

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Representation of Indian Diplomats Concerning Peace Process in Nepal :

A Study of Nepali Print Media

A Thesis Submitted to

Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in English

by

Prem Raj Khanal

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

January, 2009

**Tribhuvan University**

**Faculty of Humanities and Social Science**

This thesis entitled **Representation of Indian Diplomats Concerning Peace Process in Nepal : A Study of Nepali Print Media** Submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Prem Raj Khanal, has been approved by the undersigned member of the research committee.

Members of the Research committee

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Head

Central Department of English

Date:.....

## Acknowledgements

The present study would not have come to this form without kind support and encouragement of honorable teachers, seniors and friends. I would first of all express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor Mr. Maheshwor Poudel for his invaluable guidance and correcting my mistakes, without whose assistance this thesis would never have been completed.

Likewise, I would like to extend my profound gratitude to my respected teacher, Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the Head of the Central Department of English, T.U. for granting me an opportunity to carry out this research on the subject of my interest. I am equally thankful to my respected teachers Dr. Sanjeev Upreti and Mr. Badri Prasad Acharya for providing me invaluable suggestions with necessary materials. Similarly, I am also thankful to my respected teachers Dr. Arun Kumar Gupto, Dr. Shiva Rijal, Mr. Sadan Raj Adhikari, Mr. Ghanshyam Bhandari, and Mr. Pom Bahadur Gurung for their assistance.

At last, I am deeply obliged to my parents Baman and Radha Khanal and my sister-in-law Aarati for their inspiration and support. Similarly, my brothers Nawa Raj Khanal and Ghanshyam Bhattarai's help is precious and unforgettable. I would also like to thank my Anu didi and other colleagues for their cooperation.

January, 2009

Prem Raj Khanal  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

## **Abstract**

India has shown a lot of concerns towards the peace process in Nepal. Its concern is natural as India has been close to Nepal not only geographically but also economically and politically for a long time. Indian diplomats and leaders often visited Nepal and expressed their opinions. Nepalese media, on their part, represented their expressions often positively without being necessarily critical and analyzing their underlying motives and interests. Their views expressed occasionally in public can be taken as an interference into the independence, sovereignty and integrity of Nepal, but, Nepali media could not figure out this reality. Although Nepali media, being aware of their intervention, tried to resist their high-handedness on some occasions, it is to be noted that the resistance was neither strong nor adequate. Their interference could not be amply challenged by the media as the media was victimized by the power structure and hegemony of Indian leaders, diplomats as well as Indian media.

## Contents

Approval Letter	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
I. Introduction	1-8
Internal Conflict : A Threat to Peace	1
End of the Conflict : Beginning of Peace Process	4
Peace Process at Transitional Phase	5
II. Discourse, Representation, Hegemony and Media Studies	9-24
Discourse	9
Foucauldian Perspective on Power and Discourse	12
Representation	15
Hegemony	17
Media Studies	19
Relevance of Tools to the Research	21
III. Representation of Indian Diplomats Concerning Peace Process in Nepal	25-42
IV. Conclusion	43-45
Works Cited	46- 47

## **I. Introduction**

### **Internal Conflict : A Threat to Peace**

The Maoist insurgency started from 2052 after the submission of 40 point demands by United People's Front to the then existing coalition government. Even after six years since the restoration of democracy, there were no significant changes in the nation. There was no real political change. People from all walks of life were dissatisfied with the mainstream political leaders for their failure to lead the country as expected. The presence of the government could not be felt. The system was democratic but the leaders of the system who were leading the country could not be democratic. The nation was reeling under the acute problem of poverty, unemployment and disparities without any tangible efforts of the government. This conditions ultimately resulted in the emergence of the Maoists.

Moreover, the foreign interference increased tremendously. The neighboring country, India took a lot of advantages in trade, water resource, territorial issue and so on from the immature and inexperienced political leaders who were in power. Despite the assurance of the democratic government to establish good governance and improve the socio-economic condition of the country, no tangible results could be seen and felt in practice. There were also other causes of the conflict. Different political parties, politicians and analysts had different opinions regarding the emergence of the Maoist problem. Regarding the rise of the Maoists, the Communist Party of Nepal (UML) presents its views as :

The Maoist problem started when the governments formed after the revolution of 2046 could not initiate sufficient development programmes as aspired by the people. Rather, unemployment, poverty,

backwardness, administrative exploitation and regional imbalance increased tremendously. ( Maobadi Bidhroh, 42)

This was the view of the party. It regarded social injustice as the fundamental cause of the problem.

Similarly, a politician of Nepali Congress, Pradip Giri, argues as:

I consider the Maoist problem as a result of poverty, unemployment and corruption rampant in the society. Till the prevalence of such problems, the Maoist problem cannot be treated alone—Maoist problem is not the cause of the country's problem but it is the outcome of the armed and violent revolution. ( Maobadi Bidhroh, 69)

As expressed above, many political analysts agreed that poverty, unemployment and economic inequality are the causes of the armed struggle but some other analysts like Chaitanya Mishra, considered strong ideological belief of the Maoist to succeed the revolution through the armed struggle as the main cause of the Maoist struggle.

Anyway the immediate cause of the struggle was the rejection or the light response to the 40 point demands by the government.

Similarly, regarding the rise of the party, Li Onesto remarks in *Reports from the People's War in Nepal* as:

The youths were looking for a revolutionary party—looking to see which one will lead the way to solve the people's problems. And the party analyzed this situation and gave a revolutionary programme to the young generation. The common interests were jointed between the party and the rebellious generation. This was the case especially in Rukum, Rolpa and Jajarkot. With the change in the government to a

multiparty system, the party was able to stay on the revolutionary path—and didn't divert to revisionism or reactionary thinking. (153)

Thus, the party got the support of the young generations to speed up the revolution.

The conflict got intensified with time. The Maoist insurgency became a huge challenge to the government. As it was the armed struggle, it was very dangerous and a big threat to peace. The condition of peace got worse and worse day by day. Despite the attempt of the government to suppress the revolution, the revolution got stronger and the conflict seemed very indomitable. There was a lot of destruction of human lives, property and physical infrastructures. According to the record of Informal Sector Service Centre (INSEC), the number of people killed during the insurgency till the end of Asar 2064 was 13, 393. Out of them, 4990 persons were killed by Maoists and 8403 were killed by the state. Similarly, thousands of people were the abducted, disappeared, tortured and became physically and mentally disabled.

Thus, the condition of human rights was very miserable. The country where the apostle of peace was born drowned in the stream of blood. Even the assistance of India to the Nepalese government to crush the Maoist revolution became fruitless. India was very aware of the Maoists' demands and the causes of the revolution. India was charged as expansionist by Maoists. So, the Indian diplomats often visited Nepal and showed their anxious curiosity to the problem confronting Nepal and its peace process. Although the assistance of India was important for the government of Nepal to solve the problem, India was interfering with the political independence of Nepal. The Maoists were very much aware of the high handedness of India over the internal affairs of Nepal since the restoration of democracy in 2046 B.S. Therefore, India was also careful not to let the Maoist struggle be successful in Nepal.



### **End of the Conflict : Beginning of Peace Process**

There was table-talk between the government and the Maoists for three times but the talks could not be fruitful. The existing democratic governments could not function smoothly due to this complicated problem. A lot of time and budget of the government was spent to solve the Maoist problem. The socio economic condition became very critical in the absence of peace and security in the country. There was no environment to pay attention for the development and prosperity of the country. Due to the failure of the democratic government, the King Gyanendra took the power in his hand by misinterpreting the article 127 of the constitution 2047. He started ruling the country very autocratically. It angered the political leaders and they carried out the revolution against the direct rule of the king in the street. During the time, the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) also came in association with the Maoist party. As a result, there was 12 point understanding in Delhi. The understanding reached to establish full democracy by ending up autocratic kingship and removing all types of disparities prevalent in the country. According to the point 1, they acknowledged that there is no possibility of peace, progress and prosperity in the country as long as the kingship remains in power.

