



Global Scientific and Academic Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies

ISSN: 2583-4088 (Online)

Frequency: Monthly

Published By GSAR Publishers

Journal Homepage Link- <https://gsarpublishers.com/journals-gsarjms-home/>



Where History and Sociology meet? The power, knowledge and Social Research.

By

***Dr. Mana Hari Dhakal¹, Amrit Dhakal², Ishwori Dhakal³**

¹Central Department of Sociology

²Management of Model Collage Surkhet

³Divisinal Engineer



Article History

Received: 10/08/2026

Accepted: 22/08/2026

Published: 24/08/2026

Vol – 5 Issue –8

PP: - 81-91

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.
22067926

Abstract

We are going to discussing social sciences and its development in Nepal. Mainly this article has three main objectives and some section. First, to discuss some of the substantive and epistemological tendencies inherent in the tradition and practice of social science research in Nepal. The second comparing history and sociological research, power and social writing and to present some broad suggestions for making social research more transparent to the Nepali people and to ourselves, as well as to our own weaknesses, hopes, and fears. Third where history and sociology meet.? This article is divided into different sections. The discusses only the social science subjectivity preliminary aspects of the article. The discusses some major epistemological trends of social and political power and some major substantive trends of historical and sociological writing. Introduce Ancient to contemporary writing of history and sociology. We are going to introduce where History and Sociology meet? And some general suggestions regarding research priorities and alternatives. Finally, attempts to briefly examine the relationship between social research and the university teaching system. The realizing commonality of sociality of these various topics in relation to the word 'social', we are trying to express only the most general and emotional topics here, so that we can remain detached from the thematic specificity of any given topic. In this article we are going to use secondary information according to social science publication and mainly focusing relationship between History and sociology. The origin of history is with the origin of humans.

Keywords: Power, knowledge, Universal Truth, Social Research, Relationship.

Introduction

Social research and social activity socially created refers to the act of actively using society and social sciences subject matter. Social information, reviews, or recommendations, instead of relying on traditional and contemporary research search starting the topic, we would like to clarify something here. Firstly, in this article, the term ' power, knowledge, and universal truth of social research' targets all those research efforts, which are related to all social activities of humans. Therefore, no distinction is made here whether they are related to society and social, family problems or national problems or only related to political, economic, ideological issues. To clarify this definition further, the term social research here traditionally encompasses all studies related to history, Gender, political science, Culture, economics, anthropology, sociology, and Nepali English that have been conducted on Nepal. Naturally, since we are expert in one of these subjects, my attempt to discuss the trends of social research is not that of expert social related history and

sociology, economics and construction but of a curious layperson. Nevertheless, we have certainly had the opportunity to learn something about those subjects from scholars in various related fields.

Discussion and Findings

We are not focus here only on ' The power, knowledge and the universal truth of Social Research at Tribhuvan University' but will discuss the topic of ' The power, knowledge and the universal truth of Social Research in Nepal'. A large part of the social research conducted in Nepal has been carried out either at the university itself or by people associated with or educated at Tribhuvan University. And this situation is likely to remain the same in the future. In addition, there are often similarities between this university and other research institutions in terms of research topics and obstacles to research work. Perhaps, for this reason, in thematic research discussions, there is a tendency to try to discuss research efforts outside Tribhuvan University as well. Realizing the possible incompleteness of presenting this very broad subject

in a very detailed article, we would like to make another clarification here. First, we were asked to keep this article as short as possible, keeping in mind the short time of the seminar. Second, as mentioned above, this article does not take into account the thematic characteristics of any field of study, and therefore, it is intended to provide only general information without attempting to explain any subject in detail. This letter has also taken the form of a letter. The first criticism that can be made, without any hesitation, about the institution (tradition) and work of social research in Nepal as a whole is: the inability to find the focus of contemporary research topics.

The origin of history is with the origin of humans. Its use is found in the Artha Veda or the word Ithaas has been used in the Artha Veda. Ithaas and Puranas are considered to be the fifth Veda and synonymous with each other. The word Ithaas is also found in the Shatpatha Brahmana, Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, Chandoyo Upanishad, Vishnu Purana, Mahabharata and Chanakya's Arthashastra, but in 500 BC, the Greek historian Herodotus (484-425 B.C.) began writing history. Herodotus is known as the "Father of History" at that time there were not sociological writing and research. He traveled from the Aegean Sea to the Kalasagar, from Egypt to Persia, and wrote a book called "The Persian Wars" on the basis of Field Study. This book was the first book of history writing. It adopted the investigative and descriptive style. It was actually narrative. In this book or writing there were hidden sociological events so history and sociology are mostly related interdisciplinary subject.

Secondly, another Greek historian Thucydides (455 B.C. 400 B.C.) gave birth to deductive history. It requires universal logic. "Deductive method is a logical process in which a conclusion drawn from a set of premises taken collectively" It places more emphasis on the use of facts. He wrote a book called "The History of the Peloponnesian War" in Logical Method here also hidden sociology. In it, the causes of the war and its effects were also described. History should be able to answer the question "Why?" (Barthod George Niebuhr, 27 Aug. 1776, 31 January, 1831) He gave birth to the Scientific Method of History Writing by writing a book called "History of Rome" between 1812-1813. Niebuhr is known as "The Father of Scientific History". He was a citizen of Germany. In the 19th century, another German historian, Leopold von Ranke (21 Dec. 1795, 23 May. 1886), wrote a book called "History of Roman and German Peoples 1489-1514" in 1824. In History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations, he emphasized the search for truth, pointing out the shortcomings of traditional history. In this, he wrote real details such as letters, diaries, and diplomatic reports in Sources of History. He is called the Founder of Science of Historical Evidence. Of his 54 published works, "A Study of the Popes of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" is considered the most important.

