TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Exploration of Female Individuality: A Third World Feminist Reading of Bijaya Malla's *Anuradha*

A Thesis Submitted to Central Department of English

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Amita Sapkota

Central Department of English

Kirtipur

July 2010

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Recommendation

Ms. Amita Sapkota has completed her thesis entitled **Exploration of Female Individuality: A Third World Feminist Reading of Bijaya Malla's *Anuradha*** under my supervision. She carried out this research from February 2010 to July 2010. I hereby recommend her thesis to be submitted for viva voce.

Mr. Dipak Giri

Supervisor

Date: ----------

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Approval

This Thesis entitled **Exploration of Female Individuality: A Third World Feminist Reading of Bijaya Malla's *Anuradha*** submitted to Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Ms. Amita Sapkota has been approved by the undersigned members of research committee.

Members of the research committee:

_____ _____

Internal Examiner

_____

_____ _____

External Examiner

_____

_____ _____

Head of
Central Department of English

_____

Date:_____

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to offer my profound gratitude to my respected supervisor Mr. Deepak Giri, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, for his constant encouragement and valuable time. His support enabled me to bring the present work into realization.

Similarly, I am extremely indebted and whole-heartedly grateful to Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Head of the Central Department of English, Kirtipur, for his encouragement, affection to accomplish and approval of this research work. In the same line, I am very much thankful to Mr. Harihar Gyanwali and Mr. Badri Acharya, for their constant support for the material to handle the project.

I cannot forget to thank all the respondents friend Mitra Lamsal and supportive friends for their continual support in different stages of difficulty while undertaking this research. I will be equally grateful to Bijaya Malla, author of *Anuradha* book, and translator Larry Hartsell.

Finally, I acknowledge my father Khur Prasad Sapkota, mother Goma Sapkota, brother Kshitiz, and Sister Akriti for their good will and blessings in every step of my life.

August 2010 Amita Sapkota

Abstract

Malla's *Anuradha* explores Anuradha's individuality by opposing any specific forms of exploitation propagated by male ideology and female submission. Anuradha tries her best to oppose her forceful marriage, thereby resisting the exploitation of male culture and hegemonized female supporters. Her mother forces her for forceful marriage with Ratnaman Singh without her consent. She feels that all males see her from an eye of lustfulness. For them, her beauty and smile can become an easy target. In these backdrops, she develops her value of freedom and individuality to the extent that her extreme hatred and revenge turns herself as a psychopath.

Contents

I. Bijaya Malla's *Anuradha* as Third World Women's Experience

This research analyzes Bijaya Malla's novel *Anuradha* in the light of third world feminism thereby exploring the individuality and self of the protagonist Anuradha. The term "third world feminism" designates the experience of third world women that is otherwise than the experience of western women. Third world feminism emerged in the early 1990s thereby challenging the essentialist definitions of femininity of Western feminism.

The focus of this study is on the theory called Third World feminism. It studies the biases, and prejudices of the ethnocentric orientation of Western feminism. It comments Western feminisms' neglect of the unique experiences of the women from Third World countries. According to Chandra Talpade Mohanty, women in the third world feel that Western feminism bases its understanding of women on "internal racism, classism and homophobia" (Introduction 49).

Spivak's proposition of strategic essentialism articulates a critique of Western feminist scholars for discursive colonization of Third World women's lives and struggles. This is a critical strategy, which imitates the negative representation of minority groups such as women. The idea of strategic essentialism implies that the essentialist categories of human identity should be criticized. For minorities like Third World feminists and working class people, the use of essentialism functions as a short-term strategy to affirm a political identity.

According to Sara Suleri, Third World women's identity relies in the imbrication of race and gender. In the Third World context, Women's body has been colonized by patriarchy. Therefore, Third World women writers try to decolonize their body in their writings and resist the patriarchy. Mostly women are dominated through language and their sexuality in so-called patriarchal society.

The gender essentialism does not represent the problems of marginalized women in relation to the privileged white, Western, middle class women . In such case, Uma Narayan

favors cultural essentialism to gender essentialism. The triple colonization of women under imperial conditions entails the relegated status of the Third world women's rights and equality under imperial ideology, native and foreign patriarchy that fosters the everlasting domination, and suppression of Third World women.

Third World women's liberation is necessary, but we should understand the link between political, social, economic, and sexual oppression. The very link provides the Third world women to explore their self through identifying any either/ or process of exploitation and striking back to them. According to Kumari Jayabardena, Third World feminism not only deals about foreign ideology 'imposed' on 'Third World' countries, but it also focuses women's struggle for equal rights and against the subordination of women themselves. This issue is vital in Third World's case.

Bijaya Bahadur Malla was born in Kathmandu in 1925 and grew up under the tutelage of his father Riddhi Bahadur Malla. He began his writing career by writing articles for his father's newspaper *Yugabani*. He is renowned for his campaign for world peace. During those days, when many of the countries worldwide were denouncing the authority of the League of Nations, their waging of cold war against each other and dedicating their resources to making numerous nuclear bombs, Bijaya Malla expressed his strong disagreement against those nations through his writings. In his classic short story *Antim Bhoj*, he presented a picture of the last feast of the human kind where he put the nations with nuclear weapons on one side and the underdeveloped ones in the other. Such open criticism even during those days of strong foreign policy and diplomatic dramas is highly appreciated by the Nepalese community.

He is also known as a poet, prose writer, short story writer and a playwright. Much of his works try to expose the social, historical, progressive and psychological themes. Many of his stories tell about his impressions on man-woman relationship. Some of his writing also

include Freudian psychology influenced by B.P. Koirala. For political reason, he was sent to prison, where he initiated to write verses. He had shown optimistic ideology in his writings during that time. One poem *Bhitta* reflected the senselessness of struggle against a firm wall. Other poems such as *Timi Natarsha, Bom khasala, Chhorilai manchitra padhaunda* are later compiled to be a popular *Kabita Sangraha.*

Some of his popular works are *Anuradha,* the one-act play *Kohi Kin Barbad Hos,* and the collection of short stories titled *Ek Bato Anek Mod* and *Jyudo las*. His classic story *Antim Bhoj* tried to depict the international political scenarios where strong nation with might in one catagory and rest of the world in other side. Another story *Parewa Ra Kaidi* first appeared in Madhuparka, which gave him the recognition of a prolific writer.

He was a former vice chancellor of Royal Nepal Academy. He was also one of the leading voices of the Sharada group of writers. Sharada is an early literary magazine that published some of the greatest talents of modern Nepali literature. He had been suffering from diabetes. At the age of seventy four, he passed away while undergoing treatment at Bir Hospital.

Malla's *Anuradha* (trans. 2007) has been interpreted and criticized from different perspectives by many critics. Malla's *Anuradha* dramatizes the break down of the Anuradha's psychological and mental state amidst the fault line of patriarchy supported by females themselves. Her mother continually forces her to unwilling marriage and relationship with Ratnamansingh. Anuradha's suffering of forceful marriage contributes to degenerate her madness and psychosis.

Anuradha is a powerful novel that aims to explore pain and sufferings faced by woman in the contemporary society. In this regard, Basudev Tripathi looks the rebellious attitude in female character, who subvert the absurdity of the life and says, "*Anuradha* by Bijaya Malla is not only the portrayal of a social rebel but also revolution against total

absurdity and disjunction of life. Thus, *Anuradha* is not a study of time and place, it is the exploration of the total value of the life" (121).

In the similar manner, critic Indra Bahadur Rai sees it from psychoanalytical perspectives, "Psychoanalysis is the reality of the novel *Anuradha.* By serving few drops of water of psychoanalysis, Malla has turned the stream towards the reader" (24). With the same token, another critic Abhi Subedi locates the novel with modernist deal and says, "*Anuradha* is a modern novel by Malla. He wrote a popular novel *Anuradha*, which even represent the Freudian psychoanalysis" (117). In the same brand, Taranath Sharma says:

> *Anuradha* is a textbook presentation of Freudian complexes forcibly crammed down the throat of Anuradha, a psychopathic woman. It is extremely rare, if not downright impossible, to come across a woman like Anuradha who spits out Freudian analyses every time, or a man like Komal Man who is a masochist for the pleasure of the author. Vijaya Malla is very fond of making very unusual experiments. (4)

Sharma still would have to say other side of the *Anuradha.* The very dubbing of the same psychoanalytic brand is almost same like creating the western version of psychoanalysis. The protagonist Anuradha not only suffers from patriarchy but also from matriarchal family environment, which is subsumed with the cultural patterns, behavior, and money minded cultural constructions.