After the understanding, the SPA and the Maoist party staged joint movement against the kingship. Because of the involvement of the Maoists, the revolution was very strong. It lasted for 19 days costing the life of 25 persons. The effort of the government to dismiss the revolution became a complete failure and the revolution became successful on 11<sup>th</sup> Baisakh 2063 after the announcement by the King to restore the dissolved House of Representatives. There was also the announcement on 8<sup>th</sup> Baisakh but it was rejected by the agitating political parties. During that time, India had suggested the leaders to agree with the announcement which it should not have

done as it was the matter of Nepali citizens to make the decision. Therefore, we can take Indian diplomats' role as an issue of interference.

Then Girija Prasad Koirala became the Prime minister of Nepal. There were talks with the Maoists. The Maoists were also agreed to come to the mainstream of peaceful politics. Then there was comprehensive peace agreement between the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) and Maoist on Mangsir 5, 2063 and the ten year long insurgency came to a formal end. After the agreement, the peace process started and the commitment was shown to end the peace process to a logical end.

Peace is built after the cessation of all forms of violent conflict. It takes a lot of time to maintain perfect peace. It is obtained through the conscious effort and the strong political will. Thus, peace is a long process. Regarding the process, the conflict analyst, Dr. Bishnu Uprety states as:

The process of peace generally undergoes the steps: ceasefire, peace agreement, transitional security, transitional justice, transitional infrastructures, new laws, DDR (de-integration, demobilization, reintegration) security sector reform and economic stability. (Dwanda ko Anta, 4)

Other analysts may differ from this opinion. But no analyst can disagree that peace is a process.

### **Peace Process at Transitional Phase**

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement was made but a lot of misunderstandings appeared in its implementation. Whatever agreements were made, they were not followed by the concerned party. The Maoists are still said to have violated many terms of the agreement. Many times the Maoist combatants have come out of the barracks. Even the UNMIN ( United Nation Mission in Nepal ) became a

mute spectator to it. Many people are still missing. Their whereabouts is not made public yet. The property seized by the Maoists is still not returned. There is also no environment for the displaced of the insurgency time to return to their village. There has not been the provision of transitional justice. The victims of the conflict has not been set up. Peace and Reconciliation Commission has also not been formed to the rehabilitation of the victims of the conflict. It has been a major bone of contention, especially between Nepali Congress and the Maoist party. It has also terribly delayed the constitution making process. The Prime-minister must fulfill his commitments on time to end this conflict.

There are many armed groups in the terai. They have been a big challenge to take the peace process to the logical end. There is the urgent need to bring them to the table of negotiation as soon as possible. If not it will be a grave threat to the peace process. All the groups are not with political agenda. Some groups are criminal minded and they tend to disintegrate the country. Regarding it, the government must initiate immediate steps to curb them on time.

Seven party were moving hand in hand from the 12 point agreement till the announcement of the Republic. Their unity accomplished such a remarkable success. But the politics of consensus suddenly got broken after the result of the constitution assembly election. Then there could not be the formation of the consensus government as per their earlier commitment. The second biggest party, Nepali Congress is in the opposition, which is not a good symptom on the way of peace process. Certainly there is the need of the support of Nepali Congress to end the peace process logically. There must be good understanding among all the parties and they must be fully committed to main peace. Only then the future of republican Nepal will be bright and the existing social, economic, regional and many other differences and

contradiction could vanish through the formation of the *Loktantrik* (democratic) constitution and the logical conclusion of the peace process. The Maoist government formed after the election of constituent assembly has not been serious to such problems.

The issue of the reintegration of the Maoist militants and their weapons is also a major aspect of the transitional peace process. The peace process can not be driven to its logical end without their reintegration. According to the Interim Constitution, there is an agreement about their readjustment. But there has arisen a conflict among parties how to readjust them. Even the reintegration committee could not be formed with consensus as the Agreement. It has created a big obstacle on the way of peace process. It has also delayed the major task of constitution formation. So, there is an urgent need to forget an agreement how to resolved this problem to the logical conclusion of the transitional peace process.

This thesis is very contextual in Nepal at present . Nepal, in the history, has faced a long decade violent conflict. There are different issues to study in this violent conflict. This research aims at studying the role of foreigners especially Indian diplomats concerning peace process. India always seeks good opportunities for her advantages. When Nepal faces different problems, India wants to fulfill her internal desires. India is not only a help for Nepal's problems. She is also a problem for Nepal's internal independence.

Nepal is an independent country. But in every important decision, India wants to be influential. In peace process, India seems to be a helping neighbour but at deeper level, India is interested to consolidate its undue influence. Thus, the scope of this thesis is to see critically the role of Indian diplomats in peace process. Did they follow the diplomatic ethnics ? and did our media resist their high handedness sufficiently ?

These issues will be dealt with in this small research. Regarding limitation of this thesis I cannot study about the role of other country's ambassador and the role of European Union in peace process. Limitation of time and resources could not help me to study them. Another limitation is that I cannot study the audio video media. And also I cannot study other newspapers. I chose *The Rising Nepal* and *The Kathmandu Post* including other related papers because *The Rising Nepal* is the government owned media and *The Kathmandu Post* is the largest selling English daily run by private sector. I chose the papers published between "Comprehensive Peace Accord" dated 2063/08/05 and the declaration of Nepal as a Federal Republic Country in 2065/02/15.

## II. Discourse, Representation, Hegemony and Media Studies

### Discourse

More generally, discourse refers to the language in which a subject or area of knowledge is discussed. Human knowledge is collected and structured in discourse. It can also be categorized as direct or indirect. According to contemporary literary critics, a number of different discourses constitute society. Each discourse has its own vocabulary, concept, and rules. Some poststructuralists have used discourse relating to any verbal structure, whether literary or not. They also argue that discourse is influenced by historical circumstances, including social and cultural factors. The term 'discourse' has become common in a variety of disciplines: critical theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology and many other fields.

According to Longman Dictionary of the English Language, discourse is a conversation especially of a formal nature, formal and orderly expression of ideas in speech or writing, also such expression in the form of sermon, treatise, etc. a place or unit of connected speech or writing. However, discourse can not be pinned down to one meaning, since it has had a complex history and it is used in range of different ways by different theorist, and sometimes even by the same theorist. Similarly, Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines discourse as "a long and serious treatment of a subject in speech or writing" (357). According to Foucault, the widest definition of discourse is: "The general domain of all statements; that is, all utterances or texts which have meaning and which have some effects in the real world ( *Discourse 6* )." It is also a concern with the structures and rules of discourse. Within structuralism and poststructuralist theory, the use of the term discourse signaled a major break with previous views of language and representation. In order to

understand about discourse, it is necessary to be able to decide in which context the term is being used.

For many theorists within mainstream linguistics, the term discourse signifies a turning away from sentences as exemplars of analysis of the text above the level of the utterance or sentence, thus, discourse is an extended piece of text, which has some form of internal organization, coherence or cohesion. Related to it, Trevor Purvis and Alan Hunt writes:

Discourse focuses attention on the terms of engagement within social relations by insisting that all social relations are lived and comprehended by their participants in terms of specific linguistic or semiotic vehicles that organize their thinking, understanding and experiencing. The concept of 'discourse' remains self-consciously neutral or skeptical about whether discourse as a form of existence is connected with elements, such as are invoked by notion of interest, that are external to the discursive content of lived experience. ( 476)

Here, he analyzes discourse as a linguistic vehicle.

Similarly, Fairclough argues, "The second dimension for conceiving of and analyzing discourse-as- discursive practice, that is discourse as something that is produced, circulated, consumed in society". Fairclough sees the dimension in terms of circulation of concrete linguistic objects.

Similarly, for social psychologists and critical discourse analysts, discourse is used in a variety of ways, but all of them fuse meanings derived from linguistics and cultural theory. Moreover, for cultural theorists, a discourse is not a disembodied collection of statements, but groupings of utterances or sentences, statements which are enacted within a social context and which contribute to the way that social context

continues its existence. Institutions and social context therefore play an important determining role in the development, maintenance and circulation of discourses. Thus, discourses do not occur in isolation but in dialogue, in relation to or, more often, in contrast and opposition to other groups of utterances. They are not simple grouping of utterances or statements, but consist of utterances, which have meaning, force and effect within a social context. Discourses structure both our sense of reality and our notion of our own identity. Thus, discourses do not exist in isolation, but are the object and site of struggle. They are not fixed but are the site of constant contestation of meaning.