Now let us analyze the progress and writing in Nepal in the history of history writing. History writing in Nepal was started by foreigners. It has not been possible to determine who the ancient kings of Nepal were. Since history is based only on

Power and Politics, the history of the ancient tribes of Nepal has not been written. Colonel William Kirkpatrick published a book called An Account of the Kingdom of Nepal in 1818, which is the first history of Nepali history writing. Prof. Dr. Krishna Kant Adhikari wrote in "A Brief Survey of Nepali Historiography, 1980" that history writing has still not been made scientific in Nepal. In reality, it is difficult to write true history in Nepal. When historical sources are destroyed and vandalized, no one can save them, and shortcomings cannot be written, and even the truth is prevented from being written. Kirkpatrick had prepared this book during his 21-day stay in Nepal on 3 March 1793, based on the commercial treaty signed between the British Company Government and Nepal on 1 March 1792. Classified into ten parts, this book also describes Nepal's roads, rivers, landforms, borders, map of Nepal, Nepal's culture, Doko, Khunda, Khukuri, Yubayubati, and temples.

The second book, An Account of the Kingdom of Nepal and of the Territories, annexed to this Dominion by the House of Gorkha, was published by Francis Buchanan Hamilton in 1819. It discusses the border states of Nepal. In 1851, Orfeur Cenvenagh's book Rough Notes on the State of Nepal, its Government Army and Resources was published. In 1852, Laurence Oliphant's A Journey to Kathmandu with the Camp of Janga Bahadur. Similarly, books like B.H. Hodgson's Essays on the Languages, Literature, and Religion of Nepal and Tibet together with Further, Literature Paper on the Geography Ethnology and Commerce of those Countries contributed to Nepali history writing by publishing them, while on the other hand, Actual History fell behind. In 1855, the Indian historian Bhagwan Lal Indraji introduced 23 ancient inscriptions from Nepal. Cecil Bandall also contributed. In 1895, Dr. A. Fuhrer discovered the Ashoka Pillar in Lumbini and worked to clarify that Lumbini was the birthplace of Lord Gautam Buddha.

As per the order of King Rajendra Bir Bikram Shah of Nepal, Bhimsen Thapa had to write history, poet Sundarananda wrote the Triratna Soundaryagata and buyer Sherman wrote the biographies of Dravishah to Narbhupal Shah on a hypothetical basis. Jeetman and Buddhiman prepared a genealogy during the last days of Jung Bahadur with the help of Rajopadhyay of Lalitpur based on the Newari genealogy. History was written on the basis of this genealogy. In 1923, Rewatiraman Neupane wrote a history titled "Gorkhali's Cave". In reality, it can be said that history was not written during the Rana regime. Baburam Acharya wrote Comparative Sundarakand in 1945, Old Poets and Poems in 1946 and BS. In 2022 BS, he wrote a brief history of Nepal, and in 2024-2026, he wrote the biography of Shri 5 Prithvi Narayan Shah in four chapters.

In BS 2008, Balchandra Sharma's historical outline of Nepal, the medieval history of the valley of Surya Bikram Gyawali, and Nepali national figures are considered very important. Along with the contributions of Dhan Bajracharya, Mohan Raj Pant, Bholanath Poudel, Devi Prasad Bhandari, Shankarman Rajbanshi, Dinesh Raj Pant, many others including Shriram PrasadUpadhyay, Krishna Bahadur Thapa, Surendra K.C., Triratna Manandhar, Tulsiram Vaidya, Rajaram Subedi,

Tirtha Prasad Mishra have contributed to the writing of history.

Nepali history writing is found to be influenced by politics because the idea that no one should be allowed to write against one seems to have persisted in Nepali politics. If history cannot be based on facts, then its justification is Historians, doctors, psychologists, teachers, professors, pilots, and engineers should not be party members. Only independent service is considered to have been performed as a true duty.

Power, social history and research

Power is mysterious things comes from mysteriously. In contemporary society power is identity and mass. Every men women and society fell who are we.? This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word "subject": subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meaning suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to. Generally, it can be said that there are three types of struggles: either against forms of domination (ethnic, social, and religious); against forms of exploitation which separate individuals from what they pro-duce; or against that which ties the individual to himself and submits him to others in this way struggles against subjection, against forms of subjectivity and submission (Foucault 1982). It is not enough to say that these are anti-authority struggles; we must try to define more precisely what they have in common.

1. They are "transversal" struggles; that is, they are not limited to one country. Of course, they develop more easily and to a greater extent in certain countries, but they are not confined to a particular political or economic form of government.
2. The aim of these struggles is the power effects as such. For example, the medical profession is not criticized primarily because it is a profit-making concern but because it exercises an uncontrolled power over people's bodies, their health, and their life and death.
3. These are "immediate" struggles for two reasons. In such struggles people criticize instances of power which are the closest to them, those which exercise their action on individuals. They do not look for the "chief enemy" but for the immediate enemy. Nor do they expect to find a solution to their problem at a future date (that is, liberations, revolutions, end of class struggle). In comparison with a theoretical scale of explanations or a revolutionary order which polarizes the historian, they are anarchistic struggles. But these are not their most original points. The following seem to me to be more specific.
4. They are struggles which question the status of the

individual: on the one hand, they assert the right to be different, and they underline everything which makes individuals truly individual. On the other hand, they attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way. These struggles are not exactly for or against the "individual" but rather they are struggles against the "government of individualization."