Jagdish Ghimire, another litterateur reviews it merely as a love story. His surface reading of the fiction can entail to the noxious fact of the fiction *Anuradha.*

> Bijay Malla's Anuradha is a beautiful love story of a man, who falls in love with a schizophrenic woman named Anuradha. Anuradha was previously married to director Ratna Man. Being a woman of independent ideas; she ends up hysteric, due to the possessive attitude of Ratna Man. And the narrator of

> the story meets her in the train and falls for this hysteric woman, unsure if she would ever reciprocate it. (*Republica* 14 Feb 2009: 13)

In the review, Ghimire is not aware about the woman-woman relationship of Nepalese context, which is in fact evidential in the fiction. The relationship between Anuradha and her mother is very hostile-some. Women's suppression in this regard is due to a woman's misunderstanding of another woman.

In the similar way, in "Anuradha ko Katha," by Himalayan readers club discusses on the issue of vibrant and revolting character Anuradha. The article says:

> The character of Anuradha was analysed to be a revolting lady, who while passing through the worst time is determined to take revenge against the destroyer of her life. A man with power and a lot of political influences can begin writing the fate of anyone but, he cannot make puppet out of a human being with self-esteem. Anuradha is an example. Anuradha's insanity is tragic, but her determination and a clear-cut vision about life suggest HOPE. (1)

It not only focuses on the revolting character of the protagonist, but also raises some important questions regarding the issue. It even sees the contextual side of the novel, and questions "Can Anuradha be an icon of independence and democracy?" (1), it even hints that there is the proper relevance of the political vicissitudes of 1950s of Nepal.

In this way, Malla's *Anuradha* has been analyzed from different perspectives. As this researcher observes, some of the critics point out the issue of love relationship, social rebel, psycho-sexual complexity, and so on. None of the aforementioned critics has inquired the issue of woman- woman relationship in the social life of Nepalese text. In this context, this research studies exploration of a female's self and individuality within the backdrop of third world women's colonization—through native patriarchy, and local matriarchal ethos. In this project, it lays special focus on unique experiences of the Third World women.

As the issue of hypothesis at hand demands, Third World feminism is the theoretical tool to analyze the text. But in doing so, it will not cross the frontier of the textual research. It is proved with the supports of different writers and critics from the domain concerned. The dissertation is divided into four chapters. The first chapter of this research is general introduction. The second chapter is methodology to research thesis as per the demand of hypothesis. The third chapter is textual analysis, which focuses on the exploration of the individuality and self within the milieu of exploitation of women through native patriarchy, and local matriarchy within the local context of Nepal. Finally, chapter four will wrap up the whole explanations put forward in the preceding chapters and shows Third World feminist reading of Malla's *Anuradha* thereby exploring the self and individuality of the protagonist focusing the assertion of women's cultural resistance.

II. Third World Feminism and Exploration of Self

Third-world feminism is that branch of philosophy, which deals with the unique experiences of the women in the so-called Third world countries. The feminists who are engaged in such activities are known as Third world Feminists. They see the loopholes of Western feminism in its inability to address the history and heritage of the Third world culture thereby analyzing different types of suppression and marginalization of women in different scenarios of global and local patriarchy. It also sees the vicious functioning of matriarchy that functions as a unique experiences of the Third culture. Third-world feminism commenced as a response to perceived failures of western feminism in the early 1990s. It seeks to challenge the essentialist definitions of femininity of western feminism, which are over-emphasized and generalized versions of the experiences of upper middle-class white women.

Different theorists like Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Sara Suleri, Ketu Katrak, Uma Narayan, Kumari Jayabardane, Rajeshwari Sundar Rajan, Nawal El Saadawi, and others have criticized Western feminism because of its ethnocentric orientation and neglect of the unique experiences of women from third-world countries or the existence of feminism(s) indigenous to third-world countries. According to Chandra Talpade Mohanty, women in the third world feel that Western feminism bases its understanding of women on "internal racism, classism and homophobia" (Introduction 49).

Mohanty in her work *Feminism without Borders* (2003) recognizes a deep belief in the power and significance of Third world feminist thinking in struggles for economic and social justice. It emphasizes an enterprise and a project that embodies the international commitment for best feminist practices. Through this commitment, she is urging the possibility of the border-less feminism. She says:

> Feminism without borders is not the same as "border-less" feminism. It acknowledges the fault lines, conflicts, differences, fears, and the containment that borders represent. It acknowledges that there is no one sense of a border, that the lines between and through nations, races, classes, sexualities, religions, and disabilities [. . .] a feminism without borders must envision change and social justice work across these lines of demarcation and division. (2)

In her analysis, the speaking of plurality and crossing the narrowness of borders avoiding the silences and exclusions is evidential. For her, "feminism without borders," stresses the most expansive and inclusive visions of feminism thereby transcending the very borders of feminism established by the Western feminists.

There is an important difference between Western and Third world feminism in terms of conceptualization of woman as a subject of struggle. Western feminists make equality between men and women as the center of their struggle. According to Saunders, Third world feminism stresses "satisfaction of basic material needs as a pressing issue in the context of disadvantageous international economic order" (6). In this way, the principle struggle of Third world women should be centered around the satisfaction of basic needs, and basic rights. They believe that women should attain freedom not only from gender related inequalities, but also from those related to race, class, and national asymmetries.

Mohanty wishes to analyze specifically the production of the Third world women as a singular, monolithic subject in some feminist texts. She even defines the issue of colonization as a predominant discursive discipline. In such context, she analyzes the intellectual and political construction of 'Third World feminisms' in terms of two simultaneous projects:

> [T]he internal critique of hegemonic 'Western' feminisms and the formulation of autonomous feminist concerns and strategies that are geographically,

> historically, and culturally grounded. The first project is one of deconstructing and dismantling; the second is one of building and constructing. [. . .]. Third World feminisms run the risk of marginalization or ghettoization from both mainstream and Western feminist discourses. (17)

In such analysis, there is the testimony of real case scenario of the validity and inclusiveness of Third world feminism in opposition to Western ethnocentric feminism. The process of dismantling and deconstructing western feminist formulation and the creation of new history of Third world women is essential because the women of the Third world can no more follow the risk of marginalization thereby taking the subservient nature of women. In this space, they even search their self and individuality through opposing their oppressor and searching their own potentiality.

For her, the relationship between woman and women is one of the central questions that the practice of feminist scholarship seeks to address. She defines the concept "woman" as a cultural and ideological composite, which is represented through diverse representational discourses like scientific, literary, juridical, linguistic, cinematic and so on. Similarly, the concept of "women" is real, material subjects of their collective history. She says:

> This connection between women as historical subjects, and the representation of woman produced by hegemonic discourses is not a relation of direct identity or a relation of correspondence or simple implication. It is an arbitrary relation set up by particular cultures. I would like to suggest that the feminist writings I analyze here discursively colonize the material and historical heterogeneities of the lives of women in the Third World. (*Feminism without Borders* 19)

By this, she suggests that the feminist writings discursively colonize the material and historical imbalances of the lives of the women in the Third World. The Western feminists'

production and representation of Third world women is a composite, and singular, stereotypical one, which is criticized by Third World feminists.

Third world feminism discovers and articulates a critique of Western feminist scholars for discursive colonization of Third World women's lives and struggles. Therefore, it produces or represents different icon otherwise than Western humanistic discourse. Mohanty further says:

> The assumption of women as an already constituted, coherent group with identical interests and desires, regardless of class, ethnic, or racial location, or contradictions implies a notion of gender or sexual difference or even patriarchy that can be applied universally and cross-culturally. (21)

In this regard, she focuses the strategic location of category 'women' in relation to the context of analysis. The context of analysis can be anything like kinship structures, the organization of labor or media representations. In these designations, she sees the different implication and assumption of a woman than class, ethnic or racial location.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak examines the effects of political independence of subaltern of inferior women, blacks, and other marginalized people in the Third World. Her subaltern studies refers to the subjugation of women or female subjects by dialogue between male dominated West and male-dominated East. She says:

> In subaltern studies, because of the violence of imperialist epistemic, social, and disciplinary inscription, a project understood in essentialist terms must traffic in a radical textual practice of difference [. . .]. Subaltern historiography must confront the impossibility of such gestures. The narrow epistemic violence of imperialism gives us the imperfect allegory of the general violence that is the possibility of an episteme. (qtd. in *Postcolonial Studies Reader* 27-28)

Spivak sees the epistemic violence as a bitter side of colonial experience. She even takes the same tool to strike back to imperial thinking and behavior. Her critique is rather academic because she sees epistemic violence as a naughty face of colonial stigma and violence. Therefore, she despises the essentializing, dominating, and coercive Western male and female tendency thereby valorizing the subalternity of the then so called colonized countries.