Discourse can also be understood by comparing it with text and ideology.

David Crystal contrasts discourse with text as:

Discourse analysis Focuses on the structure of naturally occurring spoken language, as found in such 'discourses' as conversations, interviews, commentaries and speeches. Text analysis Focuses on the structure of written language, as found in such 'texts' as essays, notices, road signs and chapters. But this distinction is not clear-cut, and there have been many other uses of these labels. In particular, 'discourse' and 'text' can be used in a much broader sense to include all language units with a definable communicative function, whether spoken or written.

Some scholars talk about 'spoken or written text'. (Crystal, 116)

Thus, he argues that discourse analysis focuses on spoken language but text analysis focuses on the structure of written language. However, he accepts that his distinction is not clear-cut.

Similarly, Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short argue that discourse is linguistic communication seen as an interpersonal activity but text is seen as a message coded in



its auditory. Moreover, Michael Stubbs treats text and discourse as more or less synonymous. But he agrees that in many cases, a text may be written, while a discourse is spoken, a text may be non-interactive whereas a discourse is interactive and a text may be short or long whereas a discourse implies a certain length.

Some theorists also contrast discourse with ideology. Roger Flower states:

'Discourse' is speech or writing seen from the point of view of the beliefs, values and categories which it embodies; these beliefs etc. constitute a way of looking at the world, an organization or representation of experience-'ideology' in the neutral non-pejorative sense. Different models of discourse encode different representations of experience; and the source of these representations is the communicative context within which the discourse is embedded.

(Flower qtd. in Hawthorn, 1992:48)

Thus, he argues that discourse is seen from the view of beliefs but ideology is a way of looking at the world.

### **Foucauldian Perspective on Power and Discourse**

Foucault's theory of power and discourse owes to the theory of German Philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche argues that all knowledge is an expression of the "Will to power" (qtd. in *Critical Theories* 634 ). He believes that all linguistic activities are related to the power structures operating in the society. His main concern is that discourse is involved in power: "It is in discourse that Power and Knowledge are joined together" (*Sexuality* 10). 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 others. Those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude others who are not in power. M.H. Abrams in *Glossary of Literary Terms* writes:

Discourse has become the focal term among critics who oppose the deconstructive concept of a "general text: that function independently of particular historical condition. Instead they conceive of discourse as social parlance, or language-in-uses and consider it to be both the product and the manifestation not of a timeless linguistic system, but of particular social condition, class structures, and power relationships that alter in the course of history. (241)

Discourses are produced within a real world of power struggle. Discourse is used as a means to gain or, sometimes even to subvert power. For Foucault, discourse is a central human activity. He is interested in the process how discursive practices change over time.

Discourse, according to Foucault, is produced in which concepts of madness, criminality, and sexual abnormality and so on are defined in relation to sanity, justice and sexual normality. Such discursive formalities massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, which prevail in a particular period. Foucault argues in his essay "Truth and Power" that, "The rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal or ration, have the power to silence what they exclude" (qtd. in *Critical Theories* 1142). His main point, here, is that meaning of any discourse depends on who controls it. For example, the scientist who first claimed "The earth revolves around the sun" was punished and his truth was ignored because for the people who were in power had another version of truth: "The sun revolves around the earth". So truth can be proved wrong by power.

The term discourse is widely used in analyzing literary and non-literary text. Foucault has used the term 'discourse' in his discussions of power, knowledge and truth. The term discourse is not rooted within a larger system of fully worked out theoretical ideas, but is one element for theorists and may be one of the reasons that there are so many different definitions of the term discourse, and so many modifications of the meaning of the term. According to him, a discourse is something which produces something else, rather than something which exists in and of itself and which can be analyzed in isolation. a discursive structure can be detected because of the systematicity of the ideas, opinions, concepts, ways of thinking and behaving. Thus, there is a set of discourses of femininity and masculinity because women and men behave within a certain range of parameters when defining themselves as gendered subjects.

For Foucault discourse has effects because of the factors of truth, power and knowledge. Truth is something which societies have to work to produce, rather than something which appears in a transcendental way. Discourses do not exist in a vacuum but are in constant conflict with other discourses and other social practices which inform them over questions of truth and authority. Power is a key element in discussions of discourse. He has been instrumental in the rethinking of models of power. Unlike liberal humanist and Marxist theorist, Foucault has attempted to come to terms with the complexity of the range of practices which can be summed up under the term power. He is very critical of the view that power is simply about preventing someone from carrying out their wishes and limiting people's freedom. So, for Foucault power is spread through out social relations, that it produces possible forms of behaviour as well as restricting behaviour.

For Foucault, a discourse is not a set of utterances which is stable over time, he tries to work against the notions of progress and development which dominate many liberal ways of thinking. Instead of viewing history, for example, as a simple progression towards greater civilization or, as Marxists have done, as a series of class conflicts which lead to greater equality. Foucault has argued that history is discontinuous there is not a seamless narrative which we can decipher underlying history, nor is there any continuity at all. He argues for seeing history as shifting and lurching in ways which are not entirely graspable by humans, and which are not entirely within our control. He said in an interviews:

My problem has not at all been to say: there it is, long live discontinuity. . . but to pose the question: how can it be that there are at certain moments and in certain orders of knowledge these sudden take offs, these hastenings of evolution, these transformations which do not correspond to the calm and continuist image that is ordinarily accepted.(Foucault, 1979: 31)

Foucault is therefore concerned with charting these moments of discontinuity when discursive structures undergo radical change.

### **Representation**

Representation simply refers to as using one thing in the place of the other. The Oxford English Dictionary defines representation as "presence" or "appearance". So representation means the act of representing somebody or something in a particular way: something that shows or describes something. Representation can also be define as the act of placing or stating facts in order to influence or affects the action others. To represent something is to present the thing in a new way with a different view point. When something is presented again, it may not be exactly like the original one.

Similarly, representation is always of something or someone, by something or someone, to someone. It never takes place in isolation, rather it is done in a large social context so that what is represented will be assimilated. Representations are influenced by culture and have the capacity to shape culture and mould society's attitudes, values, perceptions and behaviour. Representation in any social situation plays double role as a means of communication which is also a potential obstacle to it. Representation therefore has power to distort the reality and present it in a new way.

Culture and cultural identities play a very important role in representation. For cultural critics like Chris Barker, representation plays a key role in the formation of cultural identities. For him representation is "bound up with the object of study (texts, events, social process), the preferred conceptual armature ( discourse, ideology, institution, economy ) and the methods of investigation which map out those changing fields" (192). Representations are therefore verbal formations which are the 'ideological product' or 'cultural construct'. So, they are produced, enacted and understood in special social context. Representation is closely bound up with language and culture. In cultural studies every institution and practice are viewed as a cultural construct. It focuses on how the world is culturally constructed and represented to and by us. Cultural representations and meanings have certain materiality; they are embedded in sounds, inspirations, objects, images, books, magazines and television programmes. In text, cultural and ideological representations in text serve mainly to reproduce, confirm and propagate the power structures of domination and subordination which characterize a given society. The representation of the non-west by the westerners is also motivated by the quest for domination.

Using Foucauldian term, Said defines Orientalism as a discourse which was produced by the west about the non-west. It is a system of statements produced by the West about the non-western people and the land. The writers portrayed the orient as mysterious, uncivilized, barbaric and so on whereas the westerners were portrayed as civilized, superior and active. The orientalist, the writers about the East, created certain stereotypical images of the orient which was aimed at ruling and dominating the orient. It always created the hierarchy of superior and inferior, or the creator and the created. Said's main argument in Orientalism is that orientalism helped to further the western colonial domination over the east. The westerners were articulate, powerful and superior where as Easterners were weak, inferior and feminine. Such basic distinction facilitated the powerful west to govern the non-west. He argues:

Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the orient-dealing with it by making statement about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, setting it, ruling over it. Orientalism as a western style for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the orient. (3)

For Said, describing the orient, writing about it, representing it in texts the west was able to manage its domination over the orient. Because of their relatively superior position of power, the westerners were able to dominate the non-west.