5. They are an opposition to the effects of power which are linked with knowledge, competence, and qualification: struggles against the privileges of knowledge. But they are also an opposition against secrecy, deformation, and mystifying representations imposed on people. There is nothing "scientist" in this (that is, a dogmatic belief in the value of scientific knowledge), but neither is it a skeptical or relativistic refusal of all verified truth. What is questioned is the way in which knowledge circulates and functions, its relations to power. In short, the regime du savoir.
6. Finally, all these present struggles revolve around the question: Who are we? They are a refusal of these abstractions, of economic and ideological state violence, which ignore who we are individually, and also a refusal of a scientific or administrative inquisition which determines who one is. To sum up, the main objective of these struggles is to attack not so much "such or such" an institution of power, or group, or elite, or class but rather a technique, a form of power (Foucault 1982).

The situation in other disciplines is not much brighter. Research in political science has almost routinely avoided problems such as the promotion and distribution of power, the relations of pressure and submission. This becomes even more strikingly clear when we realize that ours is one of the most hierarchical societies in existence. The fact that the current tradition of political science research has failed to take into account the important experiences of our daily lives becomes even more apparent when we look at the priority list of research in political science. Apart from a few important works, historical research in Nepal has also been limited to discussing historically coherent and meaningful social history. The study of history is largely oriented towards the discussion and study of greatness, the study of personal political history, genealogy, records and fiction. It is said that for our historians, there is no place for the common people and their society has no existence. So far, social and anthropological research has also been focused on the study of less important and superficial topics than the central themes. These topics are only superficial, fragmented and meaningless studies on caste or socio-economic surveys and impact studies, and are far from thinking about fundamental issues such as social structure and cultural manifestations. The theme of one of the first seminars held at Tribhuvan University related to the subject of sociology was: The study

of Dharmi Jhankri in Nepal. This expresses the lack of sociological concern towards discussing worldly issues.

Considering the society and social research tradition that is more inclined towards the ideological and non-material world related to caste context, the introspection that is currently taking place under this subject is natural. What kind of justification would there be for such sociological and anthropological studies in a society like ours, which is entangled in the problems of wheat and cotton? This is not a problem that only frightens sociologists and anthropologists. What would be the utility of these studies if they were to be generally detached from subjects that are actually secondary to our social and national existence and were to be engaged in research.

Social research in Nepal has been driven by the power and ideological interests of national and international political administrations. We are not going to discuss any specific case of any department or agency involved in any of these particular research activities. We have only tried to indicate the transaction of legitimacy between these diverse interests and the tradition of social research. Until we are fully convinced that these diverse interests and the general public, who have considered political, economic, social research to be inert and inactive, have their own distinct desires, then we can do nothing more than express general concern about the list of research priorities that we are experiencing, distorted by the highly profitable business of approved research. If this is the case, we will continue to be slowly but surely dedicated to the same interests.

These neoliberal interests now shape the research agenda and we conduct social research within that framework. Nowhere is this more evident than in the official mission statement of our principal research center, the Center for Economic Development Administration. Suffice it to say that the principal person involved in the research of the Center for Economic Development Administration is the policymaker. What the document clearly conveys is that the research efforts of the Center for Economic Development Administration are intended to inform policymakers through various plans, programs, and the aim is to support the formulation, implementation and evaluation of policies, and the reconstruction of administration. As we have been informed, the research efforts of the Center for Economic Development Administration are also directed towards providing necessary suggestions, alternative ideas, experiences and decisions to policymakers. In fact, the Center for Economic Development Administration is not the only institution dedicated to policymakers everywhere.

The now outdated adage of 'serving the people' is not mentioned in any of the introduction brochures of various newly established research institutions. On the one hand, the field of social research has become dominated by policy-making and producer-related research. Such research reflects a dedication to the power and upper class. On the other hand, such research does not focus on the interests and aspirations of the lower class. Similarly, it is commonly criticized that the

social research system has been collecting information with its hands mostly reaching upwards, i.e. towards the upper class, and its eyes focusing downwards, i.e. towards the lower class.

We are unanimous in our belief that the researcher is a person who goes 'into the field' and 'seeks facts'. We have thought of facts as gifts waiting to be researched in the rural areas. We are not concerned with the fact that a definite theory or metatheory gives the true meaning or birth to the search for facts. The first criticism that can be made of the epistemological basis of the tradition of social research is that this tradition has unanimously inclined towards a theoretical and immediate empirical research method. Facts cannot be properly meaningful unless they are framed within a definite theoretical framework. Because the categories of research depend on theoretical categories, research without theory has no dignity. Nevertheless, we attach great importance to 'facts'. We assume that the collected facts speak for themselves. Sadly, we are still stuck in old beliefs even as we begin to question the validity of the facts in testing the theory.

The second weakness inherent in the tradition of social research is our failure to grasp that society is an interconnected whole. We do not think it necessary to emphasize this point too much. This is obvious to most of us who are engaged in social research. Yet these traditions and practices of social research always violate this common belief. Some of us are engaged in economic, some in political, some in historical, and others in sociological research. We know that these are only artificial boundaries. Yet, having been trained within that system, we are not able to illuminate the real interrelationships of our social life. Unable to discuss the whole social whole, we discuss only a part of it. Worse still, many of us forget that the part we are discussing belongs to a whole. In the process, we are losing some meaning and some coherence, and are producing some misleading and distorted conclusions.

It is uncertain what long-term significance the tradition of isolated, small-scale, and limited social studies of the family, community, and village level will have. In fact, the impetus for such studies in current social research is clear. We have no doubt that such studies, if conducted competently, will help the researcher to gain some important information about the place. However, the main concern here is whether such irregular and limited studies can be taken as a legitimate basis for national or global studies. Certainly not. Therefore, we need to establish the necessary harmony between the substantive and broad structure and the very detailed research.

The tradition of social research is generally embedded in research frameworks that are neither comparative nor based on any historical methodology. The main reason for this is that our research efforts are more transient and one-off in nature. The historical methodology or comparative is clear that the achievements of research efforts conducted without a methodological basis are very weak in terms of their ability to be generalized, that is, in terms of overall national significance. The studies that are not reinforced by historical or inter-social comparative evidence are of little value.