Spivak even proposes a critical strategy, which imitates the negative representation of minority groups such as women, the subaltern, or the working class. She refers this critical strategy as strategic essentialism. The idea of strategic essentialism accepts that essentialist categories of human identity should be criticized. For minorities like Third World feminists and working class people, the use of essentialism functions as a short-term strategy to affirm a political identity. In this regard, the rereading of the Western feminist literary criticism is essential. According to her, "As the female individualist, not quite/not male, articulates herself in shifting relationship to what is at stake, the 'native female' as such (within discourse as a signifier) is excluded from any share in this emerging norm" (*Critical Inquiry* 245).

In the similar manner, Sara Suleri observes that current feminist discourse is embedded with the questions of identity formation. This view leads to the debates between essentialism and conservatism or distinctions between situated and universal knowledge. For her, Third World feminism is:

> [S]till prepared to grant an uneasy selfhood to voice that is best described as the property of "Postcolonial women" whether this voice represents perspectives as divergent as the African American, or the Post-colonial cultural location, its imbrications of race and gender are accorded an iconicity that is altogether too good to be true. ("Women Skin Deep" 758)

The concept of imbrications is very much fascinating in this regard. The creation of icon through the imbrications of race and gender is the Third World women's identity, which is bad. In this hybrid space, there is the formation of identity, which is arranged in an overlapping manner and there is a chance of subsuming Western notions. Suleri thinks that 'Radical subjectivity' frequently translates into a low-grade romanticism that cannot recognize its discursive status. In this context, she says:

> When feminism turns to lived experience as an alternative mode of radical subjectivity, it only rehearses the objectification of its proper subject. While lived experience can hardly be discounted as a critical resource for an apprehension of the gendering of race, neither should such data serve as the evacuating principle for both historical and theoretical contexts alike. (*Women Skin Deep* 761)

She analyzes that structure of racial body and theoretical interventions becomes minimal into the category of lived experience. According to her, the body serves as testimony of lived experience. The very body receives the sufficient questions from different perspectives on the dialogue between race and gender.

She realizes that hitherto reality is Eurocentric and patriarchal, which cannot represent disparate cultural and ethnic realities. Therefore, she advocates for the radical feminism which can be able to provide an alternative perspective. The very alternative strategy can be a radical strategy thereby responding the situated experience. She says:

> [. . .] If realism is the Eurocentric and patriarchal pattern of adjudicating between disparate cultural and ethnic realities, then it is surely the task of radical feminism to provide an alternative perspective. In the vociferous discourse that such a task has produced, however, the question of alternativism is all too greatly subsumed either into the radical strategies that are designed to

> dictate the course of situated experience, or into the methodological imperatives that impel a work related to Woman, Native, Other such as bell Hookes' *Talking back: Thinking Feminist and Thinking black*. (*Women Skin Deep* 763-764)

In such context, we see Third world feminism as radical feminism, which provides an alternative perspective representing different disparate cultural and ethnic realities. That is why, it is inclusive and egalitarian activities to raise the different socio-cultural realities of the then marginalized Third World women.

In her book, *The Rhetoric of India* (1992), she has observed the function of narrative of empire, which functions as a tool to control colonized. The issue of narrative has become a great issue in the Third World viewpoint, because as a tool it let them to be ruled for a long ages. She observes:

> The narrative of empire do not merely "mess" with the colonial subject, but are in themselves encoded with a dubiety that requires the function of intransigence to protect the myth of colonial authority [. . .]. This absence of authority is most readily discernible in the colonial will to cultural descriptions, which demonstrates an anxious impulse to insist that colonized peoples can indeed be rendered interpretable within the language of the colonizer. (7)

Her analysis of narrative of empire is equally important for Third World feminism. Third World feminism avoids myth of Western feminism like avoiding the myth of colonial authority. Such absence of authority entails cultural descriptions of the history and heritage of Third World scenario.

Ketu Katrak, another prominent theorist, defines Third World women's body under the title "Theorizing a Politics of Female Body" and says that women's body has been

colonized by patriarchy. Therefore, Third World women writers try to decolonize their body in their writings and resist the patriarchy through internal and external exile. Mostly women are dominated through language and their sexuality in so called patriarchal society. By using the English language, colonizers impose racial superiority as well as they make women linguistically and culturally alienated from the native language and culture. Ketu Katrak says that, “The uses of English over indigenous languages, imposed by colonialism and how linguistic choices encode cultural belonging or alienation and second the female body and generated inequalities in patriarchal postcolonial society” (*Politics of Female Body* 1).

According to her, women in the Third World postcolonial society have become victims of gender inequalities both in the indigenous and the colonial culture. Both of them simultaneously oppress women. Ketu Katrak argues that Mahatma Gandhi's resistance to British colonial rule in India proffers gendered representations for the purposes of Indian nationalism but that did not become fruitful to free Indian women from their patriarchal subordination to men. Katrak says:

> Gandhi's appropriated images of passive women to promote his campaign of 'passive résistance' to British colonial rule. Both men and women were encouraged to adopt a passivity exclusively associated with feminity, although only for the purposes of breaking colonial authority and not patriarchal authority. (179)

By this, she has hinted at a trend towards male chauvinism in many forms of nationalism. The representation of the icon of the nation as mother India or mother Africa are used in nationalist representation to reconstruct the image of the passive female who depends upon the active males to protect her or restore her honor.

In the same way, Kumkum Sangari and Suresh Vaid feel the demand of analysis of consciousness of other historical periods with the subdivision of other factors like gender, caste, and class.

> If feminism is to be different, it must acknowledge the ideological and problematic significance of its own past. Instead of creating yet another grand tradition or a cumulative history of emancipation, neither of which can deal with our present problems, we need to be attentive to how the past enters differently into the consciousness of other historical periods and is further subdivided by a host of other factors including gender, caste, and class. (18)

They analyze the ground of feministic movements and try to evoke the revision of ideological and problematic significance of its own past so that Third World feminism can come in full fledge with exploration of self by including each and every aspect of marginal location of women.

Uma Narayan in *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third World Feminism* (1997) aims at the related notion of nation, identity, and tradition to show how western and third world scholars have misrepresented third world culture and feminist genders. It directs a philosophical perspective on areas of ongoing interest such as nationalism, post-colonial studies and the cultural politics of debates over tradition and westernization in Third World context. According to her, since Western feminism cannot locate the unique experience of Third World cultural designations, it is invalid in such context. She argues, “[T]hird World feminism is not a mindless mimicking of “Western agendas” (13). She further sees:

> [W]omen in Western contexts might be unfamiliar with the violence against women connected to the contemporary functioning of the institutions of dowry and arranged marriages. They have no strangers to battery and violence

> prevalent within their own various forms of marriage and family arrangements. They are no strangers either to the sense of shame that accompanies admitting victimization, or to a multiplicity of material, social, and cultural structures that pose serious impediments to women seeking assistance or to their leaving abusive relationships. (13)

In such designations, it shows that Western feminism cannot address different, and so called unique experiences of the Third World women. Their continual ignorance to address the cause of dowry murders, dowry related harassment, issues relating to women's poverty, work, health and reproduction shows that they are unable to address the social cultural experiences of Third World societies.

For her, essentialist generalizations of the Western Feminist thinking proceeds with the Western Feminist representations of the women in the Third World contexts. She valorizes individualistic exploration of self in this context by amalgamating the core Third World issues. She says:

> Ahistorical and apolitical Western feminist understandings of "Third World traditions" continue to appear, for instance, in more contemporary work on issues such as *sati* and dowry-murder, and in discussions relating to human rights-based interventions into "cultural practices" affecting Third-World women. (43)

By this, she comments on Western feminists on the ground of their colonialist stance with respect to their representations of Third World cultures, traditions, and problems. Her case study of *Sati* and dowry murder is a vicious history and unique experiences of the Third World countries especially that of South Asian societies.