### **Hegemony**

Hegemony refers to the dominance of one state within a confederation. It is means of domination by consent. It means the dominance of one state or ruler over another. The term was coined and popularized in the 1930s by Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci. For Gramsci, hegemony refers to the ideological rule of one social class over another. In another sense, hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince

other classes that their interests are their interests of all. Domination is thus exerted not by force, nor even necessarily by active persuasion, but by a more subtle and inclusive power over the economy, and over state apparatuses such as education and media, by which the ruling class's interest is presented as the common interest and thus comes to be taken for granted.

Gramsci defined hegemony as ideological rule as well as military rule, as the control of dominant ideas as well as control of the means of production. From his point of view the power of capitalism in the twentieth century is not only its power as the dominant economic system in the western world, but its control over people's way of thinking and behaving as workers, consumers and as citizens. Ideological control, argued Gramsci, not military might nor economic dominance, is the highest form of hegemony, a form of consent rather than coercion- and western societies today have taken capitalism to their hearts as well as their heads. Gramsci argues:

No ruling class could be dominated by economic control, or even by political force alone. What is also needed is ideological control, the consent of the governed, and this is achieved through such important socializing agencies as the family, church, law, media, school, and even trade union. (122)

They all promote and legitimize the ideas of the ruling class to point where such values are accepted uncritically and unconsciously as normal. They form the basis of everyday life, its core values and norms, and even underline our notions of 'common sense'. Thus, while the ruling class can ultimately enforce its rule through state (the law, police, army etc.), its real control lies through its intellectual dominance over civil society.

Similarly Brennon Wood writes:

Stuart Hall interprets hegemony as a complex discursive field that takes shape across various social locations. However, he also appeals to some notion of the state, a notion that devalues cultural mobilization by stressing a much narrower site of power. Hegemony pulls discourses together and it is the contradictory unity so constructed and held that rules. ( 404)

For Hall, at some point plurality must be restricted and solidarity retrieved from difference. This insight draws Hall towards an alternative understanding of social life. Hall argues that social life includes organizational features that cannot be reduced to discourse. Hall criticizes Foucault for sidestepping the deep and different problem of the relation between the lateral powers in the sites of civil society and social relations and the vertical powers of the state and political relationship.

### **Media Studies**

Mass communication is communication from one person or group of persons through a transmitting device (a medium) to large audiences or markets. Generally speaking, mass media are the tools of mass communication. Mass media include newspapers, magazines, journals, books and other forms of publication (print media), radio, television (broadcast media), films/cinema, internet (electronic media). Mass is the large number of people and media is any physical object used to communication. We can say that the media are businesses. But the media are more than business: they are key institutions in our society. They affect our culture, our buying habits, and our politics, and they are in turn affected by changes in our beliefs, tastes, interests, and behavior. Raymond Williams opines: " Society is a form of communication through which experience is described, shared, modified and preserved." (4 ) The media reflect and affect the political, social, and cultural institutions in which they operate.



But they should represent independently with a sense of responsibility towards the citizens.

The products of media are the information and entertainment. Other motives shape the media in Nepal, of course; the desire to fulfill the public's need for information, to influence the country's governance, to disseminate the country's cultures, to offer entertainment, and to provide an outlet for artistic expression. But Nepali media are, above all, profit-centered. However impartial and people oriented mass media is important because of the significant role they play in our society. The media influence our beliefs, tastes and behavior, and they help set the agenda for political, social and cultural debate. They serve as a bridge between the government and the citizens. The programs of governments are informed to the citizens and the wishes of the citizens are conveyed to the government. Shirley Biagi, a professor in the Communication Studies Department at California State University, argues : " The print media identifies national agendas and inform the government to ponder over such agendas ". ( 276 ) The interrelationship between government and media defines media's role. The media also are social and cultural mirrors, displaying the nation's values. They also are influential participants in the culture, sometimes altering the national dialogue by focusing attention on issues and trends.

The objectives of mass mediated message is intellectual and cultural enrichment. The requirements of different population, groups and strata influence the cultural patterns of everyday life. These are significant for managing social processes. The media effects can be answered in terms of creating awareness, knowledge, attitude and behavior change; impact on value systems and ideology of society, and creating tripartite relationship between media audience and society. Narula (1993) emphasized that mass media channels are mirrors and moulders of ideology. Therefore, the

ideology of society as well as ideology of communication channels is mutually dependent on each other. Thus there is tripartite relationship between media, audience and society. DeFleur and Rokeach suggest that the media effects is in terms of change in beliefs systems and attitudes, and values. The attitude formation towards a constant flow of new topic, a subtle shift in the value system. Another cognitive effect may be media role in agenda setting. Agenda setting is an interactional process. The topics are selected by the media, presented to the public. Information about such topics is selectively assembled and selectively disseminated.

To sum up, the media has a big responsibility in a democratic country. But it cannot fulfill its responsibility unless it is solely people-oriented and independent of power structure. By the joint effort of media persons with the help of civil society, the media can be free from the undue influence of power structure in Nepal's present context.

### **Relevance of Tools to the Research**

According to Foucault, discourse is involved within power. It is inseparable from power. Those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude others who are not in power to talk about Indian diplomats, their statements concerning Nepal are also related to power structure. They exercise more power over many issues in Nepal than Nepali diplomats do in India. Their discourse easily overshadows the discourse of Nepali diplomats. Similarly, the institution of media plays an important determining role in the development maintenance and circulation of discourses. It is a means to disseminate the discourse of those who are in power. Nepali media has also done the same despite some instances of exception at some occasions and situations.

Indeed, there are abundant facts and events how and when India has dominated and intervened upon Nepal's internal affairs but this solid truth has been

sidelined because of an equal power structure between Nepal and India. So, truth can be proved wrong by power and Nepal's power is always weak in comparison to the power of India. In the same way, the role of India media is always stronger and more influential than the role of Nepali media. That's why, Nepali media has to serve the purpose of Indian media because of power inequality. Anyway, when Nepal government is strong enough, then the discourse of India may change. When there is a change in power structure, the discourse will also change and so will be the case with the spread of discourse through the media. With a changed power structure, the media will analyze Indian diplomats' opinions in a new way. But to see Nepal's plight, it is very challenging for Nepal to attain the level of Indian socio-political height.

Media is an institution that reflects the power structure of the government. But when Nepal government can not maintain its own stance; when it dances in Indian's tune, the media is also helpless to interrogate the highhandedness of India. Although, the media endeavors to challenge India's interference in Nepal, it has a lot of difficulty on the way because of power difference. On the other hand, the Nepali media itself should be able to challenge its own government and the foreign domination. In fact, Nepali is still far away from its norms and values. It has not enabled itself to work for preserving Nepal's integrity, sovereignty and independence. This failure has already tarnished the image and the role of Nepali media to a high extent. It is unable to spread the discourse of conscious Nepali intellectuals at national and international level.

It is clear that there is the domination of India over Nepal on various aspects. This can be understood as hegemony of India. Such a domination is exerted not by force, nor even necessarily by active persuasion, but by a more subtle and inclusive power over the economy, and over state apparatuses such as educational and media.

India's dominance and interference at Nepal's peace process is not only a political issue. There is also an ideological control. Not only this, there is also an economic domination and such a domination is achieved through socializing agencies such as media. By the help of media, the ideas and actions of a more powerful country get promoted and legitimized. But the media should abstain from it. It should not worship power and should be devoted to convey the truth to the citizens and the media people should fight for independence with power structure. It should be possible in democratic country, the media should work impartially, independently and democratically.

It also seems that Nepal's leadership is in the hand of India. Nepal is accustomed to the tradition of taking help of India even to sort out its completely private issues. Nepal is also blameworthy to intensify India's high-handedness. India's hegemony is never resisted by Nepali leaders and the media also suffers the same debacle. Nepali media has also been the victim of Indian media's hegemony. To publish a news about Nepal's sensitive matters as well, Nepali media should wait for the publication analysis of Indian media. It is a very worrisome matter for an independent country . Geographically, Nepal is said to be independent. But it is quite clear that Nepal is not independent and under the domination of Indian hegemony on all other aspects.