Therefore, a good research study can only be one that is rich in historical and inter-social comparative evidence. Most of our research studies do not fit this definition.

The importance given to research technology or research methodology in the field of social research is not entirely appropriate. This type of technology has given uniformity to research efforts and facilitated the process of its evaluation but at the same time, it has hindered creativity and has also given the impression that research technology and theoretical analysis are independent of each other. Due to the temptation of technology, even the inclination towards the substantive subject has started to deviate. In this has not become such a deep problem for us. But in the world of Western social research, it has also become a subject of strong criticism. From

time to time, criticism is heard that researchers are more inclined to show off research techniques that are more attractive than thematic interests. A highly respected American sociologist once said that when a researcher has a topic of research that interests him or her, the appropriate research techniques for studying it develop almost spontaneously. A certain amount of chaos regarding research techniques does not harm research.

The current social research tradition's mask of scientific and neutrality has denied critical research and made itself impotent. That is why we often fail to put the results of critical social research into practice. On this subject we do not want to go into further detail, because Prof. Kamal Prakash Malla's exemplary collection of articles, 'The Road to Nowhere', has made this its theme. But critical inquiry should not be limited to criticizing the surface of a subject. More than that, it should be able to pierce the illusions that appear on the surface of events and dig up their roots. However, considering our inclination towards the overpowering ideology of so-called scientific inquiry, it does not seem that we can properly utilize the power of critical inquiry.

Social research and trouble: First, the tradition of social research must strive for interdisciplinary inquiry. The different disciplines we have studied or trained in cannot explain meaningful social associations. I am more concerned that within these different shells there are some mantras that are very effectively hiding and downplaying the complex problems that need to be clearly exposed.

Second, the institution of social research must strive to promote theoretically informed research. Our research results, which are hungry only for facts, information, and statistics, will certainly be of little value in the long run. To the extent that our research efforts are centered around real problems, the traditional distinction drawn between theoretical and practical research is no longer justified. That is to say, to the extent that theory is relevant to our practice, the theorist It is meaningless to say that it explains an unreal and unrelated subject. On the other hand, only theoretically conscious research can adequately depict the various expressions and meanings of our activities. In other words, only from a theoretically conscious perspective can the problem be clearly

understood. Because such a perspective is reflected towards completeness and towards the general or universal form of the subject.

Third, social research institutions should make conscious and concrete efforts to portray the complex problems faced by the vast Nepali people. Only if we can do that will we be able to develop into the heart of Nepali life and examine the real problems. But in our opinion, this is not the time to be too liberal in the selection of social research topics. Because the social organizations of Nepali society and the social research organizations are not independent.

Fourth, we must strive to accept that social research is an integral part of critical work. What we must realize is that genuine social research aims to re-evaluate the necessary social and intellectual associations. Critical research is able to do this in the process of evaluating the present and searching for alternatives for the future. To do the above, it is necessary to understand the dialectical relationship between teaching and research. Only through teaching can research be reproduced, and teaching must be based on new research. In this context, we as teachers must strive to understand the interaction between these two aspects.

It is not our intention to discuss this issue in detail here. However, a cursory glance is sufficient to show that our teaching is incapable of producing 'proper' research capacity. This is a complex problem and can only be assessed in some depth. We believe that the main reason for this unfortunate relationship between our teaching and research is the mismatch between the subjects our students study in class and their life experiences. This mismatch reduces their interest in studying, which gives rise to indiscipline, lack of interest in studying, lack of commitment, etc. In our opinion, one of the main reasons for the mismatch between education and life experience is the nature of the curriculum.

As mentioned above, the curriculum should be closely related to our daily reality it is the suggestion of social research. It should be related in a new way. It should not be a mere repetition. We believe that a deep evaluation of the current curriculum will reveal many surprising mistakes, big and small. Like as subjects like agricultural economics and population economics are kept as elective subjects at the postgraduate level of economics. Local, district and regional politics have received little importance in the study of political science. The situation in other social sciences is not much different. Second, all social science teaching should be based on Nepali experience. However, in the context of the global theoretical context, the principles and theoretical ideals should be taught at the certificate and undergraduate levels, even if in a simplified form. Third, Repetition of lessons at different levels should be eliminated as much as practical.

Fourth, for interested students, the subjects of study should cover as many current issues as possible, such as environment, water resources, public participation, national integration and so on. This type of management not only creates interest in students towards studies, but also creates specialized and employable human resources. In addition, it

prevents the skills of subject-specific graduates from being compromised. Finally, a curriculum should be created for students in undergraduate studies that also provides them with practical experience in the field of their interest.

The power, knowledge and Social Science: There is a trend in Nepal and around the world to keep 'mental' products such as data, information, skills, technology, traditions, policies and rituals, as well as ideas, education, knowledge, etc. mysterious. Not only are witchcraft and witchcraft 'knowledge', but there is also a flood of fabricated data, whose sources are not disclosed and which do not have official scientific sources, which may fluctuate by two to four hundred percent, but which at first glance appear 'modern' and reliable. More interesting than quantitative differences and inappropriate methods of data collection, is the answer to the question of why data was collected on specific topics and problems and why data was not collected on other important topics and problems. Such an answer also helps to reveal the character of society and power. A concrete example of this is the poverty statistics, industries, and the politics, economics, and culture that are flourishing around the world, especially in countries like ours. Most poverty-related statistics and research delve into the depths of the poor: how much the poor eat, how much they go hungry, how much they produce, how much they earn, how much they spend on what, etc.

