Editorial

Inaction is a fen that rots and sleeps,
It drowns the child called reason ere ye know.
Channelized visions live and move and glow –
Perennial streams that ever seaward sweeps,
   Full-tided all the boulders.

....

Flow waters flow... for in this flow is life,
   Experience in motion gives you light,
Patterns you finely in your living strife,
And gives you pulse, increasing depth aright.
Let flow the choicest dreams! Upon your shore
   The richest harvests grow for evermore.

[Laxmi Prashad Devkota, “Your noblest dreams are powers.”
   Bapu and Other Sonnets]

A University, like Devkota’s “perennial streams,” is in constant strife to let flow people’s “choicest dreams” allowing “richest harvests to grow for evermore.” University teachers, as leaders of this flow and that of the growth of knowledge, are in a two-dimensional struggle. First, they must save themselves from “inaction ... that rots and sleeps” and “drowns the child called reason.” They should work as channels to let knowledge flow across generations. Success in such venture depends on their access to existing resources and on the ability to internalize ideas to the benefit of others at transference. Second, they must add new dimensions to the existing knowledge and simultaneously take challenges (sometimes risks) of creating completely new knowledge. Bodhi was envisioned in order to continue this struggle.

Three years’ journey with Bodhi has been marked with what Francis Bacon postulates in one of his famous treatises: “He that questioneth much shall learn much, and content much; but especially if he apply his questions to the skill of the persons...
whom he asketh: for he shall give them occasion to please themselves in speaking, and himself shall continually gather knowledge” (“Of Discourse”). For us this means questioning ourselves to learn, questioning others to learn, and creating a space for more questions in the venture to “continually gather more knowledge.” We began Bodhi in 2007 to substantiate our inquisitions into different fields of humanities and social sciences, particularly because our affiliation with media studies demanded this interdisciplinary leaning. The two earlier issues have helped us mature, to some extent, in this pursuit of knowledge, if not to the level of perfection but of contentment at least. We feel more enriched by the time the third issue takes shape. We have more resources to transfer to our students, and more avenues to suggest for their own inquiries.

This issue contains 12 articles from the writers of Korea, Nepal, Norway, and the USA. The articles deal with a range of issues with particular leaning in the discourses in media related subjects.

Jae-won Lee and Leo W. Jeffres discuss the issues of news media’s roles in bridging the “chasm between public-sphere ideals and media’s business imperatives.” They argue that the advocacy of professionalization in journalism “is now stifling the very subjectivity in the course of objectification, as evident in such consequences as news conformity or standardization of news.”

Hem Raj Kafle outlines the development of media studies as a discipline. He mentions some dimensions of the field’s interdisciplinarity. His critical focus is on the general skepticism about professionalism and employability of the field.

Laxman Datt Pant presents a critical assessment of journalism and media education in Nepal. He presents a sketch of the “triangular relationship between corporate, educational and socioeconomic challenges” of the discipline in Nepal.
Sten T. Brand outlines some facets of media’s role in the wake of the 2008 Constituent Assembly Election in Nepal. He points that “literacy and locale played a major role in people’s attitude and knowledge” of the Constituent Assembly election.

Indra Dhoj Kshetri discusses the trend of the use of agency materials by Nepali newspapers. He argues that “it is too early to conclude that they have adopted McJournalism.” He recommends further researches into the “impact of public relations in news content or the use of PR agency materials by Nepali press.”

Khagendra Acharya studies the issue of English mixing in Nepali television commercials. He argues that English mixed commercials signify an edeavour to construct and reinforce modernity.

Deepak Aryal discusses whether oral traditions can be taken as valid historical sources. He suggests the extension of historiography beyond written texts arguing that “even distorted or blurred oral traditions” are a part of history.

Nirmala Mani Adhikary describes the sadharanikaran model of communication and delineates its fundamentals. This is the first ever such document in English that presents extensive description of the model, which he had developed and presented in 2003. Till the date, comprehensive discussions on the sadharanikaran model itself were available only in Nepali.

Krishna Paudel analyzes the link between space, time and event. He proposes inclusion of GIS, Remote Sensing and GPS in the curriculum of media studies to make students acquainted with ‘spatial thinking.’

Janga Bahadur Chauhan dedicates his article to late poet Laxmi Prashad Devkota on the occasion of the latter’s centenary year celebration in Nepal. In personal nostalgic tone, Chauhan brings references on Devkota’s affinity with then
Soviet Union, his contribution to enhancing Nepal-Russia literary and cultural relationship, and the respect given to him by Russian writers and poets.

Lopita Nath presents a survey of the lifestyle of Nepalis in San Antonio, USA, from the point of diaspora studies. She examines “issues of identity, assimilation, adjustment and notions of home expressed in Nepalis struggles to create a new sense of themselves in the process of self-construction which immigrants commonly encounter in the USA.”

Ram Chandra Paudel takes account of the origin of Vedas. He discusses that Vedas are divine creations, and that “individuals who understand that all the living creatures have one and same soul and see no difference between self and other, have the true knowledge of Vedas.”