The representation of the presence of Indian diplomats in Nepal is different from actual meaning of their presence. Their real intention is not incorporated and displayed by our print media. The representation is not actual and it is not based upon socio-political reality. It is uncritically in favor of Indian diplomats. Although Nepali print media has attempted to display the truth at sometimes, its attempt is not adequate, clear and strong. Anyway, when we say representation, it always distorts

the reality and presents it in a new way because it has power. Similarly, the media has also power and it presents the opinions of Indian diplomats by concealing the reality behind their opinions. Nepalese leaders are often portrayed and treated as weak, submissive and inexperienced democrats by Indian leaders and diplomats and they interfere with the steps and decisions of Nepali leaders . But Nepali media does not muster up its courage to resist it and represents their highhandedness positively without any sense of professional responsibility and without any effort to alert the Nepali leaders.

### **Chapter III: Representation of Indian Diplomats Concerning Peace Process in Nepal**

The interest of India in Nepal is enormous. However the interest may not be seen and felt directly. Although, every country has some kind of interest in its neighbouring country, India's interest is not always tolerable and compromising. In fact, there has been a lot of disturbing effects on the sovereignty, independence and integrity of Nepal from India. This reality can be found when analyzing the expressions of many Indian leaders and diplomats in Nepal. The conscious intellectuals of Nepal are quite aware of it but they are not boldly vocal. Our media had to play a big role to interrogate their expressions, but it has not been found doing so in Nepal. At times, Nepalese media seem critical but the effort is not adequate and strong.

During insurgency, India allowed its territory for Maoists to carryout their activities. But Indian diplomats seemed to have assured Nepal government not to have such a suspicion. India pretended it wanted to see peace in Nepal, helping Nepal to resolve the Maoist problem but kept on providing shelter for the Maoists. Nepal's magazine, *The Nepal Bi-Monthly*, 15 Shrawan 2057, rightly published an information as:

Without the information or permission of Indian government, the Maoists leaders can not make their movement; they can not conduct gatherings and their cadres can not receive training in Indian territory. And, even the big leaders of Nepal have started being vocal about the interference of India towards the political and internal issues of Nepal.

(8 )

Thus, the newspaper tried to explore India's motives and to aware Nepali leaders. It was a bold and praiseworthy step. But it was not adequate. It could have published

such news till the notice of Indian government. No comment and response was made from Indian media regarding it. It happened so because the issue raised by Nepalese media is trivial in the eyes of Indian media. Similarly, Nepali media could not challenge the hegemony of India and also of its media sufficiently. The Nepali diplomats might have also requested Indian government not to encourage Maoist activities in Indian ,but in front of Indian diplomats, the discourse of Nepali diplomats was obviously sidelined. So, as India was more powerful, its discourse, although false, became truth.

Later, 12 points agreement was forged between the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) and the Seven- Party Alliance in New Delhi. On the basis of the agreement, Comprehensive Peace Accord took place in Nepal. Indeed, it was a very historical achievement regarding peace process in Nepal. Along with the Accord, the peace process in Nepal was supposed to have taken place and started . A lot of gratefulness was expressed toward India for cooperating Nepal government to bring the Maoists to mainstream politics. It was certainly a laudable effort of India in this regard. But it should also be noted that India made the effort with the awareness of the repercussions of the prolonged conflict. India also started intensifying its interests and highhandedness upon Nepal's matters. While being gratitude towards India, its interference was taken for granted. Nepali leaders started to depend upon Indian leaders too excessively. They began dancing in the instructions of Indian leaders and diplomats. And this trend has been going on unchecked and uncritical. The trend started from Haidarabad House 53 years back by Ranas, the King and the Congress to solve the internal problems . It was also continued even by the Communist at Silgudi, Lakhnau and New Delhi while making 12 point agreement. Unfortunately and shamelessly, they could not make agreement by residing in our own territory.

Furthermore, Girija Prasad Koirala and other leaders including Madhav Kumar Nepal had a talk with prominent Indian leaders Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Prakash Karat and PM Manmohan Singh before making the 12 point agreement at Delhi. It shows Nepali leaders' excessive dependence upon them without considering the possible fallouts. When the Nepali leaders were asked about it, they replied that the venue of talks does not matter. *The Rising Nepal*, 19 Nov. 2006 published a news as:

Leaders of mainstream political parties said so long as progress was made on bringing the Maoists into the political mainstream, it did not matter whether dialogue is held on foreign soil or within the country. "What we need today is an amicable settlement of Maoist problem. It does not matter where the dialogue takes place," said Khem Raj Pundit, Assistant General Secretary of Rastriya Prajantra Party.

(1)

But it was sure to be influenced by India due to this step. India would naturally intend to gain something after assistance. Similarly, only the place of India was not used. Even the suggestions and views of the Indian leaders were taken into consideration before making the agreement. Thus it also instigated to intensify India's interference upon Nepal's internal matters in the days after the agreement.

If the conflict was prolonged in Nepal, then millions of people would flee to India. Nepal is surrounded on three fronts by India . Any disease, anomalies or any benefits that influence Bihar and Utter Pradesh states would influence Nepal and vice versa. From this perspective, the development, prosperity and the stability of Nepal would benefit India as well. The Maoist insurgency and the violent activities would spill over to India. Many political analysts argue that if the insurgent groups operating



in both the countries failed to join the mainstream politics, it could be hard to contain the terrorist activity.

Dated Feb, 15, 2008, *The Rising Nepal* writes :

Wrapping up their three day visit to Nepal, the five member delegation of Indian Congress (I) Party Tuesday clarified that India had no hand in the ongoing armed violence in the Terai and vowed to support the election to the CA at any cost. The team, however, expressed commitment to facilitate talks between Nepal government and the armed groups in the southern region of the country, Terai.( 1 )

When analyzing this publication and other succeeding writings in the paper, we find that Nepalese reporters are not critical. They are too loyal. Furthermore, they have expressed that they are ready to help solve the Terai problem without receiving any request of the Nepal government for that. And the Nepali media are silent at the active and unnecessary inquisitiveness of the delegation. Similarly, Nepal government only suspected the hand of Indian criminals without any effort to urge the Indian government to investigate in this issue. Nepal's voice against India is always low and it is easily silenced by the Indian power structure.

India is the key player in forcing the major parties to go for a federal structure in the name of dousing the fire that has engulfed the Terai region. According to Nepali Congress insider, India insisted that the party amend the interim constitution to allow a federal structure that will divide Nepal into several provinces, dissipating its limited resources and forcing it to depend on external sources to run its economic lifeline. With the onslaught of globalization, many more players have joined the fray to advise our mediocre political leadership on how to handle the transitional political order. Nepal has now turned into a more passive and recipient state that often listens

to others' advice to chart its future's course. We often hear foreign delegations visiting Nepal as if they have brought with them a magic wand to solve our problems. And our leaders are so eager to meet them and seek their blessing. A widespread feeling among the public is that our political leadership has lost the minimum dignity and forgotten to keep national interest at the centre while dealing with the foreign powers. For instance, to settle terai agitation, the negotiation between Nepal government and the terai leaders was held in the Indian Embassy. It is the climax of Nepali leaders' dependence upon India and the proof that India's role is decisive for settling Nepal's internal affairs.

Similarly, according to the news published on 6th April 2007 in *The Rising Nepal*, Ex Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala was reported to have remarked as: 'I found India very positive while asking for assistance to resolve the problems of Terai.' ( 1 ) It shows that Nepali governments are too dependent upon India. He should have solved this problem himself as an internal matter of Nepal. If he was confirmed this problem could not be solved without India, he could ask for help. But without trying by himself, undermining his own and his cabinet's capacity, he jumped to the assistance of India. It displays his submissiveness to Indian hegemony. He was habituated for a long time to solve Nepal's problems only after receiving special help and instructions of Indian.

Ex Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala also remarked that the problem faced in the Terai region could be solved in a minute if India assisted Nepal. The remark by the highest executive was a clear indication that the coalition government formed on the strength of the April Movement was helpless in curbing the violence and anarchy that continued in the Terai without Indian support. The Indian government had denied its role in the surge of violent activities across the Terai. Yet the Prime Minister's

disclosure officially reaffirmed the widespread concerns among the Nepalese that Nepal was being forced to put its sovereignty at stake to address security issues and maintain law and order in its own land.