Similarly, she in her essay, "Essence of Culture and a Sense of History," draws parallel between gender essentialism and cultural essentialism. She points out some of the

common features of essentialist pictures of culture. According to her, “cultural essentialism is detrimental to feminist agendas,” and therefore she suggests strategy for its avoidance (86). Gender essentialism proceeds to assume and construct sharp binaries about the qualities, abilities, or locations of “men” and “women” whereas, cultural essentialism assumes and construct sharp binaries between “Western culture” or “non-Western cultures”. She says:

> Gender essentialism often conflates socially dominant cultural norms with the cultural values and practices of a culture. While gender essentialism often equates the problems, interests, and locations of some socially dominant groups of men and women with those of “all men” and “all women”. Cultural essentialism equates the values, world views, and practices of some socially dominant groups with those of “all members of a culture.” (88)

In her analysis, she points out that cultural essentialism is being generated as a result of self-conscious feminist attempts to avoid gender essentialism. She even presents testimony of Mary Daly’s *Indian Sutee* (1978), which is a reproduction of an essentialist picture of Indian culture both by ignoring that sati was not a practice ever engaged in by all Indians.

According to her, gender essentialism might end up subscribing to cultural essentialism. Feminists effort to avoid gender essentialism sometimes result in pictures of cultural differences among women. She thinks:

> The gender essentialism perpetuated by relatively privileged subjects including Western feminists, is understood to be a form of “cultural imperialism,” whereby privileged subjects tend to construct their “cultural others” in their own image, taking their particular locations, and problems to be those of “All women”. (89)

The generalization of “all women” is replaced by culture specific essentialist generalizations that depend on totalizing categories such as Western culture, non-Western culture and so on.

Since essentialist generalizations result in theoretical perspectives and political agendas, it effaces the problems, perspectives, and political concerns of many women. She thinks:

> Women's subordination to their confinement to domestic roles and the private sphere can constitute problematic essentialist generalizations if they ignore that the links between femininity and the private sphere are not transhistorical but have arisen in particular historical contexts. Thus, while the ideology of domesticity may have immured many middle class women in the home, it also sanctioned the ethnocentric exploitation of women slaves and working class women, whose most pressing problems did not result from their confinement to the private sphere. (86-87)

In such effort, the feminists' avoidance of gender essentialism can become inevitable. The feminist critique of gender essentialism does not merely charge women's generalizations as hegemonic in that they represent the problems of privileged women, white, Western, middle class, heterosexual as women's issues.

Kirsten Holst Petersen and Anna Rutherford have used the phrase 'double colonization' to refer to the ways in which women have simultaneously experienced the oppression of colonialism and patriarchy. They together argue that colonialism celebrates male achievement in a series of male oriented myths such as "mateship, the mounties, explorers, freedom fighters, bushrangers, missionaries" (9).

In this context, Leela Gandhi's analysis of the problematic history of the Western feminists' designation of "feminist-as-imperialist," is important because it criticizes the colonialist deployment of "feminist criteria" to arouse the appeal of the civilizing mission. She analyzes:

> The most significant collision and collusion of postcolonial and feminist theory occurs around the contentious figure of the 'third world' women. Some

> feminist postcolonial theorists have cogently argued that a blinkered focus on racial politics inevitably elides the ‘double colonization’ of women under imperial conditions. Such theory postulates the third world women as victim par excellence—the forgotten casualty of both imperial ideology, and native and foreign patriarchal. (83)

In her analysis, double colonization of women under imperial conditions entails the relegated status of the Third world women’s rights and equality. Their victim is rather caused by triple consciousness. She hints that imperial ideology, native and foreign patriarchy are three causes which fosters the ever lasting domination, and suppression of Third world women.

Nawal El Saadawi is a well-known Egyptian feminist writer and activist wants Third World women’s liberation not only in terms of national, colonial, or international exploitation, but also from legal, sexual, and family oppression. She clarifies about ‘what is feminist struggle’ in an interview:

> [. . .] we women cannot liberate ourselves as one half of the population in isolation of the other half, men. This is the problem with the patriarchal system. Men have tried to liberate themselves without women [. . .]. This system has ended in what we are suffering now—war, oppression, invasion, exploitation, colonialism, and neo-colonialism[. . .]. It is a battle on many fronts. It is a political battle, it is a sexual battle, it is a psychological battle, and we have to fight in all these fronts. (34)

Her analysis is appropriate to derive well-formed conclusion that until and unless we understand the link between political, social, economic, and sexual oppression, we cannot put women’s liberation within the liberation of the whole country. The very link provides the Third world women to explore their self through identifying any either/ or process of exploitation and striking back to them.

Kumari Jayabardena is another leading feminist and scholar from Sri Lanka. Her book, *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World* reconstructs the history of women's rights movements in Asia and the Middle East. According to an anonymous writer, "Her research shows that feminism was *not* a foreign ideology 'imposed' on 'Third World' countries, but instead, was indigenous to Asia and the Middle East as women struggled for equal rights and against the subordination of women in the home and in society in general" ("Feminist Classic" 65). This conceptualization of feminism(s) is seen as indigenous and unique to non-Western societies and nations rather than mere offshoots of Western feminism(s).

To wrap up, Third World feminism is such challenging domain, which criticizes the dominating, essentializing, coerceive, and denigrating ethos of Western feminism and Third world male culture. Third World feminism tries to explore female individuality by opposing any either/or specific forms of exploitation propagated by triple domination: imperial ideology, western patriarchy, and native patriarchy. In this context, Bijaya Malla' *Anuradha* (trans. 2007) is significant for Third World feminist studies. It sets woman protagonist Anuradha, who explores her self and individuality by opposing forceful marriage, and creates certain level of strong anger and madness to violate the existing norms of patriarchy.

III. Exploration of Self and Individuality in Bijaya Malla's *Anuradha*

Malla's *Anuradha* projects the breakdown of the Anuradha's psychological and mental state amidst the fault line of patriarchy supported by females themselves. Her mother continually forces her to unwilling marriage and relationship with Ratnaman singh. Anuradha's suffering of forceful marriage contributes to degenerate her madness and psychosis. In this context, the present researcher studies Third World women's suppression through native patriarchy, supported by females themselves thereby analyzing the exploration of Anuradha's self and individuality in relation to Third World women.

It presents Anuradha's life story with three man: Ratnamansingh, Samundraman, and Komalman, who come in her life in three different modes. Ratmanshing is her so-called husband, but he had never become a husband in her real life. Second is Samundraman, brother of Ratnamansingh, who becomes a tool for Anuradha to create strategic revenge in Ratnamansingh. In Komalman's case, he is victimized by her beauty and smile in the similar way as it does to Samundraman and Ratnamansingh. Around these male characters, her mother supports Ratnamansingh for his wealth and threat. The matriarchal ethos carried by her mother subsumed with the male patriarchy. She is a matriarch in her family and therefore decides everything by her own. Anuradha's sisters even supports the mother's decision. They are just docile followers of male patriarchy. In search of self and individuality, she becomes desperate with the notion of revenge. However, she does not commit a murder, as she desires. Then, this results in psychosis and madness. In this case, her madness is metaphorically her full freedom and practice of self.

When Anuradha's father and elder brother are at Lhasa, she is called by her mother with the reason of mother's sickness. She becomes so desperate to help her mother in such condition. She comes from her Lucknow's study to help. When she arrives Kathmandu, she does not find her mother sick. Mother's sickness is just a strategy to marry her with a wealthy

bureaucrat Ratnamansingh forcefully. At that moment, she compares herself with a chess piece:

> You know very well the moves of chess pieces. The chess pieces of life are moved in exactly the same way. Some people are merely chess pieces in life, not players. Myself, I am only a chess piece. But who would not want to prove that he is not merely a chess piece, but is a player? I wanted to be a player and still do. (108-109)

She merely becomes puppet before the conspiracy played by her own mother. The strife between mother and daughter is vital in this case. Though she is less suppressed by male in patriarchal system, the female subordination has become a dehumanizing effect in the Nepalese society.

Since she is graceful and loving to her mother, she comes to support her mother leaving her study in the middle of her continual study. At that time, her affectionate love towards her mother turns out to be a vile one. She had not even thought that her mother is calling there to force her for marriage. Her mother and sisters were successful at their move to arrange an unknown marriage to Anuradha. Whatsoever the circumstances may be, she decides to stay Kathmandu for few days and hopes to return to Lucknow for her study. However, they did not allow her to return. Under the pretext of *Puja*, her mother persuaded her to stay. Everyone is busy for preparing the *Puja*. In such situation, they are just making her a scapegoat. She compares herself with a goat who is going to be sacrificed in the *Puja*. She says:

> The goat does not realize that not only will there be a *Puja* in the temple, but he is to be the sacrifice! I would be sacrificed but I did not die. I survived but my pride and self respect did not—I gave them up to be consumed! In their place, a will for revenge has consumed my life, the progression of my mental

> progress has changed, the pace of my life has changed. I was no longer that young women who studied in the Kalimpong convent and the college at Lucknow, the object of young men's affection. I was a broken woman. (111)

Their lavish preparation of *Puja* in Gujeshwari temple makes her frustrated. She is even ordered to dress up in the traditional style called *Sixteen Ornaments.* Her elder sisters have dressed in such a traditional way. She feels fine with the white sari, but her mother suggests her to wear Red *sari,* which is a symbol of married women in Nepalese society.

