s special representatives just witnessed the agreement without involving

himself in forming the conducive atmosphere for UN to work in Nepal. Meanwhile, it also creates the ‘discourse of power’ that UN is that powerful which can’t be withdrawn from Nepal without strategic planning in the country. Therefore, the writing vividly confers the hegemonic situation within the writer himself that he fears either UN will be withdrawn as soon as the job will be done in Nepal.

In the same writing Prakash A Raj further says: “To extend mandate for UNMIN in Nepal a new terms of reference should be negotiated after the agreement by both the government and the Maoists. This is primarily because the deteriorating law and order in parts of Terai was not main problem in the beginning of 2007 when UNMIN started working” (20/11/2007, TKP). The writing further complicates the UN role by shifting the context of agreement for UN invitation and the latter context of more complicated in terms of political instability and chaos creating by some of the regional parties. The intension of the article asking for the renewal of the agreement-may be on the basis of the negotiation- wants UN to be more framed with the wider responsibility but narrower role in relation to the ‘power’.

The Rising Nepal provides space for Madhavji Shrestha for his article entitled ‘Nepal’s Participation in UN: Making It More Meaningful’ valorizes UN with its global context and by attributing it as the organization with lofty principle. He further illustrates:

For the weaker and smaller nations, the United Nations is global organization whose lofty principles and objectives are the main points of attention and attraction. In fact, it is symbol for their hope and trust. Inescapably, Nepal as a weak nation exudes confidence and professes unflinching faith in the ideals and action of the UN. Naturally, the bleak reality facing Nepal now does push further towards the UN for help to resolve its ongoing problems. Nepal’s involvement in UN activities have already crossed five decades-a period long

enough to perform many substantive works as an experienced member for
itself, the UN and its various organs and agencies as well. (16/10/2007, TRN)

The article presumes Nepal as weaker nation and attempts to create the discourse of lower powered country 'represented' by the global organization. The emphasis paid for the term 'lofty principle' refers the high meaning of the UN and since Nepal is a member country serving for this powerful and global organization has smaller power position. At the same time, by taking UN as responsible for the degrading situation of Nepal it further provides credits for the UN in protecting it from crisis. The context of Nepali people working for UN under various organs and agencies shows that the Nepal still realizes the UN hegemony.

The agreement reached between the government and Maoists in presence of UN on the arms and armies states that UNMIN was established in Nepal in the request of Nepal government based on Comprehensive Peace Agreement. It further shades lights as:

In keeping with the letters to United Nations (UN) Secretary-General of 9 August and the Comprehensive Peace Accord of 21 November 2006; guaranteeing the fundamental rights of Nepali people to take part in the Constituent Assembly election in free and fair environment without fear; [. . .] Affirming the will to fully observe the terms of this bilateral agreement witnessed by the United Nations: the parties agree to seek UN assistance in monitoring the management of the both arms and armies of the both sides by the deployment of the qualified civilian personnel to monitor, according to international norms, the confinement of Maoist army combatants and their weapons within designated cantonments areas and monitor the Nepal Army(NA) to ensure that it remains in its barracks and its weapons are not used against any side. (8/12/2006, Agreement on Monitoring of the Management of Arms and Armies, UNMIN)

The United Nations want to construct the 'ideology' that Nepali people will be deprived of free and fair environment for election if the UN will not be present. This has highlighted UN ideology globally that it is very important in preserving people's rights for voting. The civilian representatives that are deployed by the UN can monitor the Maoist armies and Nepal Armies in the barracks locates high power to those civilians creating hegemonic control over the arms and armies of either side. The UN believes that unarmed civilian represent more power than the armed so that armies and Maoist combatants can't use their arms against any of the sides.

The then Home Minister of Nepal Government Krishna Prasad Sitaula assured the UN verified Maoist combatants to be integrated into Nepal Army. *The Himalayan Times* quotes him as saying: "Home Minister Sitaula said today that the integration of UNMIN verified Maoists People's Liberation army fighters in the Nepal Army would be initiated after the verification process ends. He added that it was very likely that 40 percent of the PLA fighters would be declared unfit by UNMIN" (07/12/2007, THT). Mr. Sitaula who was also the coordinator of Maoist-Seven Party alliance talk team viewed the PLA should be integrated when he was in that power holding situation. But as soon as he withdrew from the post of minister, he views the Maoist should not be integrated. He says: "The Maoists who are indoctrinated politically can't maintain the norms and values of Nepal Army. So they should be used for security body in different forms rather than just integrating into the army" (17/3/2009, TKP).

