

Tribhuvan University

Memory as a Constitutive of Identity in Rookmangud Katawal's *My Story*

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

By

Rom Nath Nepal

Roll No.: 255

Exam Roll No.: 6143

Redg. No. 6-2-1-397-2012

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

April, 2019

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Rom Nath Nepal has completed his thesis entitled “Memory as a Constitutive of Identity in Rookmangud Katawal’s *My Story*” under my supervision. He carried out his research from December 2018 to April 2019. I hereby recommend his thesis to be submitted for viva voce.

Lecturer, Taralal Shrestha

Supervisor

Date: _____

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Approval

This Thesis entitled "Memory as a Constitutive of Identity in Rookmangud Katawal's *My Story*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Rom Nath Nepal has been approved by the undersigned member of the Research Committee:

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head of the Department
Date: _____

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor Dr. Tara Lal Shrestha, Lecturer, Central Department of English for his continual co-operation, proper suggestion, genuine inspiration, insightful comment and motivation to accomplish this thesis. No expression of thanks can adequately carry out my deep felt appreciation for his cherished advice and splendid guidance during the course of this research work.

I am beholden to Head of Central Department of English, Dr. Anirudra Thapa for his encouraging advices. Similarly, I would be delighted to extend my gratefulness to respected Lecturers, Diwakar Upadhyay, Badri Prasad Acharya, Raj Kumar Baral, Laxman Bhatta, and other lectures as they contributed enormously to my understanding of the difficult subjects. The knowledge on the related theories gained from their classes filled me with confidence which inspired me to do this thesis.

I am rejoiced to grab this occasion to record my immense gratitude to my parents, Ganga P. Nepal and Sarada Nepal, sisters Susila and Shova Nepal, my brother and sister-in-law Prem and Annet for their all kind of support, their constant encouragement, grandiose suggestions and profound dedication. I owe them a great deal for what they have done. Meanwhile my colleagues Prakash Singh Bist, Dinesh Sharma, Bibek Adhikari, Subash Baral and Ashish Pokhrel deserve a great share of thanks from the depth of my heart for their help.

April, 2019

Rom Nath Nepal

Memory as a Constitutive of Identity in Rookmangud Katawal's *My Story*

Abstract:

This research paper delves into the autobiography of the Former Chief of Army Staff of Nepal, Rookmangud Katawal's My Story, with the special attention to his memory which eventually creates his identity evident in the way he uses language to describe his past, the prioritization of some incidents, deletion of some important incidents and the politicization of the past history of the autobiographer. This paper uses Politics of Memory, the theoretical text developed by Joanne Rappaport to find out how the writer uses his past in the present context to create his identity from Royal-made person to Self-made devoted and patriotic Army. This paper especially highlights the use of language, narrative technique, inclusion and deletion of the events, selective remembering and application of his past in the present scenario to dismantle his previous identity as an adopted son of the King Mahendra and creates his new identity as one of the patriotic person in current republican context of Nepal. This examination of autobiographical technique of remembering the past with present socio-political circumstances leads to a finding that this text works as a tool to reestablish his individual identity--not bestowed by the Royal family but on of his own. In this way, this paper helps the readers in understanding the hidden politics of remembering the past of the General Katawal and his politics behind writing an autobiography.

General Katawal's My Story deals with his life, his experiences, ups and downs and his quest of identity to be a devoted and patriotic Nepalese Army. But his remembering of the past has some politics. The autobiography seems fictional story as well as tool of his identity. By remembering his past, he is trying to create his new identity because his name was previously associated with Shah Family. After the establishment of Republic system in Nepal he feels identity crises on him so by writing an autobiography he creates his separate identity. He only recalls his good events and memories from his past, eulogizes his self and his royal affinity and politicizes his past to create his identity.