In fact, right after the revolution in 1951, the Indian establishment, upbeat by its victory over the British Empire, began to play the role of big brother in sorting out the internal affairs of its small neighbour. A democratic India has never bothered to amend the 1950 Nepal-India Treaty, which the last Rana Prime Minister, Mohan Shumsher, hastily struck with India in a disparate attempt to save his family rule that was under threat. The controversial treaty contains so many provisions that undermine Nepalese sovereignty. The then Indian Home Minister Sardar Ballavbhai Patel, speaking in the Indian Parliament, called for annexing Nepal with India by force, but Nehru criticized Patel because such military action would be counter-productive and draw international condemnation. A shrewd and diplomatic Nehru, who considered Nepal as India's security border to the north, knew that India could exercise its hegemony over Nepal only through political meddling and cultural and intellectual apparatus. In fact, not only him, all the government formed in Nepal are found helpless before India's interest. Before being the part of government, they are critical to India but after stepping on the government, they change their voice in favor of Indian activities surprisingly but shockingly being oblivious of the fact that Nepal is a free, sovereign and an independent country.

There is a widespread and long established belief among political leaders that the Nepali politics is not possible by isolating India. This is the weakest point of Nepal's politics. According to *The Rising Nepal* published on 21st December 2007, a border expert, Buddhi Narayan Shrestha, was reported to have said as, "The politicians raise hue and cry about Indian's encroachment of Nepalese border during

election and when they are not in power, but as they reach the power, they remain mum". It also displays the helplessness of Nepal government. Furthermore, *The Rising Nepal* reports him saying the feeling of bigger, richer and powerful had contributed to the unabated crossing of the borderline.

In the same way, there has been a tradition for every new Prime Minister of the government to visit India first and then only to other countries. When this tradition was broken by the Prime Minister of the Maoist- led government recently, much hue and cry spread through the country and among Indian leaders. Many feared that India would be angry with it and the relation between Indian government and the Maoist led government might be cold. In fact, there was no need to worry for the Nepalese and no need to feel upset for India because the Prime Minister of a sovereign country was absolutely free to choose any country in the world as a first visit. Moreover, there was no presence of Indian diplomats at his welcome and departure time. It also shows the hegemonic and dominating attitude of India.

Indeed, due to power inequality, the discourse of India is more powerful and influential in Nepal. The newly appointed Indian diplomats behave and express their opinions regarding Nepal's matter very confidently as experienced diplomats. Similarly, it can be said that they do not suggest Nepal government. Rather they order while analyzing their language of expression. Before submitting their credentials and informing to the foreign ministry of Nepal, they are much vocal towards Nepal's concerns. For example, an Indian ambassador to Nepal, Rakash Sood met then Prime Minister Koirala before submitting his credentials. At May 16, according to the news report of *The Rising Nepal*, he also remarked: "I submitted my credentials to the Prime Minister. The republican nation is an aspiration of the Nepalese people. The republican agenda can be implemented smoothly". Thus, we sense a kind of

interference in his remark. The newly appointed diplomat seems confident of knowing Nepali people's aspirations. It is not acceptable at all. In fact, he had to say that it was Nepali people's decision to finalize about the republican agenda. He did not seem to have considered Nepalese as sovereign citizens. From his above remark, we also understand his view that with India's assistance, the republican agenda can be implemented smoothly. His underlying meaning which could not be figured out even by the newspaper was that without India's active hand, Nepal can not implement republican agenda smoothly. So, we can also say that there is distortion of reality behind the expression of Indian diplomats in Nepal. This process of distortion of reality is known as representation.

Similarly, Yadav Khanal, in *The Kathmandu Post*, 22 Mar.2007, writes as:

Although Indian VIPs are said to be in Kathmandu to promote India-Nepal relations, they invariably pressure local authorities not to say or do things that go against Indian's interests in Nepal. On occasion, the visiting dignitaries are also believed to have threatened government ministers and politicians and put pressure on them to carry out their wishes. One glaring example is Foreign Minister Pradhan bowing to Indian pressure and asking all those concerned in Nepal not to use the word "encroachment" when talking about India grabbing land on the Indo-Nepal border. She wanted people to use the term "border problem" instead. (March 22, 2007)

Thus, it shows the power exercised by Indian diplomats in Nepal. They behave as if they are superior to the rank of ministers in Nepal. And they are here just to promote the interests of India in a threatening and big brotherly attitude. Nepalese leaders suffer from inferiority complex. When our leaders sit for negotiation and dialogue

with their counterparts, they appear unable to raise the national issues with a proper argument, consider themselves as equals and represent the great Nepali people in safeguarding their national interests. Most of the negotiations and dialogues have suffered from this inferiority complex. Nepali leaders and diplomats often used to say that we have "special relations" with India. This could create doubt in the mind of others because we should not keep special relation with any foreign country if we have faith in our sovereignty, independence and integrity. A radical change in the Nepali political leadership is the need of the day to fulfill the aspirations and needs of the people.

The government of India also prescribed the 'twin pillar policy' for Nepal. The policy includes constitution monarchy and the multiparty democracy system. It was in fact the domination of India upon the Nepali people. It was the matter to be decided by the Nepalese. Regarding this matter, our media seemed to have interrogated Indian diplomats. But what was found was that they lightly dismissed such a sensitive issues and the media remained quiet instantly. According to *The Kathmandu Post*, dated 24 Apr.2006 secretary of India, Shyam Saran was reported to have replied as:

When we said India stands for multiparty democracy and constitutional monarchy we were reflecting nothing more than what the people of Nepal themselves and the political parties themselves had committed to. So, you should not take this as something that was prescribed by the Government of India. (1)

Thus, so was the reply and there was no further inquiry regarding the matter. Our media could not adequately challenge the highhandedness of India to the extent that something as such would not be repeated in the future. In fact, many times, in many occasion, Indian diplomats have expressed their ideas not in a suggesting tone but in

an ordering manner, which indicates the India's big brotherly attitude and hegemony. When we analyze the following expression of Rakesh Sood, an Indian ambassador, as reported in *The Kathmandu Post* , dated 16 May, 2008 we sense the same:

Speaking at Reporters Club Nepal, he said formation of a government based on national consensus was necessary in Nepal in the present critical period. All the major political forces must come together to make a national government and they should work on the basis of consensus. He also urged the Maoist to take the initiative for such a consensus. ( 1 )

Thus, when analyzing the manner and the language of his expression, we understand the fact that Indian does not advise, rather intends to force and interfere Nepalese leaders in their actions.

There are vast differences between Indian representatives and Nepali representatives. They are very instant to reject any allegations to India but Nepalese are weak in this regard. When a cartoon was shown regarding encroachment at Susta, Gopal Baglay, the Spokesman of Embassy of India reacted Letters toEditor, in *The Kathmandu Post* dated 4 Jan, 2008 as:

The cartoon carried on the front page of the Post regarding the alleged encroachment by India in the Susta area of Nepal is not only misleading but also in very poor taste. The question of "encroachment" on "Nepali land" does not arise since the border in Susta is yet to be delineated. It is unfortunate that vested political interests in Nepal have chosen to disturb the peace and vitiate the friendly relations between the two countries by recklessly engaging in anti-India rhetoric. ( 5 )

Thus, they are so much defensive and reactive, Nepalese diplomats should learn a lesson from them and prepare themselves to present counter-arguments in such situations. Similarly, there is another example as well which is relevant here to note. Regarding the allegation of Indian involvement in making the problem in the terai knottier Shiva Shankar Mukherjee instantly replied as, "Those are utterly motivated and baseless allegations against India"( Jan 27, *The Kathmandu Post* ).

There was the intervention from India during Janandolan-2 as well. The movement would have abolished the monarchy but it could not do so because of Indian intervention. Talking to reporters in New Delhi, Dr. Karan Singh member of the Upper House of the Indian Parliament said *The Rising Nepal* dated 23 Apr. 2006, as:

His Majesty's decision was a significant step forward in resolving the political turmoil in Nepal. There may be differences in some quarters but the Seven Party Alliance should soon take the responsibility of forming a government. Dr. Singh also said India favoured a constitutional monarchy in Nepal. ( 1 )

India first sent Karan Singh whose formula was rejected by the Nepalese people. Again the attempts were made to find an agreement between the parties and the King. It seemed that this effort resulted into the reinstatement of parliament. With this, the objective of political parties that were fighting against regression was met but the mission of Jana Andolan II was beyond it. When the Maoists moved ahead to fulfill this mission, the political parties and the international forces came together to create obstacles on their way.

