Roles of Rahul Sankrityayan in Nepalese Cultural Tourism is an analysis of Nepalese Cultural tourism potentialities and facilitation of great personality. The study has identified the points on Independent Movement, on Diplomacy, on Buddhist Religious Tourism, on Art, Literature, and Language, and on Theorizing Tourism. Therefore, Nepal has to make a park in the memory of Sankrityayan with a Vihar for meditation, museum and library for the researchers and Stupa with some sorts of relics pilgrims. The main objective of the study is to find out the contributions of Sankrityayan in Nepalese Tourism development and to identify the roles of Rahul in cultural tourism in between India and Nepal. Methodologically the study is a general literature review of secondary information to identify and describe the roles of Rahul on the development of Nepalese Cultural Tourism. Every Indian Buddhist, Vaishnava, Marxist, or Student visitors to Nepal are compelled to visit and homage the tribute to Rahul. This compulsion really take place in the cultural tourism development of both the countries and strengthen the diplomatic tie in people to people connectivity.
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Introduction

Nationalism should be in borderline of a nation neither inside nor outside. Most importantly limiting a culture within a national boundary is disaster. Nepali culture is highly flourished in Assam, Bhutan, Darjeeling, Myanmar, Nepal, Sikkim, Uttarakhand, up to Satlaj river from east to west of Himalayan Hindukush region and the northern part of Ganga River. Studying Nepalese Culture within the boundary does not give actual sense. Study of contribution of Rahul Sankrityayan limiting within Indian boarder is another senseless job because he was the scholar of 34 languages and Himalayan Buddhism and visited entire Europe and Asia. By birth he is an Indian scholar, linguist, traveler, nationalist, and author of more than 150 books (Sarao, 2017). He is particularly known for his contribution to Tibetan Studies and Himalayan Buddhism, especially in bringing a large collection of manuscripts from Tibet, and housed in the Patna Museum.
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According to Sir Edward B. Tylor’s definition of culture (1871) “Culture… is that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society.” According to this definition Sankrityayan belongs the qualities of Knowledge, Beliefs, Morals, Arts and other capabilities to develop Nepalese cultural development. His works and his visits itself a pool of resources or inspiration of Nepalese Art Culture and tourism.

Given the cultural similarity between India and Nepal, the Nepalese readily welcomed Sankrityayan into their cultural community, so that Sankrityayan never really felt as if he were in a foreign land (Chudal, 2015). He was close friend of Nepal, Nepalese Himalayan Buddhism, and tourism. Culturally he had married Dr. Kamala Pariyar was a Nepali origin and was living in Darjeeling. Cultural tourism as “the absorption by tourists of features resembling vanishing lifestyles of past societies observed through such phenomena as house styles, crafts, farming equipment and dress” as defines UNESCO (Grieve, 2006). Cultural Tourism is in South Asia is dominated by pilgrimage and religious tourism. Buddhists as well as Hindus conduct pilgrim for the salvation and nirvana. The pilgrim itself a travel and important component of cultural tourism. Rahul Sankrityayan was the catalyst of Indian pilgrimage to Nepal in Pashupati and Lumbini.

Rahul Sankrityayan, often called mahāpandita (great scholar), was one of the most widely travelled scholars of India, who spent 45 years of his life in travelling away from home. He became a Buddhist monk and eventually moved towards Marxist Socialism (Kumar, 2018). He was arrested and jailed for nearly 3 years for his anti-British writings and speeches.

Rahul Sankrityayan was born on 9 April 1893 to an Orthodox Hindu Bhūmikār-Brāhma family in Pandha village of Azamgarh district in Uttar Pradesh. He was the eldest among five brothers and one sister. As his mother died early, he was brought up by his grandmother. Tourism is completely based on Dharma and Culture. He was originally Vaishnav and later on he became Buddhists so he was the scholar of the religion of South Asia (Sarao, 2017). He had linked China, India, Nepal, Russia, and Tibet, in as a garland.

He lived as a Vaiṣṇava saṅnyāsi from 1914 till 1930 and was known as Damodar Svāmī. Later, he took up the name Rahul after converting to Buddhism in 1930. Between 1921 and 1927, he participated in the freedom movement. As a result, he was arrested and spent some time in the prisons at Buxar and Hazari Bagh. Between the years 1936 and 1944, he actively participated in peasant movement and spent 29 months in jail (1940–42) for being a member of the Communist Party of India (Sarao, 2017). He was the man searching science in religion. He has analyzed Aryan culture and Civilization in Volga to Ganga. He had mixed perfectly the communist’s
Marxists ideology into religion or we can say he had perfectly separated each other the politics and religion. He was democratic political cadre at the beginning of his career in India.