The Kathmandu Post writes quoting the then Nepal Army Chief Rookmangud Katwal that he stood against the agreement reached between the Maoist, the government and the UN in relation to the integration of former Maoist fighters. The post further attributes to him as saying:

Nepali Army is Nepali people's army that is paid for by the people themselves. So the national army should not be kept under any isms, ideology and political motivation. [. . .] It should be competent, professional and disciplined, impartial and obedient to the order of military chain of command. [. . .] Katawal said what the army wants is stability and sustainability in all sectors of the country. 'We believe that stability and sustainability can be gained only through democratic system. And a force is required at the national level to guarantee stability; only such a force can make a democratic system strong and stable and support political forces that hold the people's mandate.'(07/01/2008, TKP)

The Army General shows its greatness not only in terms of arms but also in terms of responsibility for people that each army is paid by its people. At the same time he resists the political decision of integration of armies by saying that non of the isms and political ideology should be reflected in the Nepal Army. The army general talking about the stability and democracy widens the area of Nepal Army rather than to comply with the government decisions. While defining the national forces, general Katawal highlights the upper hand power and creates ideology that only apolitical national force gets the mandate by the Nepali people. Such ideological valorization not only hegemonizes with the army power but also defies the agreement reached among the government, UN and the Maoist for the integration of PLAs into NA.

One important concept of power that we need to contemplate is that people do not have power implicitly. Rather, power is a technique or action that individuals can engage in. Power is not possessed, it is exercised. For instance, the ruling political parties exercise their power to influence the UN role in favor of them because the Maoists attempted to create discourse for bulk PLA integration in NA and Nepali Congress and UML leaders are trying

to misinterpret the understanding as they say PLA should be used in different forms of forces related to security. *The Kathmandu Post* reports the then Prime Minister and the President of Nepali Congress party Girija Prasad Koirala as saying that PLA integration may politicize the security forces. He is reported as saying: “‘integration could lead to the Army’s politicization, which I don’t want.’ Giving the example of India after its freedom struggle, Koirala said, ‘Nehru didn’t integrate the freedom fighters in the national army but adopted alternative measures’” (09/01/2008, TKP). The Koirala’s view on PLA integration to the Nepal Army is changing as his power position shifts from governing power to the governed power. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement signed under his prime ministerial tenure was opposed by himself when he was pulled down from the post. The proclaimed hero of the Nepali Democratic forces changing the influencing opinion really leads the Nepalese Peace Process at the high risk breaching the agreement by constructing such ideologies.

Similarly, the influential leader of the Communist Party of Nepal –United Marxist and Leninist (CPN-UML) in *The Himalayan Times* is reported as: “General Secretary of CPN-UML Madhav Kumar Nepal said today problems will arise if Maoist combatants are kept in cantonments for long. ‘The combatants can be integrated into national security wings. Boarder security force or industrial security force can also be created to absorb them’” (19/05/2007, THT). Here also the highly influential leader of major political party of Nepal changes its opinion as the power and context goes changing. The UML was the leading party while signing the agreement between the Maoists and the government of the Seven Party alliance. This shows not only change made because of the power-position but also the resistance by creating opposing discourses.

The UN special representative in Nepal, second after the former Ian Martin was called back, Karin Landgren is attributed by *The Kathmandu Post* as worrying on the breaching of CPA by recruiting new armies. The post reports Landgren as saying:

I did raise the question about the remarks of the defense minister during the meeting and the prime minister emphasized that the government respects and will stick to the CPA. Our view is that the parties should refrain from making any provocative and aggressive statements. The CPA needs to be implemented and respected by all the parties. [. . .] Landgren said UN Secretary General Ban ki Moon is serious about the many delays in the peace process. She said integration and rehabilitation of Maoist combatants is ‘extremely important and the central part’ of the Peace Process. Expressing satisfaction on the activities of the technical committee to determine the fate of rebel soldiers, she said as the Special Committee is responsible for taking political decisions, it should expedite work. (23/10/ 2009, TKP)

The UN commits its submissive position by saying that it can just worry on deteriorating Nepalese Peace Process rather than active role in driving it in right trial. It has constructed ideology that UN being the umbrella organization for the many countries in the world including—Nepal as UN member—UN worries for the ruining situation of Nepal. At the same time UN appeals the Nepali political parties not to breach the agreement and things should be done according to the CPA. The UN sticks on the spirit of CPA that the ‘fate of rebel soldiers’ should be determined by the authentic body, which is technical team.