Similarly, the Indian Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh, as well favored the Royal proclamation and hinted agitating political leaders to agree with the announcement. Instead of such a response, he could behave it to be decided by the



Nepalese people and the leaders. His immediated reaction was unrespetful to the Nepali people. *The Himalalayan Times* published 23 Apr. 2006 the news as :

PTI, however, quoted Prime Minister Manmohan Sing as saying that the king's proposal was a "step in the right direction". "There should be a government in place which exercises all the executive powers. The process has begun,' Singh told reporters aboard his aircraft on his way to Germany for a three-day visit. ( 1 )

It could be analyzed as an intention to pressere the Nepali leaders and to sustain monarchy. It was certainly not good to comment such an important issue without hearing the response of Nepali people.

India is still exercising its selfish strategies and policies towards Nepal. After Janandolan -2, when Nepal's Prime Minister, Girija Prasad Koirala went to India with a four- day official visit, Prime Minister of India, Dr. Manmohan Sing accorded him a hearty welcome at the Indira Gandhi International Airport. *The Rising Nepal* published the news 7 Jun. 2006 as:

Prime Minister of India, Dr Manmohan Sing accord him a hearty welcome at the Indira dandhi International Airport. Also present to welcome Prime Minister Koirala at the airport were Indian Minister of State for External Affairs Ananda Sharma, Foreign Secretary Shyam Sharan, Charge d'Affairs at the Embassy of Nepal in New Delhi Tara Prasad Pokharel ans senior embassy staff and senior officials of the Ministry of External affairs of India. ( 1 )

Here, the newspaper published the incident with emphasis. But it failed to analyze critically the meaning behind such a huge and surprising welcome. Similarly, regarding it , *The Rising Nepal* published 7 Jun. 2006 writes in its editorial as:

It may be worth mentioning that considering the strong and amicable relations that exists between Nepal and India, the Indian Prime Minister himself came to welcome Prime Minister Koirala at the Indira Gandhi International Airport in New Delhi. This shows the high priority that India gives to the relations with Nepal. The relations have remained warm and friendly despite minor problems which crop up now and then , but talks have always resulted in settlement to the satisfaction of both the countries. ( 4 )

Thus, in the editorial as well, it portrayed the welcome accorded to the Nepalese Prime Minister quite positively. Furthermore, the newspaper conclude that the welcome that was the result of the high priority that India gives to the relations with Nepal. But what the newspaper failed to analyse is that India might have some underlying behind it. Here, what is to be recalled is that the heavy welcome offered to the Rana Prime Minister, Mohan Shumshar, and its terrible result that is the treaty of 1950. Thus, the welcome to Girija Prasad koirala might be the same strategy applied in Rana time to persuade him to make some agreement in favour of Indian interests. But our media was oblivious of such type of solid fact with historical proof.

According to the interview of Anand Swarrop Verma, veteran Indian journalist, published in *The Rising Nepal* dated 24 Dec., India has been interfering in Nepal. According to him, there was a massacre in Gaur of Rautahat where about 29 pro-Maoist people were killed . Some independent fact finding teams from Nepal and India visited the site and categorically named the leaders, mafias and feudal of Bihar who were involved in the massacre. In the interview, he further responded as,

A section of Indian ruling class is very much active to destabilize the whole peace process and save the monarchy. In Dec.2006, there was a conference "Biswo Hindu Sangam" in Gorakhpur, organized by Adityanath, a priest of the Gorkhanath Temple. A number of Hindu fundamentalist leaders from Nepal and India attended it. Bharat Keshar Singh, Upendra Yadav and Laxman Lal Karma were also there. At the meeting, Yadav said that one could not imagine Nepal without a king. Some time ago, there was a meeting in Patana attended by Madeshi leaders including Ram Raja Prasad Singh. Its objective was to create disturbances in the Terai for a separate state.( 3 )

Thus, he was strongly against Indian interference into Nepal although he was an Indian journalist.

Developed Western states as well determine their relationship with Nepal in coordination with India. They have neither an independent policy towards Nepal nor do they wish to adopt any policy that conflicts with Indian's policy. For instance, Norwegian Minister for International Development, Erik Solheim talking at a press meet in Lalitpur after concluding his four day official visit to Nepal, said "Norway is not looking for a big role in Nepal's peace process while India's role is major in this regard" (6 May, 2006). As a result, Nepal's dependency on India has increased along with the domination of India. We need to take account of this fact and change our bilateral ties in tune to time and space. Nowhere in the world has such a policy been adopted except in the case of Nepal, not even in the Middle East or the war-torn countries of Africa and Latin America. That attitude, if maintained, could be seen as directly affecting Nepal's sovereignty, sooner or later. Our political leadership and the

elite have to realize that the interest of India in Nepal is different from that of the European, Asian and other developed states.

Regarding Indo- Nepal relationship, Yadunath Khanal, a Nepali diplomat express as, "When Nepal has political stability and socio- economic development, it will contribute to the betterment of India as well. So, it is better not to intervene in the internal affairs of Nepal by India" (*Yadunath Khanal, 77*).

Here, he means that when Nepal's internal affairs are disturbed by India, it is hard for Nepal to make progress, prosperity and development. Similarly, when Nepal is poor, backward and full of problems, it will surely have an adverse impact upon India. India needs to assimilate this actuality and behave accordingly. Moreover, he is also of the opinion that Nepal should not be disturbed while formulating its foreign policies and deciding Nepal's relationship with other international countries. In each and every sector, there should not be the excessive concerns of India. If not, the result is not lethal only to Nepal but also to India. The role of India upon Nepal should really be advisable rather than interfering. For this, India should change its strategies and behaviours and Nepal should also pursue the policy of check and balance. Only India is not blameworthy. Nepal is also equally responsible to create the problem of interference regarding Nepal's domestic issues. Here, it is advisable for Nepal not to blame always to India. Rather, Nepal should assess the drawbacks in its foreign policies and reformulate them boldly intelligently and diplomatically.

The present scenario in the political arena of Nepal is extremely volatile. The perpetual imposition from our foreign friend in many internal matters has mocked our integrity. Indeed friendship relies, grows and dependence on mutual cooperation and understanding. But it does not mean that the cooperation and understanding should welcome interference on domestic affairs.

Foreign interference is , however, natural during major national crisis or when there is a political vacuum. It looks as if Nepal has arrived at a point where foreigners' role becomes decisive in setting its internal problems. It is clear that some foreign powers do not want stability in Nepal and have always been playing games. It is unfortunate that the Nepalese political leaders have failed to understand them. No one should forget that once their interests are fulfilled, the parties and their leaders will be sidelined. To stop foreign meddling in Nepal and safeguard its nationalism, the need for unity among all the political powers is obvious. This is the interest of the country's sovereignty.

Our foreign friends should not take or be given the right to direct or impose when and which party should be included in the government. If friendship seeks that level of intervention as a means of deepen relationship, that is not friendship in the real sense, that is rather a master-servant relationship. Despite stance on Panchasheel, there has been a constant interference in the internal affairs of Nepal.

India shares common border with five nations of the region, and each of them feels insecure and vulnerable to India's mismanipulations and hegemonic designs. The making or sacking of any government, ratifying any treaty, and making and removing Nepal's seat in any international forums or institutions, developing or making poor in Nepal depends upon India's wish. This has been reflected in the heart and mind of many Nepalese. In this country, civilized nations extend their assistance to develop their neighbors because the prosperity and stability of neighbors is considered as their own prosperity. Any problem of a neighbor is shared by another. Such an attitudinal change of approach needs to be brought about in India not only at the political and people's level but also at the bureaucratic level. Such changes should be reflected in policy and action. Neither India nor we can change the geography and

bring a neighbor from Europe but each of us can change ourselves in order to change the face of our people. So, at the crossroad of our national life we need a real friend, completely changed friend, to strengthen our bilateral ties.