He had his first marriage in his village when he was very young and left home. Secondly he had got chance to teach Buddhism in Leningrad University and married to Ellena Narvertovna Kozerovskaya and had a son (Igor) with her. Ellena and Igor were denied exit visa by the Communist authority to accompany Sankrityayan to India. Finally, Sankrityayan got married to Dr. Kamalā sankrityayan Pariyar (1920–2009) of Indo Nepalese origin and with her had a daughter (Jayā Pathak) and a son (Professor Jeta Sankrityayan of North Bengal University) (Sarao, 2017).

In the 1950s, he accepted a teaching job at a Sri Lankan University and was made a Tripitakacariya. While in Sri Lanka, he suffered seriously from diabetes, high blood pressure, and a mild stroke. After returning to Darjeeling, he was struck by a second stroke in 1961 and lost his memory as a result. His wife took him to Russia in 1962 for treatment, but there was no improvement. He was brought back to Darjeeling where he breathed his last on 14 April 1963 (Sarao, 2017). He has written more than 5000 pages among them the most popular books are Baudh Darsan, Darshan Digdarshan, Ghumakkar Shastra, Ghumakkar Swami, Kanaila ki Katha, Kinnar desh mein, Lhasa ki or, Madhya Asia kā Itihās, Mahamanav Buddha, Manava Samaj, Mansik Gulami, Rgvedic Arya, Sāmyavād hi kyoñ, Sādkhor kī Maut, Tibbat mein Baudh Dharm, Tumhārī Kṣāyā, and Vaigyānik Bhautikvād. (Sarao, 2017). Entire books are read worthy.

Objectives

The main objective of the study is to find out the contributions of Rahul Sankrityayan in Nepalese Tourism development endeavor. More specifically the study will identify the roles of Rahul Sankrityayan in cultural tourism in between India and Nepal.

Methodology

Methodologically the study is a general literature review of secondary information to identify and describe the roles of Rahul on the development of Nepalese Cultural Tourism. We might call it narrative biography of Sankrityayan. It is a qualitative factual historical analysis of roles of Rahul Sankrityayan in Nepal.

Discussion

Sankrityayan was an Indologist, a multilingual linguist, a Marxist theoretician, and a creative writer of varied interest. One of his most famous books is Volgā se Gangā in which historical elements
are remarkably interwoven with fiction whereby he provides an account of the migration of Āryans from the steppes of Eurasia to the regions around Volga River and thence across the Hindu Kush into the India subcontinent. Merī jīvan-yātrā, an autobiography in five lengthy volumes, offers a captivating account of his life. Amongst Nepali community, also providing valuable appendices on Rahul’s engagement with Nepal (Kumar, 2018). The perception of Sankritayayan and the reception of his work amongst Nepali community, also providing importance on Rahul’s activities in Nepal. people of the new generation in Nepal would be familiar with the life and works of a remarkable semi-freak, amorous anarchist, sadhu, linguist, literary creator, and a Marxist writer of India with over 120 books to his credit--named Rahul Sankritayyan (1893-1963) (Subedi, 2018). It means that he was a master of entire south Asian cultural vibes.

His connections with Nepalese were from different walks of life – scholars, merchants, politicians, writers, and others (Chudal, 2015). However, this article will limit its focus to Sankritayayan’s relation with the Nepalese religion, culture and tourism. Krishnachandra Singh Pradhan and Janaklal Sharma were very close associates of Sankritayyan, had a great repertoire of personal memories about writers of Nepal and India, and his episodes were unlimited (Subedi, 2018). The philosophy and character of Sankritayyan, a unique scholar of this region who dedicated his life to find links and forge bonds in terms of the commonalities of people, especially in spheres where they share a number of issues, scripts and cultures. It is typically especially interesting to recall Sankritayyan in today’s context when Nepal’s relationship with India is passing through a number of vicissitudes.

For the first time in the form of a one-and-a-half month trip to Kathmandu (during those days the capital was known as Nepal) in March–April 1923 to participate in the Śivarāṭri festival (Chudal, 2015) in Pashupati as a disguised Sadhan. It was his symbol of religious tourism. Entering Tibet was no easy thing for Indians at that time. After going over maps, he realized that he could only enter Tibet via Nepal, and penetrating Nepal up to Kathmandu was only possible for Indians during the Śivarāṭri festival. He left Sri Lanka on 1st December 1928 with the aim of utilizing the three months before Śivarāṭri by making pilgrimages in India to a number of historical places associated with the Buddha (Chudal, 2015). He was the contemporary of Laxmi Prasad Devekota and he had compared him as the Indian scholar Panta Prasad Niral.