Unlike the UN stick to the CPA, the leader of UML and Minister for Defense is quoted by *The Kathmandu Post* that she opines for the amendment in CPA. The post further writes:

The Defense Minister Bidhya Devi Bhandari has defended her statement that the CPA needs a review. ‘The CPA had aimed to resolve the issue of Maoist combatants within six months after formation of new government following the Constituent Assembly election. It was signed under the entirely different

political equation. But the six months has passed and the political equation has changed, so I have floated the idea of revision of CPA'. She said regular recruitment in the national army can't be stopped indefinitely. (23/10/2009, TKP)

The Bhandari's statement when she is in the position of Defense Minister portrays that how the political parties are trying to influence the soul of Comprehensive Peace Accord and want to generate the situation in favor of their interest. Here, minister Bhandari as the opponent of Maoist ignores the agreement involved by her party and tries to construct 'discourse' which leads to her 'resistance' with the support of the 'power' she holds as minister.

Meanwhile, Ram Bahadure Thapa aka Badal as a leading Maoist leader is attributed by *The Kathmandu Post* when he was Minister of Defense that the CPA is equal to both the parties and NA and PLA can't recruit any more. The post further writes him as saying:

'The duty of the army is to obey the government's order. If it defies the order, the defense ministry will be compelled to take a harsh decision. The NA thinks it can full fill its vacant posts because it is National Army while PLA, being a rebel troops can't do so. The PLA thinks that the agreement applies equally to both and it should also be allowed to recruit for its vacant posts.' Thapa said the present controversy can be settled after the UNMIN, political parties, the government and NA establish the same definition about the issue of army recruitment mentioned in the CPA. Criticizing political parties that are urging the army not to stop recruitment, he said army disobedience would mean the military supremacy over civilian government. (28/01/2009, TKP)

The then minister Thapa creates 'resistance' against the Nepal Army's traditional authenticity which creates upper hand space as they are national army and the Maoist fighters as the

rebellion leaders as well as ‘the other’. Such resistance not only creates hierarchy between these two forces but also the minister refers that government is the ultimate authority of the national security force. Therefore, he wants to establish hegemonic feeling to the national security force that the government has right to take any action—‘harsh decision’—when needed. He creates the Ideology that any ‘disobedience’ by the national army as the core part of the government should comply with the norms and values of the government and should not decide on its own. If Nepal Army denies the elected government’s decision then such decision would be against the notion of civil supremacy.

The Kathmandu Post writes in an interview to B. Lynn Pascoe, the then Under-Secretary General for Political Affairs of US that he worries on Nepalese Peace Process. The post writes:

The peace process had its ups and downs and there have been good times. But there is concern on our part that any process like this needs to keep going and keep moving. [. . .] When it looked like things were tough, parties would come together and work out a compromise and move on to the next stage and make it work. There was always self interest; this was politics after all and we understand this. [. . .] Across the board where we do such work, be it Nepal or any where else the UN job is to support the progress, at times have some ideas or provide some mechanisms that help resolve disagreements that parties to conflict may be having. (13/10/2009, TKP)

The Pascoe, through constructing the ideology, urges the Nepalese political parties to ‘come together and work out a compromise’. This refers that he has been trying his exercise over power taking Nepali parties should do what he believes. After showing such hegemony, Pascoe moves ahead with the ‘discourse’ that the Nepalese Peace Process is at stuck because of the ‘self interest’ guided by political parties. He further shades lights on the UN role in

global scenario. Here, he traces UN as a supporting mission that helps ‘resolve disagreements’ among the political parties. Thus, Pascoe as an representative of US which hold dominant power over the UN commits its power position.