While the preparations of *Puja* were under way, she went out alone to wander in the woods around Gujeshwari. She suspects something unusual when her elder sister blurts out, "you were out wandering around, even at a time like this? You frightened Mother terribly!" (114). She was surprised finding everyone behaving cautiously towards her. Then she recalls her mother and sisters' saying in home, "she'll understand during the *swayambar*" but for that moment she did not give particular significance to those words (114). In such context, she questions herself with consideration of her self and identity. Her mother and sisters' carelessness about her freedom let her meditate upon the search of her identity. She observes:

> Ultimately they did not really care whether they had my assent or not. They had gone to a lot of trouble to work out the most intimate relationship of my life, but had told me absolutely nothing. They had the audacity to sell me like a sheep or a goat, and I became the greatest victim of my mother's harsh rule and unjust behavior. Furious anger burned in all the limbs of my body, and angry tears burned my eyes. (116)

Being furious in such a humiliating and depressing situation, she wishes to break the conspirators against her freedom. She feels, "I wanted to break these conspirators into little pieces and throw them away" (116). She is so desperate that she feels like destroying

something, killing someone and dying, and doing something that has restricted her freedom and rights.

In the ceremony, her elder sisters and some other girls surrounded her and began to tease with a traditional marriage ceremonious tone. They say, “Today it’s your turn to distribute *Prasad*, to bestow the flower garland. He whose neck you adorn with this garland will be yours—so look carefully before you put it on someone eh? Our turns have come and gone” (116). She collects distressing experience and even pity with her sisters that they even do not know what is happening inside their sister’s heart. They are very indifferent and careless towards her misery. Anuradha feels:

> A blow was striking down one women’s complete freedom, a woman being abducted against her will, violence had been forced on one woman’s existence, and there was an attempt to force her into a lifeless path. They had no understanding of this. They were laughing and I was forced into nakedness. That was my *Syambhar*, my “choosing” of a husband! The ‘betrothal of my own choosing’; what a naked perversion it was, what a laughable injustice! (117)

She locates prejudiced, marginalized, and superimposed behave of her own sisters to a sister in dehumanizing way. This is not justice at all. Her anger is evidential when she says, “Throw these garlands and things in the gutter! Tear them up and Throw them away!” She becomes even angrier than earlier. Then, she snatches the *mala* being a ‘bold lioness’ and a ‘wounded tigress’ from her sister and rips it into bits and pieces and throws them down.

For this act, she claims a major blame to her mother's act. She does not want to place the blame solely on Ratnamansingh. For her, “my mother was must to blame, as she had committed a truly abominable crime like aborting her own baby. Or rather, like choking her baby as she was nursing it at her breast. I did not die however, but I was burning and burning,

turning to ashes, a prolonged prematured death" (119). Her mother does not understand her, in fact she blames upon her as a great fool, dishonored, and unmannered. Her mother is a severe, angry, obstinate and proud woman. Being a mother, she does not understand the feeling of her daughter. She even follows the patriarchal rules thereby submitting herself with a forceful marriage designed for her daughter. In such situation, we see the struggle of Anuradha rests not only for equal rights but also against the subordination of women in the home and society, which is equally relevant to the context of Nepal.

For the society, it is a terrifying mistake because she is going beyond the boundary of patriarchal system. In Nepali social sphere, it is not right to neglect a person, who is from good family, education, and polite culture. In Hindu society, It is considered that father and mother's *dharma* is to search for such a house, where they might send their daughter. Her sisters and mother are the worshippers of money. Since Ratnamansingh is a wealthy person, they want her to marry with him so that they can at least financially benefit from that relation. For Ratnamansingh, he has the power of great wealth. For her, her sisters regard money as all in all, and Ratnamanshing, an educated government bureaucrat does not accept women as independent beings. She examines:

> They could not begin to examine the value of the building of character, education, the love of freedom—to them my value was simply in money. They could not conceive of the feelings of my life, which consisted of what I accepted and did not accept, what I liked, and did not like, what I loved and hated. That man, who was also educated, who had reached a fairly high level in the government bureaucracy, could not imagine that a woman could be on the same level, could not imagine that a woman could be a different kind of person, who had to be won, not bought by trickery. That was his crime. (120)

In such way, Ratnamansingh is equally responsible for her psychological demise. He also makes her game piece in his conspiracy. While feeling so, she still has a fear of him that he will take revenge of this dishonest and disrespect in public place. In such context, she analyzes Ratnamansingh, and her sisters as weak because they rely on tricks and fraud.

We see the male characters, who treat women in terms of the object of beauty, smile and gracefulness. All three male characters including the narrator Komalman are fan of her beauty. Komalman's obsession of her beauty can easily be seen. Komalman says, "The charm of her beauty and smile made me desire her physically" (94). Anuradha herself has found her beauty as captivating to male. She finds herself, "[A] very important person, so that I became an object of envy, while at the same time I was greatly admired. Some of my school mates admired me and became my follower, while others hated me out of envy" (98).

Komalman, narrator-cum-introspective refugee from his family and home in Kathmandu who has half-heartedly taken up farming in Terai, feels captivated with the beauty and smile of Anuradha. When he meets Anuradha, his male instincts hover over him and he comes to take the same male culture, who celebrates the beauty of Anuradha. Though unheard, he takes women as the subject of his dream and infancy. He sexually awakens when he sees Anuradha. He says, "This young woman seems to appear before my eyes. Her lips begins to move, her hands and feet slowly spring to life. Her entire body appears in front of me" (14). His eye is ultimately male eye. Therefore, he sees her as mad women, unconscious, and delirious women. he observes from the male eye:

> She has neither the presence of mind to give me her permission, nor would she be able to help me. Even if she "lives," unconscious, and delirious, she is not a living being. She is, in fact, insane, a mad woman. She cries, sobs, claws, and yet she is aware of nothing, knows nothing. That form is there, that body,

> walking and moving, those beautiful eyes, that cascading hair, that smile, yet she has no awareness of existence of herself, of anyone else, or of me. (15)

Since Komalman is also a member of patriarchal structure, He thinks woman in valuation of her beauty. This is evidential through his narration that he spends most of his time praising her beauty. He addresses her as "not living being," indicates that he is only a living being, not Anuradha. Sometimes he becomes amazed with the situation of Anuradha and tries to figure out the different causes behind her so-called illness and madness. He questions himself, "What is that young woman not governed by that reality? Why has she vanished from the world of her own thought to be sunk into this? Why have psychiatrists diagnosed her as mentally ill, deranged, gone beyond the pale of ordinary behavior, insane?" (16). Sometimes he takes her madness as bliss, something that he himself want to possess. It is not sure that whether he is triggered by the emotions caused by her beauty or his own torments makes him to think about the same situation.

He becomes overwhelm by her beauty. He meets unexpectedly and gradually without realizing it. He describes his situation, "[B]it by bit I handed over more and more control of my own behavior, my emotions, and indeed my very life to her. In this way, the rights of my entire mental possession fell into her hands. I began to love her. This love became the supreme emotional event in my life" (19). He is even awe struck by her beauty, though he cannot express his emotions in concrete way. He feels his love for Anuradha in his soliloquy, "I love you. I could battle the entire world for you and win. For the sake of your happiness, I would do anything" (20). He behaves as if he has the sole right to possess her. In comparison to Ratnamanshing, he appears psychologically affected. He feels love for Anuradha, "I love the madwoman Anuradha! I love you!" (23).

Sometimes he is also obsessed with the sexual desires as well. That is why, he wants to fulfill his unfulfilled hopes and lustful desires. He thinks, he has to say to Anuradha,

"Anuradha, I can fulfill your dreams, your little girl wearing a tiny dress, your little boy wearing short pants! Your new life! Anuradha, I can make all of this a reality" (24). But he faces the problem because "she was insane, a raving lunatic. This is my torment" (24).