**Roles on Independent Movement**

Nepal was Sankritayyan’s second home. Though it was a different country with a different polity, he never thought of Nepal as a vides (‘foreign country’). One clear reason for this was that he
understood that the country was an important place on the Indian subcontinent where his works were being read (Chudal, 2015). During his creative period, India was in conflict with the British over the question of sovereignty, while the Nepalese for their part were struggling against the Ranas. The visits to Nepal in 1920 and 1923 do not really reveal any clear aims other than the journey itself. Later, however, it would be his interest in Buddhism and Buddhist studies that drew Sankrityayan back. He wrote of his first Kathmandu visit in 1923 that it was meant as “a rest from the pressure of political work” and in fulfilment of a long cherished desire. Nepalese were fighting against Rana Regime and Indians were fighting against British rule in India in the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. His visit was a milestone for cultural relationship that had added extra energy on the movements. To commodify the historical event for Indian tourists Nepal should make a Nepal India Freedom Monument.

Roles on Diplomacy

On the very special day of Šivarātri, Mahārājā Chandra Shamsher visited the Thapathali math and was curious to learn what Sankrityayan had to say about the political situation in India in 1929. Rahul Sankrityaan was the special guest of Pandti Hemraj Sharma and kept in a math in Thapathali as Arya Samajist’s Speaker. The latter proved rather incommunicative, wishing to hide his identity as a political activist (Chudal, 2015). He did not answer means he was supporting democratic movement of Nepal. He had the philosophy of travelling, that a traveler should not have caste, creed, religion and nationality.

Romantic studies of cultural tourism have tended to theorize it as a pilgrimage by alienated modern individuals who seek the authenticity of other times and places away from their everyday life. Rahul’s every story is out of the permanent home. Tourism is understood as a leisure activity that presupposes its opposite, namely, regulated and organized work and the consumptive labor of late capitalism (Grieve, 2006). His religious ideologies of Hinduism and Buddhism of democratic religious freedom was neutralized by his social Marxists’ ideology so he was a good diplomat and was able to balance the relationship from Russia to India via Tibet and Nepal.

Sankrityayan felt Nepal to be his second home, a view grounded in the notions of “one cultural soul”. He developed intimate ties with Nepal and the Nepalese through his devotion to Buddhism and Buddhist studies. In the context of this study’s examination of Sankrityayan’s relationship with Nepal, his speech at the Fourth World Buddhist Conference held in Kathmandu in December 1956 is worth quoting. In front of a large gathering on the parade grounds of Tundikhel, where all the guests and King Mahendra Shah were assembled, he gave a spontaneous response in Hindi to the welcoming speech (Chudal, 2015).
His remarks on the speech, emblematic of Sankrityayan’s vision of India Nepal relations and why he regarded both countries as historically bound one to the other. In his opinion, their common culture (their one cultural soul) had united both countries. The common link between India and Nepal through Buddhism goes deeper, in that they witnessed the birth of the religion, but their links go far beyond even Buddhism. It is the symbol of unanimity of the Northern Ganga Civilization. This diplomatic ties must be known by new visitors and tourists who knows the scholars around the globe.

Roles on Buddhist Religious Tourism

During his visit in Nepal, he had gone to a village, Shikhar Narayan, in the south of the Valley near the Dakšinkāli temple and remained for two weeks. This place is called Pharaping. This is the place where Guru Padmasambhawa or Guru Rimpochhe of Himalayan Buddhism had got enlightenment from his meditation. It means that Sankrityayan had meditated for two weeks in Shikharapur Pharping. Then he turned his attention to searching for Buddhist texts, and towards this end visited some Buddhists in Patan. There he found out about the existence of some valuable Buddhist texts in the library of Hemraj Sharma, to whose house he directed himself (Chudal, 2015). Newar Buddhists in Patan, hearing Sankrityayan talk of himself as a Buddhist, were surprised that a Brahmin should have abandoned his caste. It was strange at that time that Brhaman were supreme and did not use to change their religion. Sankrityayan stayed at Dharmaman Sahu’s house for two days and moved into the newly renovated Kindol Vihara. Sankrityayan resided at Dharmaman Sahu’s kothi close to Asan Kathmandu. Dharmaman Sahu wrote a letter to his sons in Lhasa asking them to accommodate Sankrityayan there in Lasha as well.

Although Nepalese law was very strict, then, it was possible for people to get around it. Many non-Nepalese, such as Kawaguchi, Sankrityayan, and Rajnath, entered Tibet pretending to be Nepalese (Chudal, 2015). Sankrityayan had close relations with many members of the Theravada Buddhists movement in Nepal as well. He is still very famous in Tibet, India and Shri Lanka in Buddhism. Nepal can invite to pay tribute to his statue or a kind of monument in Nepal it will be remarkable cultural tourism development plan. Most of the Nepalese people visit Chaurasta Darjeeling because of being a statue of Nepal’s first poet Bhanubhakta Acharya.