On the other hand, most of these statistics and researches do little to delve into the inner workings of the non-poor, that is, the rich. In addition, poverty There is no attempt to examine the intricacies of the economic, political, and cultural structures and processes that create and nurture poverty, let alone even draw a map. Since statistics, research, and studies on poverty are conducted under the umbrella of the power of the rich, under the power of the economic-political practices and processes that themselves create and nurture poverty, such research and studies can turn into non-political practices. The study of poverty is not only about the poor, but also about the economic-political, structures and processes that produce poverty, as well as the non-poor. And poverty is not caused by the poor, but by specific class, regional, gender and other social relations. These facts are often overlooked or even disappear in most statistics, research and studies. In this way, power also dominates in hiding the truth in statistics, information, policies, knowledge, etc.

The question of rewriting, revising and reconstructing history has emerged as a pressing issue in the educational and political world of India. News, analysis and 'Thomas' related to this have been splashed across newspapers, radio and television. The immediate and direct question has become whether the 'real' socio-political history of India is adequately presented in school history textbooks. Both the Bharatiya Janata Party government and the textbook authority it dominates have been busy rewriting school history textbooks, claiming that the established textbooks are disproportionately dominated by leftist and non-Hindu, especially Muslim, perspectives and facts. While the dispute over history textbooks is ostensibly about history textbooks, there are larger economic, political and cultural issues at play. The

issues are the relative right-wing or left-wing nature of the economy and state power, the ultra-Hindu or question of pluralistic religion, culture, and society, and the political-social basis that can be used to dominate the immediate elections. Truth, facts, and education are on the verge of kneeling before the government. However, the opposing government has not bowed down either. Even if the opposing government ultimately prevails, the closeness of truth, facts, and education to the government is still evident.

The interdependent relationship between sociology, history and power is not limited to the Indian context. The extensive and heartbreaking imperialist behavior that the Japanese regime unleashed in China, Korea, and other Southeast Asian countries in the first half of the twentieth century is not recorded in Japanese school textbooks. The massacres committed by European countries and capitalists throughout North and South America are not properly described and explained in school textbooks. The history taught in British schools is full of English heroic tales. In it, the long and complete colonial destruction occupies very little space. There are also different views in Nepal on how to define Prithvi Narayan Shah and 'national unification'. But the dominance of power is not limited to the description and interpretation of history. From Socrates to Galileo, from Gandhi to Subba Krishnalal Adhikari, the lives of people like him illustrate the interrelationship and conflict between power and knowledge. In some states in the United States, a legal dispute was going on until last year over whether or not to teach the theory of evolution of scientist Charles Darwin at the school level, a theory that does not support the narrative of human birth as set forth in the 'Bible'. This dispute also illustrates the relationship between power and knowledge.

The third tableau is also about the curriculum. In all college campuses around the world, different 'worldviews' are explained in order to help analyze human life and the social world in the teaching of various social sciences universality of worldview. It discussion and determination of which of these perspectives is the best are also found in these textbooks. Reading about worldviews is also very important. But no worldview is divinely or naturally derived, nor does any worldview simply descend from the mind of a thinker or by itself. Even the right worldview is synthesized and modified on the basis of social relations, conflicts and struggles. It is on the basis of the specific nature of social relations and struggles that unfold in a specific period of a particular society that a particular worldview emerges and develops. Therefore, no established worldview can be universal in its entirety, nor can it be 'applied' in the same way to all places, societies, economies, politics and cultures. That is, even a 'worldview' cannot escape the 'trap' of history. A right worldview cannot be ahistorical.

Even within Marxism, which is the most correct worldview, the limits of other worldviews and world interpretations other than dialectical historical materialism, the paramount importance of labor, and class organization have been assessed by world history over the past 150 years. It is worth remembering in this context that Marx himself said, "I am not

a Marxist." This statement is a very sharp blow to the limits of the 'universality' of worldviews. The issue being raised here is more tangible and simpler than the above. Most of the textbooks and other materials taught in college campuses in countries like Nepal and Nepal are written by European and American authors against the backdrop of social relations and struggles in Europe and America, which is natural. Even though the authors of the textbooks and other materials are local, the perspective and interpretation lose locality and the experience of another society is given priority. Moreover, we make abundant use of textbooks prepared in the historical context of Europe and America.

Our contemporary Nepal's culture, which seeks to make us more critical rather than more religious, we end up accepting the worldviews used in those textbooks as supernatural and universal truths. As a result, we prepare teachers and students who carry information from another society and period that is far removed from our own society and history, and who are unable to describe and explain the historicity of that information. Instead of teaching social science, we end up reading and teaching the Puranas.

Social Historical Writing and Research: The source of history is the place where topics related to history are raised. First of all, history should be understood as History because it was first named in English. His+Story is not his story, his story. This statement needs to be understood that history writing began only after the society became male-dominated. History is the past and it is also the past, it shows the way. Comparative teaching can help in development. Now let's move on to the history of history writing.

The origin of history is with the origin of humans. Its use is found in the Artha Veda or the word Ithaas has been used in the Artha Veda. Ithaas and Puranas are considered to be the fifth Veda and synonymous with each other. The word Ithaas is also found in the Shatpatha Brahmana, Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, Chandoyo Upanishad, Vishnu Purana, Mahabharata and Chanakya's Arthashastra, but in 500 BC, the Greek historian Herodotus (484-425 B.C.) began writing history. Herodotus is known as the "Father of History". He traveled from the Aegean Sea to the Kalasagar, from Egypt to Persia, and wrote a book called "The Persian Wars" on the basis of Field Study. This book was the first book of history writing. It adopted the investigative and descriptive style. It was actually narrative.