Anuradha questions her past thinking and notion of beauty. Anuradha finds different perception about her beauty. In the past, her awareness about her beauty is strong. She is even satisfied with her beauty for that moment. She feels, "[H]ow mistaken, how wrong that was! Was not it a delusion to think that my entire identity was that of a 'pretty woman?'(100), She feels previously:

> Beauty is a woman's powerful weapon, but at the same time I am aware that beauty is fragile. Look, how this illness has worn me down, so that I have become an old monkey. When I was in first bloom of youth, though, I was entranced when I looked at my own figure in the mirror, my own fascinating figure, my own healthy, robust body. At that time, I was so proud of it, very proud. My beauty was everything, and it made me arrogant, insolent, and obstinate. (98)

The continual praise and dictation of her own beauty became strong faith with her. She starts to feel her 'beauty' as a permanent identity. She thinks, "I felt so proud of that beauty that I could give myself to no one. I was married to that identity. It was a kind of marriage, since I was unable to give myself to anyone else. I was my own obstacle" (100).

When Anuradha was 18 years old beautiful young women, her mind began to show the signs of fragility. She says, "Pride and self regard had rigidified [. . .] goodness, gentleness, and modesty concealed my deep self regard and pride, hissing within like a snake" (101). Her consciousness about Kathmandu valley comes into the like manner. She compares the past beauty of Kathmandu, "How beautiful the Kathmandu valley was, as we landed! I was so happy filled with joy, and did not suspect that in the future Kathmandu

would be poison" (102). Then she compares the beauty of Kathmandu with the beauty of herself. She says in Kathmandu, "I was the very image of beauty. My elder sisters came home from their husbands' houses to see their sister. There was no one in the family who did not praise my figure. But that was poison" (102). Some feels man's nature towards beauty in various instances. She says:

> Men were deceived about me. My figure and my beauty made them impatient to know me. Some waited around to watch for me on the road, some followed me, some tried to devour me with their hungry eyes. They tried all kinds of stunts, the boys were driven crazy by my beauty and they wanted to marry me. Some even sent people to the house to discuss marriage. As I walked around the streets of Kathmandu, I always had to pass in front of the hungry eyes of the young men. (103)

These are the backdrops around, which she develops her female consciousness. She even indicates that the situation is even vicious for other Kathmanduit girls. She sees the possibility of rebellion in this case. When she walks through the streets of her neighborhood, she is frightened by the loitering men who try to sexually abuse her. They try to attack her. She figures out their faces twisted with an unnatural demonic lust. She observes:

> I constantly see this kind of passionate lust in men. I understand the language of their eyes. I could perhaps been pleased with their reactions, but I attracted this kind of behavior so often that I felt upset more often than I felt satisfaction. How can it be pleasant to be seen only with bright burning eyes of demonic lust? Isn't it disgusting? (104)

Her awareness about her beauty and self identity are solidifying. She is habituated with these attributes of male custom. This nature lets her to become more aloof and studious. It is hard to separate herself from such self absorption. This further leads her to the masochistic ethos.

She says, “True, the nature of life is not just to bloom and flourish, but also to be destroyed, to fall. Life is not only to give and receive happiness—one must give and receive misery” (108).

When she finds her own mother and sisters’ hostile behavior to her, She locates the conflict between women and women in the Nepalese society. She experiences, “The twisting and insulting behavior of my mother and her allies smothered all my feelings of affection and respect, and I felt a raising hatred for all humanity” (124). She further says:

> They thought that I was launching an impulsive, spontaneous rebellion, and that after some time had passed, I would meekly hand over my soul, a train of thought that reflected prevailing social values. I had grown up with another idea, however another concept of a women, whose self-confidence cannot be bought for any price, a woman who would choose disaster instead of meek compliance. (125)

She is determined to be rebel rather than be a docile follower of social values established by male culture. She thinks that a woman should choose disaster than compliance. According to her, self-confidence is not a subject of buy and sell. It should be achieved through struggle. In her case, the very struggle makes her psychosis and madness. But she thinks that women are hegemonized about their inferiority. She says, “The weak and powerless, those oppressed by the general perception of their inferiority, remain oddly convinced of their own power. It turned out that the conspiracy had only begun. They profited from my several days of disorientation and inactivity” (125).

She is highly convinced that for the moment she cannot go to Lucknow as a fugitive by fearing the people out then in Kathmandu who are involving in her forceful marriage. Her self-respect prevents her from going back to Lucknow. She wants:

> [T]o contrive a terrible scheme by which my family, especially my mother, as well as this man would be punished. I wanted to let people know that I would marry a poverty-stricken man from the lowest class, a man held in contempt by society. What could be a more terrible punishment to them? What could cause great mental torment and agony? I wanted to take some kind of revenge like that. The cost of such revenge does not trouble me in the least. (126)

Her resistance and revenge is so wholesome that she is determined to give more torment and agony in their lives. She satisfies herself with such act. By this act, she is being sadistic and masochistic at the same time. She torments herself so that others can feel the torment and ill environment. She finds herself in the situation of self-destruction.

Her notice of beautiful white cards is an invitation of "auspicious occasion of the marriage of director Ratnaman Singh and his wife Mrs. Anuradha Devi" (128). By seeing the card, she becomes speechless and she feels that society made her his wife. She rises in furious anger and flings the card in front of mother. She angers, "What is this? When did his and my marriage take place? Why did you have this printed and given out? Don't you have any shame?" (128). Her mother does not reply anything. Their conspiracy and intrigue makes her more crazy about the revenge. There is the rumor in the society that marriage is their choice and they are marrying because they are in love with each others. The rumors and the collective broadcasting, they make a great effort to distort the actions of one single event into something else. For them, she feels, "I was not like a conscious being—I was a monkey who would dance on cue" (130). Her sisters and mother's behavior let her pursue the path of violent. She thinks:

> The behavior of my mother and sisters caused my bitterness to take an increasingly violent form. My hatred and disregard for humanity had reached its highest level. It was possible that in my skewed mental state, I would

> perform no considered wise act. I became obsessed, and I was eager to pull out the root of all intrigue, duplicity, and dishonesty. I wanted to take revenge on my mother, sisters, everybody, and I wanted to beat the drum of my own victory. (131)

She feels the poisonous trap in the behavior of her mother. Her mother is so determined that there is no power in the world to stop her mother's decision. She feels that she has to be ready to suffer for the consequences of the event. In such situation, she engineers deceptions to ruin them as a revenge for their deceit and fraud. She feels herself as "[A] provoked, angry cobra always ready to strike. My fangs were filled with poison, which would bring unavoidable destruction" (132).

With the desire of revenge, her dream of studying at Lucknow is aborted. She wants to "[F]ocus on giving my mother, family and bogus husband Ratnaman Singh some terrible trouble, to burn them in torture and bondage, to reduce them to ashes" (132). The constant fear intimidation is at hand with the allies of forceful marriage. The machinations and constant fear is evidential In Anuradha's narrative, she says, "So I am his property he has a right to snatch away! So I am merely a thing! Someone also came around to let me know that if I had done something, Ratnamansingh would invoke the government to subject me and the family to fierce prosecution in court" (132-133).

The internalized ethos of male culture is evidential in women's psyche. They are rigorously submitted to male patriarchal culture. Anuradha experiences a woman who comes nearby her and suggests:

> Dear, we cannot oppose man like that—he is paid off some hoodlums and stationed them all around, so they are watching the whole neighborhood. We need to stay indoors. If they beat you and pull your hair, how ashamed you

> will be, and the reputation of our house will be ruined. We women must be humble! (133)

In this way, her mother and her allies begin to send a neighbor or relative to scare or threaten her every two days. They induce her to surrender and subsume with the male power of Ratnamansingh. Even their behavior changes a lot for her. She feels that her mother and sisters make jokes about her. They look at her very strangely as if to taunt her. There are series of accusations on her part caused by her denial of the marriage.

According to her, her sisters and mother are the reasons behind her madness. She feels ridiculed and accused with her sisters behavior. Their accusation let her think that they are throwing her from the house by the scruff of her neck. She says:

> When the house was echoing with their taunts, and when they begin to jeer, I felt I was in a graveyard. The sound of their voices crushed my mental state, and I was filled with hate. Sometimes I thought I would strike a match and burn down the house. Once I did in fact set the mosquito net on fire, and my room filled with smoke, but I put it out myself. If there hadnot been little children in the house, perhaps I would have set the house ablaze—their torments led to such desperate actions. (134)

Her degenerated mental health is further affected by the material entice of her sisters. Her sisters talk about the material prosperity of Ratnamansingh, who find their release of women's self in men's wealth. She has different perspective because of her education. She knows the real value of freedom, self, and identity. She even prepares to take revenge and be mad instead to subsume to man. Her sister's material enticement comes through her ear. Her sister says:

> It's really a large house, like a palace. Look, there are thousands of rupees, gold bangles, diamond earrings, ear pendants, all are yours for the taking! He

> says he will put the whole house in your name. You can have whatever you want, and with that much wealth you can always eat your fill and enjoy yourself.[. . .] Otherwise you don't come of your own free will, he says he will take you by force and lock you up in the house! (136)

Her second sister leads her to furious rage when she says if she wants to be angry, she has to be with her husband. The word "husband" let her degenerate a sense of urgent madness. Consequently, she picks up a knife to attack them but they run off out of fear. She realizes, "continual torment and pain had driven me from being a human to being a demented person capable of murder" (137). From that day on she starts to carry knife under her pillow as her psyche feels a serious threat from the outer environment.