He describes his army career that is full of struggles and achievements too, along with other political events. This memoir particularly explains his journey from a rural village of Okhaldhunga to being the chief of Nepalese Army. Rookmangud Katawal writes this autobiography in 2014 after a successful tenure as a Chief of Nepal Army. Alike others, he has presented his past life and memory of the past in his view. Being the chief of Nepalese Army for a person outside of Royal and Rana family was almost impossible, but Katawal succeeds in becoming one. Most of the people remember their past for different purposes like: to reveal fact of history, cherishing the past memories and to share the experience of some horrendous or pleasing incidents. Similarly, Katawal remembers the past where he faces different challenges and problems in his career but eventually becomes successful. In his childhood, he dared to meet the then king Mahendra in his village in spite of security challenges that obstructed him to do so. Eventually, he was taken by the king to Kathmandu and admitted to Pharping Boarding School. Then he began his army career where he encounters different chances and challenges. His journey from a junior officer to the Chief of Army Staff of Nepal was a challenging journey. In his career,

he gets chance to visit different countries and attend different trainings. From his childhood to his adulthood, he maintains good relation with Nepalese royal family. He publishes his autobiography after his retirement. What is the politics behind remembering the past and what is the reason behind selective inclusion and deletion of the past in Rookmangud's autobiography is what this paper analyses.

Most of the people eulogize themselves in autobiography for certain purposes. About autobiographical memory QI Wang, Professor and Chair of Human Development at Cornell University states that "The intimate interplay between one's self and personal history is crucial for our understanding of what we usually call autobiographical memory" (7). So, while presenting about the past most of the autobiographers praise their self. An autobiography contains past experience, events, accidents, suffering and successes of the autobiographer. An individual involves different activities, faces different problems, pain, suffering, happiness and so on in his life. But one cannot include each and every event in a single volume. So, in an autobiography the author generally puts those eulogies at center. An autobiographer employs including and excluding method in autobiography. The autobiographer politicizes about what to remember and what to forget. Here the author also did the same; he mentions his firm stands at the time of his identity crisis and the period of political turmoil in Nepal more often. Rookmangud was brought under the roof and shade of royal family. Before the establishment of republic system in Nepal he was like an adopted son of the then King Mahendra. He had value and glory associated with his royal upbringing. But later the change in social and political circumstances of Nepal causes his identity crisis. All these stories of his life are written as a product of his memory. About memory Rappaport claims that it is "the relationship between the past events and their manifestation in the present" (26). It shows that memory is just a

manifestation of past in the present. Thus, by memorizing and recalling his past and the contextualization of past in the present scenario the writer is creating his new identity as an honest and patriotic self-made man.

Katawal served as the Chief of Army Staff (henceforth CAS) of the Nepal Army from September 10, 2006 to August, 2009 preceded by Pyar Jung Thapa and succeeded by Chatraman Shing Gurung. He serves Nepal Army from 1969 to 2009 moving to different parts of Nepal. General Katawal had come into controversy after the then prime minister Pushpa Kamal Dahal had unilaterally decided to relieve Katawal of his duties as of CAS on May 3, 2009. He has written some patriotic songs, poems and articles. Most of his articles support monarchy in Nepal. In an interview with Dil Bhusan Pathak Katawal accepts that he used to write an article supporting monarchy in Nepal. "I used to write and publish articles supporting monarchy and kings as 'Ajepinath' but I have never written against democracy and nationality (n.p). Similarly in another interview named 'Book Talk with Rook Mangud'", Katawal restates that "Prithvi Narayan Shah has great contribution on unification of Nepal so as a representative of Shah regime I was supporting monarchy. King Gynandra is a continuative representation of 240 years monarch" (my translation). This shows his previous royal identity. As an army officer he used to write in favor of king because at that time Nepal Army was also known as Shahi Nepali Army or the Nepalese army of Shah Kings. Before King Gynandra declares national emergency, people used to see Nepal Army only as guard of Royal family and the ministers. Thus, his image as one of the army staffs of Sahi Nepali Sena made people think that he is a mere royalist more than anything. General Katawal, as an Army tries to create his identity alongside retaining Nepalese Army's glory. Katawal excelled in studies but never lost his cleverness. Katawal's rank got promoted, and despite the strong opposition of the