Secondly, another Greek historian Thucydides (455 B.C.. 400 B.C.) gave birth to deductive history. It requires universal logic. "Deductive method is a logical process in which a conclusion drawn from a set of premises taken collectively" It places more emphasis on the use of facts. He wrote a book called "The History of the Peloponnesian War" in Logical Method. In it, the causes of the war and its effects were also described. History should be able to answer the question "Why?" (Barthod George Niebuhr, 27 Aug. 1776, 31 January, 1831) He gave birth to the Scientific Method of History Writing by writing a book called "History of Rome" between

1812-1813. Niebuhr is known as "The Father of Scientific History". He was a citizen of Germany.

In the 19th century, another German historian, Leopold von Ranke (21 Dec. 1795, 23 May. 1886), wrote a book called "History of Roman and German Peoples 1489-1514" in 1824. In History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations, he emphasized the search for truth, pointing out the shortcomings of traditional history. In this, he wrote real details such as letters, diaries, and diplomatic reports in Sources of History. He is called the Founder of Science of Historical

Evidence. Of his 54 published works, "A Study of the Popes of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" is considered the most important.

Now let us analyze the progress and writing in Nepal in the history of history writing. History writing in Nepal was started by foreigners. It has not been possible to determine who the ancient kings of Nepal were. Since history is based only on Power and Politics, the history of the ancient tribes of Nepal has not been written. Colonel William Kirkpatrick published a book called An Account of the Kingdom of Nepal in 1818, which is the first history of Nepali history writing. Prof. Dr. Krishna Kant Adhikari wrote in "A Brief Survey of Nepali Historiography, 1980" that history writing has still not been made scientific in Nepal. In reality, it is difficult to write true history in Nepal. When historical sources are destroyed and vandalized, no one can save them, and shortcomings cannot be written, and even the truth is prevented from being written. Kirkpatrick had prepared this book during his 21-day stay in Nepal on 3 March 1793, based on the commercial treaty signed between the British Company Government and Nepal on 1 March 1792. Classified into ten parts, this book also describes Nepal's roads, rivers, landforms, borders, map of Nepal, Nepal's culture, Doko, Khunda, Khukuri, Yubayubati, and temples.

The second book, An Account of the Kingdom of Nepal and of the Territories, Annexed to this Dominion by the House of Gorkha, was published by Francis Buchanan Hamilton in 1819. It discusses the border states of Nepal. In 1851, Orfeur Cevenagh's book Rough Notes on the State of Nepal, its Government Army and Resources was published. In 1852, Laurence Oliphant's A Journey to Kathmandu with the Camp of Janga Bahadur. Similarly, books like B.H. Hodgson's Essays on the Languages, Literature, and Religion of Nepal and Tibet together with Further, Literature Paper on the Geography Ethnology and Commerce of those Countries contributed to Nepali history writing by publishing them, while on the other hand, Actual History fell behind. In 1855, the Indian historian Bhagwan Lal Indraji introduced 23 ancient inscriptions from Nepal. Cecil Bandall also contributed. In 1895, Dr. A. Fuhrer discovered the Ashoka Pillar in Lumbini and worked to clarify that Lumbini was the birthplace of Lord Gautam Buddha. As per the order of King Rajendra Bir Bikram Shah of Nepal, Bhimsen Thapa had to write history, poet Sundarananda wrote the Triratna Soundaryagata and buyer Sherman wrote the biographies of Dravishah to Narbhupal Shah on a hypothetical basis. Jeetman

and Buddhiman prepared a genealogy during the last days of Jung Bahadur with the help of Rajopadhyay of Lalitpur based on the Newari genealogy. History was written on the basis of this genealogy. In 1923, Rewatiraman Neupane wrote a history titled "Gorkhali's Cave". In reality, it can be said that history was not written during the Rana regime. Baburam Acharya wrote Comparative Sundarakand in 1945, Old Poets and Poems in 1946 and BS. In 2022 BS, he wrote a brief history of Nepal, and in 2024-2026, he wrote the biography of Shri 5 Prithvi Narayan Shah in four chapters.

In BS 2008, Balchandra Sharma's historical outline of Nepal, the medieval history of the valley of Surya Bikram Gyawali, and Nepali national figures are considered very important. Along with the contributions of Dhan Bajracharya, Mohan Raj Pant, Bholanath Poudel, Devi Prasad Bhandari, Shankarman Rajbanshi, Dinesh Raj Pant, many others including Shriram Prasad Upadhyay, Krishna Bahadur Thapa, Surendra K.C., Triratna Manandhar, Tulsiram Vaidya, Rajaram Subedi, Tirtha Prasad Mishra have contributed to the writing of history.

Nepali history writing is found to be influenced by politics because the idea that no one should be allowed to write against one seems to have persisted in Nepali politics. If history cannot be based on facts, then its justification is Historians, doctors, psychologists, teachers, professors, pilots, and engineers should not be party members. Only independent service is considered to have been performed as a true duty.

Where History and Sociology meet? The terrain where history and sociology might meet is much disputed. Despite efforts in recent years to establish common ground, we see mounting evidence of profound failure to do so. In *Dead Certainties* (Unwarranted Speculations), Simon Schama (1991) violates a once-sacred boundary between historical and literary narrative: he has a fictional soldier offer one viewpoint on General James Wolfe's preparations to attack Quebec in 1759. Schama explains that he "deliberately distorted the conventions by which historians establish coherence and persuasiveness." The 150 years or so since Comte have been marked both by substantial advances in methodology and by the emergence of profound doubts about the underpinnings of knowledge. Particularly within the past quarter-century, scholars have self-consciously explored the substantive and methodological relations between history and sociology (Abrams 1982; Burke 1980; Skocpol and Somers 1980; Zaret 1978). For the most part, this discussion has been framed by reference to broad institutional schools of scholarship and exemplary studies. This largely inductive discussion has offered little opportunity to account systematically for the diversity of approaches to inquiry; the exception is a typology proposed by Tilly (1984). Granted, purely philosophical delineation of strategies of inquiry might lack relevance to concrete practices, but socio historical inquiry is in little danger of erring in such a direction, and a measure of formalization may help bring more rigor to the craft. Here I propose contribution to that project, unearthing inquiry's constitution "forms of discourse" and a typology based on

their articulations, which describes alternative "strategies of inquiry."