The remarks made by foreign diplomats regarding the impending crisis in Nepal are beyond diplomatic norms, and can only be interpreted as interference in the country's sovereignty. The so-called democratic initiation by the US-Britain-Indian partnership in Nepal has crossed even minimum diplomatic norms. Some of the envoys representing western countries and neighboring India in Nepal want a larger-than-life role in the conflict and consider themselves to be acute kingmakers. If this were to happen in other countries, the diplomats would have been declared *persona non-grata*.

According to traditional diplomatic assumptions, ambassadors bridge cultural and economic gaps, strengthen ties with the country and shun making any kind of political comments in public. The basic job of ambassadors is to get their government's message across. All diplomats should respect the integrity and sovereignty of the country where they are posted . They must possess the ability to comment on negative situations in a tactful manner. However, some envoys have been politically active in Nepal for the wrong reasons. They apparently lack diplomatic etiquette. The Indian ambassador Rakesh Sood, met the Prime Minister of Nepal thrice even before presenting his credentials. He has not only been making political comments in public, he has gone to the extent of proposing who the president of this country should be and why the Maoists should head the next government. No doubt, the Indian factor in setting the political course is evident . But that does not mean the Indian ambassador should said the political course of this country.

Ambassadors do need public gatherings to express their opinions on issues related to the countries they represent but they can't make any comments on the political issues of this country. No doubt, sandwiched between the two Asian economic giants, Nepal needs the support of India. But they must realized that they can't decide the political course of this country though they enjoy every right to discuss such issues in private. They should not try to patronize us. They must demonstrate elements of trust and cooperations instead of making comments in public on sensitive political issues.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The relationship between Nepal and India is very long and multifarious. The relation is both positive and negative. We can find many sweet as well as bitter experiences in Indo-Nepal relationship. But as there is no geographical, economic and military equality, the benefit from the relation is not balanced. The main point here is that India has always been economically stronger than Nepal. As a result, Nepal has got enormous influence of India on all other aspects. Nepal has been depending upon India for its survival for ages. Since Nepal is not independent economically, its independence on all the aspects is very fragile. The independence, integrity and sovereignty of Nepal is already under interrogation due to the economic plight of Nepal. Now, Nepal is not in position to control its internal affairs on its own without the strong presence of India. However, India has not only put its hand in the internal affairs of Nepal, it has established its hegemony on the whole South Asian region.

On the one hand, Nepal needs to improve its financial position and on the other hand, India, as a democratic country, should not interfere in the private affairs of Nepal taking benefit of Nepal's economic downfall. The independence and sovereignty of Nepal and Nepalese should be respected by India. Similarly, Nepal's democracy and leadership must be consolidated to preserve its independence resisting India's high - handedness and hegemonic attitude. As long as Nepal does not maintain stable and cohesive political climate, Nepal is sure to suffer it but the level of interference can be reduced significantly at the present state as well with strong political will and consensus.

Regarding peace process in Nepal, India showed a lot of interests and concerns. Indian leaders and diplomats often visited Nepal and expressed their



opinions. Nepalese leaders listened to their opinions and followed them marginalizing their own opinions. This is in fact a grave mistake on the part of Nepalese leaders and diplomats. It weakened their decision making power and gave rise to Indian interference putting Nepal's independence, integrity and sovereignty at stake. Now, Nepal has drowned so deep that it is very difficult and already late to come up on the surface. But, here, only the political leaders are not blameworthy, Nepal's media, which is regarded a strong guide to the government, is also to be blamed. Nepali media could not alert the government and the leaders sufficiently about India's excessive concerns and the possible fallouts.

Although Nepali media tried to explore India's meddling into our private affairs many times, the efforts were not strong and adequate. The mediapersons mistook the expressions and actions of Indian media, diplomats and leaders for their well wishing. They took their interference positively, that lead to the proliferation of India's interfering activities in Nepal's private affairs. Here, we can say that Nepali media became the victim of India's strong power structure, hegemony and representation. Nepali media is unable to liberate itself from this victimization. There is a trend of compromises for Nepal's independence, sovereignty and integrity. The feeling of inferior complexity is obvious. Such shortcomings are there with our media culture.

The Indian diplomats did not follow or have not been following any supposed diplomatic norms and values. How diplomats are supposed to behave according to traditional diplomacy, they have not behaved as supposed at all. Although the modern diplomacy is liberal for diplomats to express their opinions on the internal political issues of the country they are appointed, the expression of Indian diplomats is excessively interfering. Their attitude is not tolerable to Nepal even while viewing

from the standards of modern diplomacy. All the concerned should raise a collective voice to end this trend so that the independence of Nepal can be maintained in the days to come.

### **Works Cited**

- Abrahms, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Delhi: Harcourt India. Private Limited, 2001.
- Acharya, Jayaraj. *Yadu Nath Khanal Jiwani Ra Bichar*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2059.
- Ahuja, B.N. *Theory and Practice of Journalism*. Delhi: Surjeet Publication, 2005.
- "Alliance debates parallel govt." *Himalayan Times* Apr. 23, 2006: 1
- Biagi, Shirley. *Media Impact*. Sacramento: California State University, 1997.
- Bijaykumar. "Maobadi Pardhapachadi Ko ?." *Nepal Bi-Monthly* 15 Shrawan, 2057: 7
- Blommaert, Jan and Chrisb Bulcaen . "Critical Discourse Analysis". *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 29 (2000): 447-466.
- Maobadi Gatibidhi Hamro Dhristikod ra Niti*. Kathmandu: CPM ( UML ) : 2054.
- "Envoy rejects, Indian criminals' role in Terai." *Rising Nepal* . Nov. 24, 2007.1
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robety Hurley. Vol 1. New York : Random House, 1990.
- "From National Unity Govt: Sood." *Kathmandu Post* . May 16, 2008,1.
- Gautam, Vaskar and Chiran Manendhara, Puran Bashnet. eds. *Maobadi Bidhroh Shshatra Shaghrshako Aawadhi*. Kathmandu: Martin Chautari, 2007.
- "Great Significance." *Rising Nepal*. Jun. 7, 2006. 4
- "India encroaches over 60,000 hectares of borderland." *Rising Nepall*. Dec. 21,2007.1
- "India positive to solve Terai problems: Koirala." *Rising Nepal* Apr. 6, 2007.1
- "Indian Congress team vows to support CA." *Rising Nepal* . Feb. 15, 2008.1
- "Indian Rulling Class Wants To Save Monarchy." *Rising Nepal* .Dec. 24, 2007. 3
- "Koirala received by Indian PM in Delhi .High priority to relation .PM hopeful about visit." *Rising Nepal*. Jun. 6, 2006.1
- Lohani, Shreedhar P., Abhi.Subedi, Sajag Rana and Ajaya Bhahdhara Khanal (ed:)

*Media Studies: Kathmandu, 1995: Mimeo*

Mc Houll, Alec and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer Discourse, Power and the*

*Subject*. New York: New York University Press. 1997.

Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2007.

"Misleading Cartoon." *Kathmandu Post* . Jan. 4, 2008.5.

"Nepali people can solve own problems." *Kathmandu Post* . Jan. 27, 2008.5

Onesto, Li. *Report from the People's War in Nepal*, 1999.

Purvis, Trevor and Alan Hunt. "Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology...." *The*

*British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 44, No 3 ( Sep.,1993), 473-499

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New Delhi : Penguin Books Pvt Ltd, 1995.

Slattery, Martin. *Key Ideas in Sociology*. Nelson Thornes Ltd. Cheltenham,

United Kingdom. 2003.

"Sood Urges Parties for National Government." *Rising Nepal* . May 16, 2008.1

Thapa, Bhairab Bd. *Nepal ra Bharat : Hijo ra Aaja*. Kathmandu: Bidhyarthi Pustak

Bhandar, 1996.

"Twin Pillars not Indian Position." *Kathmandu Post* . Apr. 24, 2006. 1

Uprety, Dr. Bishnu. *Dwanda Ko Anta*. 2006. Kathmandu

"India's role major in Nepal peace process: Norway." *Rising Nepal* . Dec. 16, 2006.2

Wood, Brenno. "Stuart Hall's Cultural Studies and the Problem of Hegemony." *The*

*British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.49, No.3 (Sep.,1998), 399-414