nobility, he became CAS during Nepal's dramatic transition from war to peace, from monarchy to republic. Katawal outlasted the royal rulers who were his benefactors. General Katawal denies he had exclusive access to the royal family. But he admits turning those rumors of his royal affinity to his advantage. As Liaison Officer to the Brigade of Gurkhas, he hosted King Birendra and later Crowned Prince Gynandra in Hong Kong and remembers frantically trying to find the king's favorite French brandy and finally adds the photos of the party with the glory of his royal affinity. His ambiguous presentation confuses the reader but along with these facts he tries to create his separate identity.

How does an autobiographer select and present past histories of self in autobiography? What is the politics of memory of the author? What kind of identity and ideology he has projected? How do they play with their memory of the past? These are the questions one should consider while analyzing an autobiography. So, being informed by theories of politics of remembering in autobiography, this research paper delves into this autobiography. Firstly, it employs Joanne Rappaport's theoretical text entitled *The Politics of Memory, Native Historical Interpretation of Colombian Andes* (1998) in which he talks about how culture in which writing is not a prominent feature creates historical tradition. He theorizes politics of memory with practical examples where he introduces how people create myth about past and live in present. The text, *The Politics of Memory*, develops the theory of remembering of the past with practical examples of Columbian Andes. The claim of Rappaport's book is "History is a question of power in the present and not of detached reflection upon the past. It can serve to maintain the power, or can become a vehicle for empowerment" (64). Sidoine Smith and Julia Watson in their book *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives* further divide memory in to 8 parts; memory as

meaning making, memory and history, memory as contextual, the politics of remembering, collective remembering, memory and materiality, memory and trauma and reading for memory. Among these eight genres the paper focuses on ‘the politics of remembering’ and finds how remembering helps to create identity. They state that “contexts are charged politically. What is remembered and what is forgotten, and why, change over time. Thus remembering also has a politics (58).” Similarly Avishai Margalit in her book *The Ethics of Memory* poses questions like are we obligated to remember people and events from the past? If we are what is the nature of obligation? And are remembering and forgetting proper subjects of moral praise or blame? And he answers that there should be ethics in memory. Why we are remembering and where we are remembering or in general the place and the context differs the ethics of memory. That meant to say one remembers his/her past in relation to present context. Our memory should have ethics and the ethics comes from caring and memory. Human being is the ultimate source of ethics. She claims that: “There are struggles over who is authorized to remember and what they are authorized to remember; struggle over what is forgotten” (69).

Katawal’s *My Story* has been critically examined, interpreted and reviewed by a number of critics and engaged their articles on its way of presentation, theme, historical authenticity, nationality, military service and the heroic statute provided to the autobiographer himself. This autobiography has been claimed to be exclusively historical autobiography by a critics like Sarala Gautam. She admires the works and life story of army chief and claims that the book represents the social history with objective truth. She writes about the book that: “Katawal presents his biography with suitable use of proverbs and lines, but the book presents social reality of the then Nepal. His daring of visit to king Mahendra at the age of early teen shows his daring

in life” (my translation). RookMangad Katawal’s first meeting with King Mahendra is presented as an admirable and glorious job which is the starting of his successes in life.

Amit Dhakal in his article writes that “an autobiographer stands in present and make a meaning of past with his experience. The writer mixes his past with present position and experience so the autobiography is newly created history of self” (1). As Amit claims the writer presents his biography as sweet memory. Amit claims in his article that: “Only through autobiography we know someone’s life but what to show and what to hide depends on the writer so the autobiography is not like a mirror” (my translation). These lines question the autobiographical truth of the book. And this also indicates that the writer manipulates his readers through his words and shapes his story how it ought to be.