Conventionally, proposals to improve working relations between sociology and history have been interdisciplinary subject. The present article advances an alternative approach-consolidation of socio historical inquiry as a transdisciplinary enterprise. All socio- historical inquiry depends on four elemental forms of discourse: discourse on values, narrative discourse, social theoretical discourse, and the discourse of explanation. Though inquiry is transdisciplinary in the problematics of these discourses, concrete methodology typically is oriented either toward theorization in relation to cases historical sociology or toward comprehensive analysis. Varying the articulated relations among the four forms of discourse once for historical sociology and again for sociological history yields eight ideal typical strategies of inquiry. The four strategies of historical sociology include universal history, theory application, macro-analytic history, and contrast-oriented comparison. The parallel strategies for sociological history are situational history, specific history, configurational history, and historicism. These ideal types offer standard reference points that help clarify the underpinnings of a diverse range of scholarly practices.

Mainly we are going to discuss about four distinctive forms of discourse. First one discourse on social values: The object of socio historical inquiry is no longer taken to exist solely in events themselves; rather, it is constituted in part by meaningful interests that shape inquiry. With the rise of the problem of subjectivity at the end of the nineteenth century, not only did the objective significance of events become problematic; in addition, knowledge of events became relativized. As it became acknowledged more widely that different observers do not see things in the same way, it no longer seemed tenable to clarify a single account of events with the ideal of certitude to which Ranke aspired. Increasingly the tendency has been to argue that all "facts" are value or theory laden. By noting the problem of values, then, we want to identify the form of discourse through which a problem is framed, such that the framed project of inquiry gives meaning to/about/from the socio historical world. However, anyone might come to terms with the relation of values to inquiry, the basic point is that the issue frames a distinctive realm of discourse which conditions research.

First, value commitments establish the purposes of inquiry in general. The age-old debate about the importance of history is an example. According to historians like Durant and Durant (1968), history is to be our teacher, and the study of history to reconstruct "what actually happened" would not necessarily make us any wiser (White 1984, p. 21ff.). On the other hand, for Ranke and a diverse array of academic historians, the goal of studying history as a cornerstone of liberal education has been supplanted by attempts to reconstruct the past, even if the purposes of reconstruction remain open to debate. Ranke sought to establish "spiritual historicism" whereby the objective study of history revealed the meanings of historical epochs and of world history (Krieger 1977). Alternatively, the study of history may promote social change. Consider Craig

Jenkins's (1985) analysis of U.S. farm workers' insurgency. Although resolutely theoretical and even-handed, it still is justified by values that transcend the topic, namely working toward the goal of "recreating a period of generalized turmoil where the democratization of social power once again becomes the paramount question of the day".

Second discourse: Draped on the framework of a "plot," narrative is intended to offer a coherent chronological story of "what actually happened." It links description, events, and subplots to one another through textual devices of temporalization such as flashbacks and cuts between different scenes that maintain a continually unfolding narrative time. Let us also consider the Annalists' histories of climate, demography, technology; of trade routes; of the relations between land, village, town, and city. Are these conventional narratives applied to new topics and based on new value interests? Do these writings simply expand the horizon, or transcend narrative altogether (see Hobsbawm 1980)? The questions help us to explore the boundaries between narrative and the other forms of discourse, for it is at least possible to imagine a demographic account that retains a plot, albeit an unconventional plot. By following Stone's (1979, p. 5) assertion that narrative engages in "answering the what and the how questions in chronological fashion," it would be possible to incorporate even ecological and structural processes within plots (see Le Goff and Nora [1974] 1985).

Thirdly discourse on social theory: Despite this diversity, social theory offers a decisive counterpoint to narrative and to explanation, considered below. Peter Gay (1974, p. 214) once claimed psychology as the "principal auxiliary science" for historical inquiry; nevertheless, social theory, not psychology, has consolidated a distinctive discourse. In the first place, inquiry has been broadened most significantly through the infusion of social theoretical perspectives, beginning with the challenges of Comte and Marx in the nineteenth century. Second, issues of social psychology effectively have been subsumed by social theorists across the intellectual spectrum, from Marx to Weber, Durkheim, Mead, Parsons, and others. Psychologists themselves, insofar as they have aspired to general theory, have become social theorists, as did Freud and B.

F. Skinner in divergent ways. In short, psychology either enters into inquiry through consideration of motives of action or, alternatively, is absorbed into social theory.

Fourthly discourse on explanation: We have avoided using the term explain, but many social theorists would hold that coherent, comprehensive, adequate theories explain. Stanley Lieberman (1991) reminds us, however, that there is a vast difference between developing a good theory and offering a good explanation of particular phenomena. Theories, he argues, should not be expected to account for everything. For every theory that falls short of accounting completely for phenomena, for every narrative that transcends the simple chronicling of events, the question "why?" inevitably raises the possibility of explanation as a distinctive form of discourse. Beyond time, the standards of explanation depend

on logic and evidence. The defining character of explanation thus does not turn on any particular content. As a form, explanation is concerned with unique aspects and contingent circumstances of a particular situation, rather than with properties and processes held to have some generic typicality. At its core, then, the discourse of explanation attends to the task of sorting through evidence relating to alternative accounts of contingency. Pushed to its limit, explanation might be said to converge again with narrative, which must be taken as the ultimate form of elaborating contingencies. Yet any given narrative is only one of a broad array of possible employments, even of the "same" events. The task of adjudicating alternative employments as "theories" of contingency lies outside narrative per se, and does not require the construction of narratives out of evidence.