She compares herself with the school Anuradha, and finds completely different. She feels her beauty of the past, dream like memories in college in Lucknow and so on. It does not give her solace because such is girl is changing into a murderer, inhuman, cruel, and mad. She even becomes desperate when her mother gets a letter with threat of ultimatum from Ratnamansingh. In the letter he wrote to mother, "If you don't send Anuradha to me now, there is nothing you can do to show respect for my honor. Please take note that this is my last letter, and please send her today" (138). After reading the letter, she realizes no limitation of his insolence and rudeness. The threats shows that "the woman he wanted to marry but had not married was his wife [. . .] I was a girl to be enjoyed, a girl who did whatever he wanted, who danced when told to dance" (138). After reading the letter she becomes real *Ranachandi*, the goddess of battle. She feels she should murder someone by the knife that she has hid under her pillow. She feels herself mad with dried lips and mouth, feeling fever. She feels, "I was no longer myself" (138).

Slowly she feels that her revenge towards her mother and sisters changes towards Ratnamansingh. She sees Ratnamansingh as the sole cause of hurdles of her freedom. She has

the strong hatred for him. She feels, “[A]s soon as I saw him I would immediately take out the knife and strike him, kill him” (141). With this, she herself goes to Ratnamansingh’s house with the aim of stabbing him. She takes a taxi and orders to drop before Ratnamansingh’s house. Though she feels strong sense of revenge, she cannot do in practice. The continual procrastination heads her way. Initially, she says, “[M]y impassioned attempt at murder a kind of weakness made me feel slack for the moment” (141). In such context, she feels quite frightened with mixed aim of revenge and fear. She narrates:

> My heart was pounding from fear, and my legs trembled. I began to feel doubts, staring at the white, clean walls of this unfamiliar house, but I was now mired in too much confusion to think of running away. My forehead was breaking out in sweat. A man’s voice startled me from a nearby room, as I restrained my nervousness and drove away the mental weaknesses that had just now arisen. (142)

When she sees like manlike figure, she thinks of Ratnamansingh and her project of murder. She thinks more than she acts with other than different reasons. Though the word, ‘murder’ is fearful for her, she is determined on her aim. She thinks, “I would narrow my eyes, take aim, and stab [. . .] This would repay him for my insult and ruin” (143).

She feels perplexed and confused, and all her intention to commit murder began to dissipate in this confusion. She cannot even stab on Ratnamansingh. She devises, "[A]s soon as I had killed him in the passion of anger, the affair would be finished" (147). Immediately she constructs another plan to give him torments and disorders rather than to kill. She did not feel murder as only means to take revenge. She uses her beauty as tool and applies that on Ratnamansingh's brother Samundraman to create extreme level of jealousy. she well identifies his frail nature:

> He had no grasp of the necessity for affection, gratitude, and forgiveness in developing highly spiritual thought and taste. He was incapable of understading that conspiracy and fraud are poison, that mistrust and suspicion murder anykind of highmindedness. How could a person with such a crooked heart understand that there is no account book of give and take, that pretense and hypocrisy do not count for magnaanimity? (163)

She even understands his deviousness through his hypocrisy. She becomes 'new Anuradha' with the knowledge of the same tool that Ratnamansingh strikes once. She is playing with his feeling as he had played with her. Her showy closeness to Samundraman makes him mad and crazy about it. Anuradha neither submits her to him. Rather she becomes strong and play with his emotions as he played once by forcefully trying to marriage her.

She starts her showy closeness to Samundraman to arouse a fire of jealousy in his heart. Being in his house as well she takes stronger position thereby taking any emotional either way of revenge and resistance of his misdeeds. When she herself comes in his house, Ratnamansingh feels that she has surrendered to him. But it is not so. Rather she strongly opposes her in terms of emotional and psychological play. When Ratnamansingh wants closeness in his home, she replies, "You can do your important work in your own room. Perhaps you will recall that it is not right for you to remain in my room. Please remember that I am not married to you. Please go quickly" (166). Once when she sees Ratnamansingh standing in the door watching her and Samundraman suspiciously, she experiences restlessness and torment in his face. She likes it. As a firsst strategy, She tries Samundraman to promise a smile back whenever she smiles at him. He agrees on the point. She thinks:

> In this way I executed a dangerous plan. I would make this attempt to foil Ratnamansingh's entire conspiracy, to rip open and shred his curtain of hypocrisy. I was eager to add to the torment that suspicion had already planted

> in his heart. I wanted him to suffer, to be ruined, to roast, to burn! I hated him, and I wanted this display to tear out his heart. I had not guessed that this would be far more effective means of getting cold revenge than using the knife. (168)

Her thinking of not to murder her conspirator is well taken and justified because she does not want to take the burden of murder. Rather she wants him to torment and suffer with the suscipion and jealousy. She thinks that this can be an appropriate revenge for his vile actions. In this time, she uses false feelings, deceitful language, and crooked behavior using the art of amorousness.

She takes advantage of Samundraman's innocence. Since Samundraman is not suspicious, she has easy time to make showy deceive to Ratnamansingh. She feels, "his simple, sincere heart harbored no suspicions toward me. It was his impression that he could be of service to me" (170). She even feels sympathy for Samundraman's guilelessness and simple heart. She equally becomes aware that this strategy may cause his untimely death and miserable life. She can feel Ratnamansingh's violent torments of suspicion and therefore delighted for it as well. she says, "Fear and suspicion cause him increasing agitation, while I felt more and more satisfaction at his secret torment" (174).

Since she is inflicted with the notion of revenge, she thinks "There is no question of justice and injustice" (174). She feels that even Samundraman has got the arrow of her beauty. It is said that everything is fair in love and war. She is in war. Therefore, she thinks that her vile means with the honest Samundraman is justified. Her increasing closeness further leads to sibling rivalry between Ratnamansingh and Samundraman. For Samundraman, the suspicions of others and radiance of her beauty has ignited his consciousness. She thinks that she has successfully used him to provide torment and revenge.

He has become victimized with the beauty and smile of her so called *Bhauju* Anuradha. She feels:

> My body and beauty had certainly set him on fire, and my smile was burning him to ashes! He was utterly infatuated, but then would feel ashamed of his infatuation, and with a red face would try to run away. While my figure had begun to inflame his passions, my successful acting and pretense had succeeded in giving poor Samundraman nothing but misery torment. I had found I could use him as a stooge for taking revenge. [. . .] In Ratnamansingh's proximity I spoke with Samundraman very sweetly, with loving gestures, with adoring eyes and flirtatious glances. (178-179)

Her and Samundraman's showy proximity infuriates Ratnamansingh to a greater extent. Oneday he feels compelled to express his anger to her. This anger is a good sign of male ethos and patriarchial system of society. He feels completely disturbed by tha act of Anuradha and Samundraman. In his eye, it is a serious deceive. He furiously says to Anuradha, "You know this is my house, and I am in charge. What I say is law! You are not to go out of that door without asking me. You are not to go out to cinema, or in fact go anywhere at all, understand?" (179). She replies trenchantly to the extremity of Ratnamansingh. She says:

> Do you understand to whom are you speaking? I did not marry you and I am not your wife. Do you know why I am here? No one has a right to stop me from doing anything here! I will do as I please, take walks, see movies. I'll go with whomever I please---and who are you to stop me? Now get out of this room! You have no rights in this room. I hate you, do you understand? (179-180)

After her saying, he becomes furious and forwards his step to beat her, but she draws shining knife concealed in her clothes. She is ready to kill him then and there but he flees from there with constant fear and intimidation. Then triumphantly she replies, "Coward! Listen, I am a whore to live with you, a kept women" (180).

She is feeling and imagining the suicide of Ratnamansingh. She feels, "Although I could not kill him myself, I wanted to see him kill himself" (183). She is being strategic to avenge her so-called forceful husband. She wants him to feel self-humiliation and self-denigration. She has well identified that mental torture is the stronger revenge than knife attack. Therefore she wants to torture him and feels her successful while doing that. She can even evidence the hostility, quarrels, and suspicion between two brothers on her subject. When Samundraman and Anuradha talks in a secluded place, Ratnamansingh notices and tries his best to beat his brother. However, he could not beat because he was protected by her. She tries to strike with the knife but in fact, she strikes herself and is wounded. As a consequence, Samundraman leaves the house and goes to Biratnagar. He turns out to be a local drunkard. He leads his dissolute life thereby leaving profligacy, and and leaving with prostitute.