Kanakmadi Dikchit, in his article named “Incomplete Book of Katawal,” claims that “Katawal’s presenting of self as Admirer of Republic is hyperbolic history. He was yes-man to the Royal family who tries to save Kingship in Nepal till eleventh hour of king Gyanendra’s power” (my translatio 1). Katawal seems opportunist in that sense. A man who was worshiper of the king claims that Nepal become democratic country because of him. Kanakmadi accuses Katawal of being a novelist because his writing is like a novel that lacks objective truth and a fixed stand. A man who was totally against Maoist is now praises republican nation. He reviews the book by saying: “Katawal presents himself as one man army in the war between the prime minister and himself, he has not given proper thanks to president and other allies” (my translation). Writer in his writing claims that everything was done by himself.

Puspa Kamal Dahal, in his interview, claims that he used to visit Katawal several times before election and he used to call Katawal *dai*. The word is politically used in the book. Prachanda says “I used to call him ‘dai’, but he writes my respect in mocking way so I know he is poor man” (my translation). In this way, Prachanda denies the authenticity of the book and authenticity of Katawal as a whole.

Similarly, Kunda Dixit in his editorial writes “A General’s Labyrinth” praises this book as: “Katawal’s memoir gives us another insider’s account of events that shape recent Nepali History.” His praise is centered upon the impact Katawal’s life has made upon the Nepalese history, his influence as an Army chief and a military perspective upon the historical events. He further writes: “Katawal admits he was initially in favour of the royal takeover to “teach the politicians a lesson” so the army could focus on defeating the Maoists. But when Gyanendra appointed Tulsi and Kirtinidhi Bista as co-chairmen, he knew it wouldn’t work. Within 14 months, Gyanendra was forced to step down” (2).

In the like manner, Lok Raj Baral reviews this book as “outspoken and bold, the general’s life story is worth reading for more insight and understanding into the Nepalese Army and Nepal’s politics (qtd. *on my story*.)” This review is centered upon the richness of historical information this memoir has carried, the history of Nepalese Army and the history of Nepal as a whole. In these ways this book has been reviewed in numerous ways, taking into consideration historical authenticity and all but least attention is provided to his narrating self. So, this paper aims at assessing his self.

Most of the events he has included in the book are selective and they favor of his politics of memory. The narrator presents himself as he is courageous and clever from the very beginning of his life in Okhaldhunga. His courageous acts start

from meeting king in his village to the last minute of his tenure. There are some successful and some unsuccessful stories in his life, but the autobiographer includes most of the events where he gets success. The autobiography seems fictional as well as romantic novel where a hero or the central character gets victory over anything. His courage of meeting with king by tricking king's guard in the tent (which was made to stay king for a while to meet with citizen) is interesting. An eight years old child can cheat the king's guard in tent which questions the security system of Nepal Army. Some years later in Jhapa, five rebellions attempt to attack on king Mahendra, which is known as Sukhani Kanda. If an eight years child can baffle the kings army what might be the consequences. Similarly, 16 days war, mission Kotwada, and control over Maoist are his successful stories.

He has used remembering and skipping technique as well as has given priority to these events where he has got heroic successes. Putting a '16 day war' at the beginning of the autobiography also provides fertilizer to his politics. The very incident can be taken as the turning point of his life. As we already know that he is courageous from the childhood because he could successfully met the king which is already mentioned, and later he uses all of his courage in the war between the then Prime Ministers of Nepal: Puspa Kamal Dahal. Later result of his courage gives him a sign of successful person. The autobiography is generally taken as telling the truth about self to other, the truth which is normally unknown to other or the truth (the real experience of the writer) which only the writer knows. The perception and the experience of the same event or accident may be different from one person to another, as a victim or perpetrator or the both as victim or both as audience/witness. The autobiography gives way to them to reveal the actual truth (experience). In presentation the narrator may not be honest to present his weakness. These

weaknesses may despoil the narrator's image. Here Katawal also doing the same. He does not reveal the facts that damage his current images. In one's life there are different life events, experiences and perception of the event and his/her participation in the events. From these vivid and different events we remember some events either successful story or failure. Why we are remembering the past and where we are remembering change the perception of what event from the past we remember. The way an orphan remembers his parents and the child who has parents remembers his parents is different. That is to say that there is purpose of remembering. Katawal in his autobiography politicizes his past with the current socio-political context and eulogize his self as hero of both monarch and republican to create the identity from king made man to self-made man. Prioritizing, skipping, dramatizing the events and selective memorize are the technique used by the author to politicize the past.