No single form of discourse is adequate, independent of the others, as a basis of actual inquiry; each of these forms typically figures into any concrete inquiry, but not always in the same way. On the basis of different articulations among the four forms of discourse, we identify alternative strategies of inquiry. Because separate purposes typically are served by thematically historical as opposed to sociological orientations, it is possible to specify a series of four strategic approaches to "historical sociology" and a parallel set of four strategies for "sociological history."

Conclusion: The source of history is the place where topics related to history are raised according to social power, norms and values. First of all, history should be understood as History because it was first named in English. His+Story is not his story, his story. This statement needs to be understood that history writing began only after the society became male-dominated. History is the past and it is also the past, it shows the way. Comparative teaching can help in development. Now let's move on to the history of history writing. The diversity of these strategies suggests several considerations about the terrain where sociology and history meet, a terrain where disciplinary boundaries matter less than actual commitments by researchers to one strategy of inquiry or another. In general, the social research tradition and work to date has failed to provide a comprehensive account of the important issues that complicate the daily lives of ordinary Nepal's. The research programs have largely neglected the core problems of Nepal's and have given more importance to the mundane. In the social research efforts to date, few researchers have addressed the problems of landlessness and land ownership, wages, poverty, tenant farming, exploitation, and general socio-economic inequality that exist in Nepali society. Similarly, few of us researchers are engaged in systematically explaining the relationship between nature and society and the natural wealth that we are destroying at an astonishingly rapid pace. Few of us are going to study the problem of gender, population growth in depth. Our search for corruption and general political-administrative professional incompetence around us has not received the attention it deserves. Just because these are our main problems does not mean they are of any particular importance. In fact, they are among our most central concerns. Yet most of us do not seem to be able to deal

with these problems. However important these problems are, we have simply ignored them. But there is no doubt that in this process we are distancing ourselves from contributing to matters that are consistent with the long-term national problems.

Reference

1. Abbott, Andrew. Forthcoming. "What Do Cases Do? Some Notes on Activity in Sociological Analysis." In *What Is a Case?* edited by Charles C. Ragin and Howard S. Becker. New York: Cambridge University Press.
2. Abrams, Philip. 1982. *Historical Sociology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
3. Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1982. *Theoretical Logic in Sociology. Vol. 1: Positivism, Presuppositions, and Current Controversies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
4. Alexander, Jeffrey, Bernhard Giesen, Richard Minch, and Neil J. Smelser (eds.). 1978. *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
5. Althusser, Louis and Etienne Balibar. (1968) 1970. *Reading Capital*. London: New Left Books.
6. Anderson, Perry. 1974. *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism*. London: New Left Books.
7. Aron, Raymond. (1938) 1961. *Introduction to the Philosophy of History: An Essay on the Limits of Historical Objectivity*. Boston: Beacon.
8. Aronowitz, Stanley. 1981. "A Metatheoretical Critique of Immanuel Wallerstein's the Modern World System." *Theory and Society* 19: 503-20.
9. Ashton, T. H. and C. H. E. Philpin. 1985. *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Atkinson, R. F. 1978. *Knowledge and Explanation in History: An Introduction to the Philosophy of History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
11. Beer, Samuel. 1966. *British Politics in the Collectivist Age*. New York: Knopf.
12. Bell, Daniel. 1976. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.
13. Bellah, Robert N. 1985. *Habits of the Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
14. Bendix, Reinhard. 1978. *Kings or Peoples: Power and the Mandate to Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
15. Bloch, Marc. 1953. *The Historian's Craft*. New York: Random House.
16. Bonnell, Victoria E. 1983. *Roots of Rebellion: Workers' Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900-1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
17. Braudel, Fernand. (1969) 1980. *On History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
18. Brustein, William. 1988. *The Social Origins of Political Regionalism: France, 1849-1981*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
19. Burke, Peter. 1980. *Sociology and History*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
20. Buroway, Michael. 1990. "Marxism as Science: Historical Challenges and Theoretical Growth." *American Sociological Review* 55: 775-93.
21. Bynum, Caroline. 1987. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
22. Calhoun, Craig J. 1982. *The Question of Class Struggle: Social Foundations of Popular Radicalism during the Industrial Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
23. Carr, David. 1980. "Life and the Narrator's Art." Pp. 108-21 in *Hermeneutics & Deconstruction*, edited by Hugh J. Silverman and Don Ihde. Albany: State University of New York Press.
24. Carroll, David. 1980. "Representations of the End(s) of History: Dialectics and Fiction." *Yale French Studies* 59: 201-29.
25. Cohen, Sande. 1986. *Historical Culture: On the Recording of an Academic Discipline*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
26. Collins, Randall. 1986. "Weber's Last Theory of Capitalism." Pp. 19-44 in *Weberian Sociological Theory*, edited by Randall Collins. New York: Cambridge University Press.
27. Cook, Thomas D. and Donald T. Campbell. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
28. D'Andrade, Roy. 1986. "Three Scientific World Views and the Covering Law Model." Pp. 19-41 in *Metatheory in Social Science: Pluralisms and Subjectivities*, edited by Donald W. Fiske and Richard A. Shweder. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
29. Danto, Arthur C. 1985. *Narration and Knowledge*. New York: Columbia University Press.
30. Darnton, Robert. 1984. *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*. New York: Basic Books.
31. Tilly, Charles. 1984. *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage.
32. Touraine, Alain. (1984) 1988. *Return of the Actor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
33. Traugott, Mark. 1985. *Armies of the Poor: Determinants of Working-Class Participation in the Parisian Insurrection of June 1848*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
34. Von Laue, Theodore H. 1950. *Leopold Ranke: The Formative Years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
35. Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1979. *The Capitalist World-Economy: Essays*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

University Press.