Indra Karki in *The Rising Nepal* writes under the title ‘UN Mission In Nepal Role In Management of Combatants’ praises UNMIN for its achievements with the given mandates. He further adds:

It is worth nothing that UNMIN has already had remarkable achievements in performing its assigned mandates. Those achievements include facilitations in clinching a Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Nepalese government and the then rebel power UCPN-M; assistance in the finalizing of the Agreement on Monitoring of the Management of Arms and Armies (AMAA), registration and verification of Maoist combatants and storage of their weapons; and the registration and storage of the Nepal Army’s weapons equal to the number of Maoist combatants’ weapons. [. . .] Nepalese people want UNMIN to play a more proactive, positive and functional role in terms of expediting the process of integration and rehabilitation of the Maoist combatants. Since on a number of occasions, UNMIN has not been perceived to have performed its role well in finding a resolution to the management of the Maoist combatants’ the UN body needs to concentrate its effort on mustering consensus among the political parties. (20/08/2009, TRN)

This extract attributes stronger representation of Nepali people through the ‘ideology’ that UN is that organization from which people expect much and want ‘positive, proactive and functional’ role. Mr. Karki praises UN for certain achievements which he believes that UN is doing as per its mandate. The encouragement of UN body in Nepal for its active role in nurturing the ‘consensus among the political parties’ shows the global strength and

hegemonic influence of UN because the UN was invited by the government formed out of these political parties and the UN guiding them for consensus tries to establish UN with higher power position.

The Himalayan Times reports UN activities in Nepal are neutral and more roles can be played when the concerned government want it. The news paper attributes UNMIN chief as saying:

‘The UNMIN has never been asked to monitor or assist all aspects of the Peace Process. But the UN as a whole remains ready to assist when it is requested to do so, while respecting the fact that this has always been and remains a Nepali owned process.’ [. . .] ‘Nepal can’t follow just one example when it comes to army integration. If I speak of one example, then it will seem that I am advocating a particular model,’ he said, adding that his organization would play a neutral role while assisting Nepal’s Peace Process. (17/10/2008, THT)

The chief of UN mission in Nepal agrees that UN is a powerful global organization but it has no mandate to work anything without the Nepal Government’s request. Therefore, UN can work only under its mandate. UNMIN has only mandate for assisting in the Nepalese Peace Process which refers to its dominated representation. But at the same time UN want to conceal its dominated position by creating the ‘ideology’ that UN, which works globally, has neutral role.

The UN Charter writes on UN role should be global and for the welfare of its member nations. The UN, as per its charter, plays non-interventive as well as due respect to the norms and mandate of its member states. The charter further mentions:

WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our life time has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental

human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.(Preamble, UN Charter)

The UN is very clear from its charter that it is more representative as seen through linguistic structure it uses. The very word “WE” refers its wider and global representation in establishing peace and works for its member as if it works for itself. Moreover, it ensures for the equal status among all the nations whatever they are small or larger. This refers to a neutral role of UN in anyone of its member states including Nepal.

The Charter further attributes UN role in different countries for mentioning the peace and keep intact with treaties and different agreements. The Charter reads as:

The Purposes of the United Nations are: To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of peace; To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determinations of peoples, and to other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace. (Chapter-1, Purposes and Principles, UN Charter)

The UN functions globally in establishing peace and security as per the mandate of the people of the country. The Charter speaks that it works by incorporating its norms and values of its member state ensuring its ‘self-determinations of peoples’. Nepal as a signatory of The

UN Charter it is bound with the agreements where UN involves. The global presence of the UN, through its different bodies—such as UNMIN in Nepal—tries to prevent peace from different threats to it. The UN works with the notion to maintain friendly relations and monitors the different situations by urging its partners to comply with all agreements and norms that are once reached to some negotiation. Hence, UN has role in establishing peace not by imposing its notions rather as per the wish and provisions mandated by its people.

Thus, the materials accessed for the analysis hold ample evidences that UN functions are as per the mandate given to it by the people of Nepal through its government and their political representatives. The UN stance is very clear that it has stuck to the UN Charter which reveals UN global power including the Veto power countries and yet Nepal, a vulnerable country counters with equal status to these veto-power states. The largest and all trusting global body confers hegemonic understanding but in Nepal it works as Nepali people want. The lingering and disturbances seen time and again on the Peace Process has Nepali upper-hand.

IV. Conclusion

The involvement of United Nations, during the crucial phase of violence and threat to peaceful Nepal was proved to be milestone in paving way to progress for peace. The desire of Nepalese people to live in the peaceful environment was supported by the UN when it welcomed the invitation to assist in shifting Nepal from more than a decade long violence to the respect of peace through dialogue and understandings. If UN had not been the largest universal organization and credible to its entire member states neither the Maoist rebellions of Nepal nor the government of Nepal would have accepted for its involvement. Thereby, Nepal would not have turned to peace process when the concerned parties were not convinced with the UN that UN can really help in prevailing peace in the country. But the UN, whatever recognition and credits it earns, is framed from the very welcome to it—the mandate for UN role is bracketed—as UN should remain quiet in all aspects except reporting the peace process.