An autobiographer talks about their memory, experiences, perception, belief, ideology, views, self and so on. About autobiographical memory and self the Professor of psychology at university of Washington states:

When individuals tell their personal life stories, they talk about their *selves* or, as some prefer, about their self-concepts and identities, about what has made them who they are and what they have become and are becoming. The same applies in the reverse: when individuals talk about their selves, they seem to refer to their life histories, their successes and failures, achievements and losses, hopes and fears. (6)

In this view, one's idea of the present self is all but peripheral to one's idea of the past. In examining the compelling influence of the self on the 'writing' of one's personal history. Similarly General Katawal's writing also covers the same. In the book he writes who is he and how he became the person. In the book *My Story* he

presents his concept of self and his identity as self-made successful Army. Greenwald further stated that “individuals remember their past as if it were a drama in which the self is the leading player; moreover, in the drama of one’s personal history the self-acts in an all-determining” (6). These statements clarify that an autobiographer eulogizes his/her self in autobiography. The autobiographer remembers himself as the leading character of both Monarch and democracy. He acknowledges his attempts and steps which he did to save monarch, later he writes he was standing against one party dictatorship. Kanakmadi Dikshit writes in his article published in *Majheri.com*: “Katawal says again, ‘since its establishment Nepal Army is working in tune to people’s will’—which is unbelievable. Helping King Mahendra in the coup of 2017, not coming upfront against the Maoists in disregarding the people’s government, being a major weapon in Gyanendra’s direct rule—was Nepal Army working on people’s will in these important moments” (My Translation 1).

Katawal starts his autobiography beginning with the ‘16 days war’ between the then Prime Minister, Puspa Kamal Dahal. He claims that these 16 days are the most important and hard day for him and for the country. His other life memories are presented in chronological plot development but he seems to focus the 16 days tussle. One might be claiming that that is a narrative technique of the writer but this prioritizing helps him to get his purpose. “The order of the explanation of meaning reflects the interpretive priority” (Rappaport 64). He has presented himself as a national hero where he resists country from one party dictatorship. His heroic presentation of self automatically turns Prachanda as a villain because where there is hero there should be villain. This first part of the book creates positive images of the author for many readers. And when you like someone heavily you consider their tiny mistakes and weakness. Thus this research claims that the priority of the events has

certain purpose. In one interview Prachanda says that “the book is totally useless, and he has presented me in a mocking way and as his villain. His way of presentation shows his level (My Translation)”. In the interview Prachanda claims that they had good and formal relation and they used to meet in their residence but through the book Katawal shows his ego against the then largest party CPN Maoist. Prachanda and Rookmangud thus accuse each-other as barrier of change in Nepal.

Our culture and ethical values differ what to remember more and what to ignore, and how to remember. For instance in the case of National Team of cricket we don't care who are Khada, Bhandari, Kami and Pubudu, we consider all of them as Nepalese but in the case of marriage we consider all the things. Margaret in his theoretical text *The Ethics of Memory* claims that there are two types of memory: common and shared memory. Common memories are the common value of belief in one particular group or community. “Shared memories are not simple like aggregate of individual memories. Shared memory is built on a division of mnemonic labor: who told, where told, when told, with whom told” (Margaret 48). On the basis of nationality and democracy (common memory) Katawal shares his memory to the people. The ‘shared memory’ create positive images of Katawal and negative image of the Maoist. People believe his idea because it meets existing belief of them. The ‘16 days war’ and winning of Katawal seems good for many people because there is democracy and nationality in peoples’ mind as common memory.