Roles on Art, Literature, and Language

His first foreign travel was started from Nepal in 1923. Tourism is the business of connectivity. Art, literature and languages are such a fantastic glue of connectivity of people of different places. He had the perfect connectivity with Balakrishna Sama, Chittadhar Hridaya, Laxmiprasad
Devkota, Janaklal Sharma and Dharmaratna Yemi were writers, and Hemraj Sharma was a great grammarian and scholar associated with the Rana court had remarkable know how. Sankrityayan’s aphorism that poet Laxmirasad Devkota was the sum total of three major Hindi romantic or chayabadi poets—Panta, Prasad and Nirla, has gone down in Nepali literary criticism as the greatest single statement unfailingly quoted even to these days (Subedi, 2018). It means that he had linked with influencing scholars of Nepal. He had collected many Buddhists literatures, arts, thangkas, and he was perfect in Nepali languages. Copy of is collections should be preserved in a museum and have the access to the students and researchers of art, culture, history, international relation, Buddhism, and Marxism.

Roles on Theorizing Tourism

The magnum opus of Sankrityayan, “Volga se Ganga tak”, describes the migration of Aryans from the steppes of the Eurasia to the Volga river, their passage across the Hindukush and the Himalayas, and how they spread in the Indo-Gangetic plains of India. The book gives an account of the Aryans from 6000 BC to 1922. It gives the complete philosophy of travelling and migration (Sankrityayan, 1953). In his another famous book Dimagi Gulami, he claims that as long as we have long civilization we will be that much slave in our society (Sankrityayan, 2011).

There is on the one hand a wide variety of conceptual and theoretical approaches to tourism which have yet to be rigorously tested, as well as the proliferation of field studies which lack an explicit theoretical orientation and therefore contribute little to theory building (Franklin & Crang, 2001). It appears, therefore, that there is a need for a journal which contributes consistently to the development (and testing) of theory in the area of tourism and related studies, and which provides a platform for the development of critical perspectives on the nature of tourism as a social phenomenon (Franklin & Crang, 2001). It seems all too clear that the theoretical net needs to be cast much wider so that tourist studies are constantly renewed by developments in social and cultural theory and theory from other disciplines. We also need to examine the wider ramifications of tourism modalities and sensibilities. Tourism is no longer a specialist consumer product or mode of consumption: tourism has broken away from its beginnings as a relatively minor and ephemeral ritual of modern national life to become a significant modality through which transnational modern life is organized (Franklin & Crang, 2001).

By evoking Benedict Anderson’s theory of ‘imagined-community’ and that of ‘print-capitalism, Alaka has looked at Sankrityayan’s unique theory of the sphere of Hindi that trespasses the boundaries that scholars by using Jürgen Habermas’s theory of social sphere have been interpreting according to their needs (Subedi, 2018). Here, we must mention Francesca Orseni’s seminal work
The Hindi Public Sphere, 1920-1940: Language and Literature in the Age of Nationalism published by Oxford University Press in 2002, that theories on the core issue of nationalism and Hindi language sphere. Orsini says Hindi’s nationalist claim was “an ideological construct’ made at the expense of local languages, and it was ‘pure’, exclusive, and elitist. Was Sankrityayan’s theory of Hindi nationalist sphere an elitist approach? (Subedi, 2018). Although he had rewritten the history of India about the socio culture and political economy of 350 to 400 AD from touristic glimpses (Sankrityayan, 1944). To build first of all it needs a hypothesis, a philosophy, an assumption and measurable proposition. In such a case he has given a direction and philosophy toward the tourism development. He had assumed the mean and end of travel is itself the travel.

“Oh! ignorant, go and travel all over the world. You will not get this life again. Even if you live long, youth will never return.” – Rahul Sankrityayan

Conclusion

In conclusion the role of Rahul Sankrityayan in cultural tourism development of Nepal can be summarized from the points on Independent Movement, on Diplomacy, on Buddhist Religious Tourism, on Art, Literature, and Language, and on Theorizing Tourism. Therefore, Nepal has to make a park in the memory of Rahul Sankrityayan with a Vihar for meditation, museum and library for the researchers and Stupa with some sort of relics pilgrims. The location of the park should be near Pharping in between Kathmandu and Patan. Every Indian Buddhist, Vaishnava, Marxist, or Student visitors to Nepal are compelled to visit and homage the tribute to Rahul. This compulsion really take place in the cultural tourism development of both the countries.
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