Ratnamansingh never let her go though there was not the relationship between them. Anuradha narrates, "He tried to keep me locked in the house, as if he were putting me in a cage, but he was not successful" (189). She neither can kill her. Her project entails with the continual procrastination. The same process continues until she develops herself as a psychotic and mad. She tells:

> I became insane, insane from then on, another reason for misery. I was not confused about the story of my own past. The memory of that remained. Ratnamansingh did not throw me out even after I became insane. He sent me to India to get medical treatment. The doctors there said that I had suffered a

> mental blow, that I was insane, and that there was nothing that could be given me, that my sanity would eventually return of itself. (190)

Her sole cause of madness and psychosis is caused by her revenge motif with her mother, sisters, and ultimately with Ratnamansingh. After a several months cure in Ranchi Hospital of India, she returns back to Kathmandu with the hope of recovery. Again, the feeling of revenge pursue her. Then again she goes back to Kalimpong with the hope of release from this revenge, she does not find her mentally and psychologically well.

Komal man finds himself in the position of Samundraman and Ratnamansingh. For him, "Her health, her beauty, and her smile could work their magic on anyone" (192). He analyzes the role of Anuradha in following way:

> Why does beauty create madness, and why do men, in lusting after beauty, cause the ruin of beautiful women? Anuradha was indeed stunningly beautiful woman. Ratnaman saw only her beauty, but did not see a whole woman. Samundraman saw only a sister-in-law, but did not care what was in her heart. Society wanted to make her into someone's wife, but did nto care what was in her heart. Nobody went to the root of her downfall, so her downfall remains meaningless. (193)

By talking about the society, he is referring to the society, where there is the prevalence of male culture. A male is discounted for his every vile behavior, whereas woman is not. In this discount of male behavior, even female like Anuradha's mother supports and plays with own daughter's life. In the eyes of law, it is considered illegal, but again being backed up with money, a man like Ratnamansingh controls authority. In this context, a female is sizzled within the backdrop of male patriarchy.

This haunted memory of the past follows her everywhere. Though she wants new life, she cannot begin it because of her haunted memory of the past and sense of revenge. She

completely wants to forget the past to lead a new life but cannot do so. She describes, "I want to forget, completely, I want to forget, so that not a word pursues me, not a word! I want a new life!" (203). Within her great aspiration for freedom, she loses her sanity and again becomes mad and the victims of past ghettoized male patriarchal mentality.

Anuradha becomes the victim of the domestic violence caused by the patriarchal system backed up by the females themselves. Anuradha tries her best to oppose her forceful marriage. This resistance is the very source of exploration of her individuality and self. Then her opposition of her marriage takes the big shape of revenge. This sort of resistance to male ethos are severly utilized by her. In each case, her value of freedom and self is fully expressed to the extent that her extreme hatred and revenge turns her out to be a mad and psychopath.

IV. Conclusion

This research analyzes Bijaya Malla's novel *Anuradha* on the light of third world feminism thereby exploring the individuality and self of the protagonist Anuradha. Third-world feminism is that branch of philosophy, which deals with the unique experiences of the women in the so-called third world countries. The feminists who are engaged in such activities are known as third world feminists. It locates the suppression and marginalization of women in different scenarios of global and local patriarchy. It also sees the vicious functioning of matriarchy that functions as a unique experiences of the third world. Native patriarchy, and local matriarchal ethos are the backdrops upon which, it lays special focus on unique experiences of the third world women.

Indeed third world feminism is a challenging domain, which criticizes the dominating, coercive, and denigrating ethos of Western feminism and third world male culture. Third World feminism tries to explore female individuality by opposing any either/or specific forms of exploitation propagated by male ideology and female submission to them. In this context, Bijaya Malla' *Anuradha* is well taken the issue of a woman protagonist Anuradha, who explores her self and individuality by opposing forceful marriage, and creates certain level of strong anger and madness to violate the existing norms of patriarchy. Anuradha's case is not only an individual case but it is insignia of the several domestic violence and forceful marriages around Nepal.

Malla's *Anuradha* projects the breakdown of the Anuradha's psychological and mental state amidst the fault line of patriarchy supported by females themselves. Anuradha's mother continually forces her to unwilling marriage and relationship with Ratnaman singh. Anuradha's suffering of forceful marriage contributes to degenerate her madness and psychosis. In the progress of her life, three men come in her life: Ratnamansingh, Samundraman, and Komalman. All of them have the strong sense of male nature.

Ratmansingh feels so possessive and proud of his wealth. All of them are fan of her beauty and smile. The matriarchal ethos carried by her mother subsumed with the male patriarchy. She is a matriarch in her family and therefore decides everything by her own. Anuradha's sisters even support mother's decision. They are just docile followers of male patriarchy. In search of self and individuality, she becomes desperate with the notion of revenge.

In our society, A male is discounted for his every vile behavior, whereas woman is not. In this discount of male behavior, even female like Anuradha's mother supports and plays with own daughter's life. In the eyes of law, it is considered illegal, but again being backed up with money, a man like Ratnamansingh controls authority and law. In this context, a female is sizzled within the backdrop of male patriarchy. The internalized ethos of male culture is evidential in women's psyche. They are rigorously submitted to male patriarchal culture.

To wrap up, Anuradha explores her individuality and self thereby opposing to become a victim of the domestic violence caused by the patriarchal system backed up by the females themselves. Anuradha tries her best to oppose her forceful marriage and resist any either/or exploitation of male cultures and hegemonized female supporters. She develops her value of freedom and self to the extent that her extreme hatred and revenge turns her out to be a mad and psychopath.

Works Cited

Anonymous. “Feminist Classics of This Wave” *in Ms* 1. 3 (Arlington, 1992): 65.

“Anuradha ko Katha.” *Himalayan Readers* 14 March 2009 <http://himalayanreaders.wordpress.com/2009/03/14/anuradha-ko-katha/>.

Gandhi, Leela. “Postcolonialism and Feminism.” *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998. 81-101.

Ghimire, Jagdish. “Republica Leisure.” *Republica* 14 Feb. 2009: 13.

Katrak, Ketu. “Theorizing a Politics of the Female Body: Language and Resistance.” *Politics of Female Body: Post Colonial Women Writers of the Third World*. London: Rutgers University Press, 1978. 1-179.

Malla, Bijaya. *Anuradha.* Trans. Larry Hartsell. Varanasi: Pilgrims Publishing, 2007.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Introduction." *Third World women and the politics of feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991. 49.

- - -. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. New Delhi: Duke University Press, 2003.

Narayan, Uma. *Dislocating Culture: Identities, Tradition and Third World Feminism*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

- - -. “Essence of Culture and a Sense of History: A Feminist Critique of Cultural Essentialism.” *Hypatia* 13. 2 (Spring 1998): 86-106.

Petersen, Kirsten Holst, and Anna Rutherford, eds. *A Double Colonization: Colonial and Postcolonial Women’s Writing*. New Delhi: Dangaroo, 1986.

Rai, Indra Bahadur. *Anuradha: Bisleshan Pahilayera, Bartaharu.* Ed. Kumar Pradhan. Darjeeling: Nepali Sahitya Parishad, 1971.

Saadawi, Nawal El. Interview with Jo Beall. “Nawal El Saadawi.” *Agenda Feminist Media* 5 (1989): 33-39.

Sangari, Kumkum, and Suresh Vaid. “Recasting women: An Introduction.” *In Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History.* Eds. K. Sangari and S. Vaid. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990. 18.

Saunders, Kriemild. *Feminist Post-Development Thought, Rethinking Modernity, Post-Colonialism and Representation*. Zed Books: London and New York.

Sharma, Taranath. *The Evolution of Nepali Fiction.* Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2005.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 24-28.

- - -. “Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism.” *Critical Inquiry* 12. 1 (1985): 243-261.

Subedi, Abhi. *Background of Nepali Literature and History.* Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2038(B. S.).

Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India.* London: Chicago University Press, 1992.

- - -.“Woman Skin Deep: Feminism and the Postcolonial Condition.” *Critical Inquiry* 18. 4 (Summer 1992): 756-769.

Tripathi, Basudev. *Bicharan.*1st edition. Kathmandu: Bhanu Publication, 2028(B.S.).