Katawal accepts that both of their families used to have lunch and dinner together. Prachada used to call Katawal brother because of their age. They had brotherly relation until Prachanda asks Rookmangud for his early resignation. Choice of diction also gives different meaning in writing. In the line, “It’s only 3 months *dai*,” (Katawal 22) he prefers *dai* instead of brother. In Nepalese culture the word *dai*

carries a greater meaning than the English word 'brother.' He uses the word to show himself superior to Mr. Dahal. His ego of being aged is shown there. But at that time Katawal was in place to obey the order of Mr. Dahal. Mr. Dahal, in his interview, tells that he used to call Mr. Katawal *dai* because he was younger to Katawal but Mr. Katawal uses that word in mocking way to be superior. Similarly he writes *aama* for his mother and *muma* for mother in-law. One of these words is from middle class and another is from a high class family. These words are used to show the relation to high class family. In Nepalese context, language also carries few ideologies and reflects social status. People from the high class should sound polite and sweet. Thus, here he tries to create his identity relating to high class family. His primary concern is to present him as self-made patriotic army but in periphery he wants to belong in high class.

The book begins with the childhood of Katawal where he portrays himself as an ambitious boy who wills to ride horse someday. And the story continues with his student life where King Mahendra picks him from his village and funds his education in Kathmandu. So, after his schooling, he gets enlisted in Army lieutenant's post. Then he begins his military life and amidst it he faces several ups and downs like being mixed up with politics. And he finally serves as the CAS and faces some other obstacles in its course. As an ambitious boy he had a dream of being a great man but in his career he could do nothing remarkable that can make his name famous. At the end he involved in a conflict between PM and he got victory over PM or the situation went in his favor. From that very event, he got a chance to create a myth. About past and the history Rappaport claims; "History is a question of power in the present and not of detached reflection upon the past. It can serve to maintain the power, or can become a vehicle for empowerment" (15). Thus, the history of Nepal and his own past

becomes vehicle of empowerment for his identity. In the final paragraph of the 'sixteen days war' he includes:

I was at complete peace while lying in my bed that night. I was confident the Maoists would not have a chance to middle in the affairs of the Nepalese Army ever again. I closed my eyes but old memories came flooding in and kept me from sleeping. I had grown up with a reputation for audaciousness. I saw myself as a small boy, holding on to my trousers, following King Mahendra from Okhaldhunga to be “big man”. (60)

After getting victory over Maoists in 16 day tussle he remembers that he was come to Kathmandu to be a big man. First of all, he has prioritized the tussle and puts in the beginning of the book. Secondly, he remembers his victory and reputation and that day he remembers his dream of being ‘Big man’. That symbolizes he considers himself as really a big-man that day. In his life before the controversy, he has done nothing extra-ordinary but in his tussle between Puspa Kamal he became winner. Thus, he tries to present himself as national hero who saves the country. He eulogizes his self with the glory of victory after winning the war, he is creating his separate identity from the Palace because Nepal was already a republic country and his previous glory and value of his royal affinity had become useless.

It is said that History is written from the perspective of those who are in power. In that conflict, Katawal won the war and he remains in power. Puspa Kamal Dahal resigns as the Prime-Minister. So, the history or the past was written from the side of Rookmangud, in this case. If the war was won by Maoists, or Prachanda, Rookmangud would have been known as a corrupt army and would be punished accordingly. So the history is a fictional fact which works in favor of power. There would be no matter was he right or wrong, if Mr. Katawal had to resign from

the post his total identity and prestige would have been spoiled. He would have such a pathetic situation which Prachanda had to face. The power holder is often praised. Prithvi Narayan Sah is a national hero of the Nepal who unified different states and made Nepal a whole. If he was killed in Kirtipur war he might have been known as terrorist because he had attacked others' state. But he gets success everywhere and history is written from power. Before the establishment of Republic Gyanendra had prestigious post but at the current time most of the people had forgotten him. Before Republican system is introduced in Nepal, KP Sharma Oli used to visit to king Gynandra and now it is vice versa. Similarly the chief also have been forgotten but his courage and his winning of war gives him a name.