Initially, UN was mandated for the assistance in Constituent Assembly election, verification and registration of the Maoist combatants along with their arms. The very types of verified arms of Nepal Army were stored in equal number and types of Maoist arms in their respective chambers. Thus stored arms were locked and the agreement on not using them was enhanced by UN. The UN after storing arms and fixing UN monitored 21 satellites cantonments including 7 main cantonments in different parts of the country shifted its role in just monitoring without agency and reporting to the concerned parties.

The UN involvement has caused the psychological and conceptual forms of understandings to both the fighting parties. The fighting parties—Nepal Army and Peoples Liberation Army tagged each other as inhuman guided by animal instincts—as rapists as well as terrorists. Such lens to look at each other as animal is shifted to the co-workers in human grounds. The UN enhanced the understanding to each other as partners and representatives of

the same state body by integration of Nepal Army and Peoples Liberation Army. The process which is in progress is made possible because of the UN presence. Thus, the UN urging to comply with the spirit of the agreements where UN involves, shows its neutral role that it is not influenced by the either side rather stuck to the agreements reached among parties.

To wrap up, UN maintains its neutral position as mandated by the government of Nepal and the United Communist Party of Nepal including other concerned parties. The UN strength through 'hegemony' and different 'discourses' don't go beyond the agreements reached among Nepali people. The lingering in the Nepalese Peace Process is not because of the problems with UN but because the parties to whom UN depends upon are trying to exercise their 'power' as their power-position defers. The different versions and criticisms on the agreements that are to be kept intact, complicates the process. The different influencing leaders of the political parties try to breach the agreements where UN has no agency to stop such thing and can only report to the concerned authorities. Hence, the UN is not responsible for any interruptions in the progress of Peace Process with its docile role and Nepali people and their representatives are more responsible with active roles.

Working Bibliography

- Abhrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. Bangalore: Prism Book, 1993.
- Adms, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Crehan, Kate. *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*. London: Pluto Press, 2002.
- Ferretter, Luke. *Louis Althusser*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Forester, J. *Planning in the Face of Power*. California: University of California Press, 1989.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977.
- - -. *Power Vol.III*. Ed. James D. Faubion. New York: The New Press, 2000.
- - -. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Penguin Books, 1972
- - -. *The History of Sexuality* (vol-1). Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.
- - -. "Truth and Power." Ed. Hazard Adams. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1992: 1134-45.
- Goggans. Thomas H. "Laying blame: Gender and subtext in David Mamet's *Oleanna*." *Modern Drama* 40.4 (Winter 1997): 433.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *The Prison Notebooks: Selections*. Trans ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishant, 1973
- IFA, NCWA and UNAN. *Nepal and the United Nations*. Ed. Nischal N. Pandey, Keshav Raj Jha, Prof. Dr. Bishwa Keshar Maskay. Kathmandu: NPTC Limited, 2005.
- Martin, Ian. "I Regret that the Offer for UN Assistance Wasn't Taken up." *The Kathmandu Post*, 2 February 2009, natl. ed.:5
- Polkinghorn, Brian. "Peace Process of Nepal." *Asia Report N°163*. 19 February 2009
<<http://www.google.com/un-peace process of Nepal/html>>.

Powell, Nancy J. “Nepalese Need to Be Demanding of Their Leaders.” *The Kathmandu Post*,
20 July 2009, natl. ed.:7.

Pradhan, Suman. “UN-Peace Process of Nepal.” *Peace Studies Centre*. Delhi. 11 July 2009
<[http://www.google.com/un-peace process of Nepal/peace research/article/html](http://www.google.com/un-peace%20process%20of%20Nepal/peace%20research/article/html)>.

Sharma, Dr. Gopal. *Law Manual*. Kathmandu: Pairabi Parkashan, 2001.

United Nations. *Basic Facts of United Nations*. New York: UN Press, 2005.

UNMIN, *Agreement on Monitoring of the Management of Arms and Armies*. UNMIN Head
Office, Kathmandu: 8th December 2006.

< <http://www.un.org/np/secretary-general/html> >.

<[http:// www.un.org/np/publications/html](http://www.un.org/np/publications/html) >.

<[http:// www.un.org/np/security-council/html](http://www.un.org/np/security-council/html) >.