He writes his own history reflecting the ego of being a winner. He writes "We are not going to surrender. No way"(44). If everything including those words goes with constitution and law then why should he have to tell such challenging words (no way)? He uses his power to save his post. He talks about law, order, constitution and chain of command all the times but most of the time the talks end up in his favor. In his citizenship he had reduced his age and once he had to face a problem regarding it. He accepts that the then King Birendra helps him to escape from that problem. Similarly he got help from President Ram BaranYadav in the case of his 16 days war. But in his writing the ego of being successful dominates majority of the ideas presented.

It is obvious that his success is possible only with the help of parties and president otherwise he would be thrown out of his post. He admits the help of CPN UML and congress. He writes that "UML leaders were known for flip-flopping, there was no certainty they would support me" (40). His description clarifies that the conflict was not personal but a political issue which brings great change in Nepal. But

he presents this statement as his personal issue. If the conflict was about nation, he might have said UML leaders would support democracy or right not me. The story seems like they were playing chess, there are soldier, minister, president etc. where the most powerful chases the opponent. At the end, Katakawa saves and collects more power and his opponent gets a loss. The writer valorizes 16 days conflict calling a war. The war which Katakawa side call as the war between dictatorship and democracy and Maoist side consider it as the one between change and status-quo. But Katakawa underestimates the 12 years conflict as insurgency. It is obvious that those 12 years insurgency is not officially called as a civil war not mentioned even in constitution as civil war hence how can he consider 16 days conflict as the war? Most of the Nepalese know that event as Katakawa *kanda* then why did he call it war? It is just because autobiographers politicized the past through naming. The act of naming also helps to know how he takes the events as. Thus, the naming and prioritizing of events support his politics of remembering.

Like a diary, an autobiography does not give real and actual description of the past event. In autobiography we do not include what had actually been happened that time but we interpret them remembering at the present. If a successful person remembers his/her past experience that he/she was slammed by his father while stealing one hundred rupees from his father's pocket, s/he says that thanks god, luckily he gave me a right track that day. If not, I would have been a notorious man/woman today. But the actual emotion, his anger, his fear and hatred to his father that day was negative. But it would be remembered in a positive way. "The magical power of history lies in the contrast and contradiction between the past as it was experienced and the structure of the present world" (Rappaport 19). When Katakawa first meets the king he recites the poem of Madhav Prasad Ghimire; 'gauchhageet a

nepali jyoti ko pankhauchali'. At the time of his childhood the national anthem of Nepal was 'shreemann gambira nepali, prachanda pratapi bhupati.' He had not taken formal education till then. The question is that why did he recite a poem of Madhav Ghimire instead of the national anthem which was more common? How could he have such a patriotic feeling at 8 years old? Or, is it because the then national anthem does not suit in the present? As a chief of army he learns and teaches the patriotic belief. Army promises to die for the country and they are known as the most patriotic person. Thus after being an army he chooses to remember the event. He has not included how did he came to know about king's arrival in his village. With whom he has gone there? "I had carefully studied the camps over the last three days and knew everything about how they were guarded, when people went in to meet the king and the other details. Based on this, I had figured out a way to bypass the guard and sneak in. It was already dark. The guards were stationed all around the tent and the whole tent was brightly lit"(76). Was he allowed to roam around king's tent in night time? Similarly, he explains the things that happened adventurously in home but does not even mentions a thing about what happened afterwards. This highlights his selection and deletion procedure. How could his mother not care about him? Every parent finds their child in evening time. Similarly, this also opens a room to call this more a fantasy about a small child and his little cheat to clear the guarded lines.

Rookmangud tries to create his and the Nepalese army's link and connection with common people more in book than in real life. He writes that he improved the relationship of army and civilians. But he does not sympathize and pity for those who died/were killed and got raped by both the military powers. As a chief of national army he should have equal treatment to any people but he is biased. He only cares about army and legal power. When he heard the death of king Mahendra he feels like

the world has collapsed. Katawal includes that: “As soon as I heard these words, I felt dizzy too, and everything became blurry. I had gone there to give the colonel a shoulder to cry on but now I needed help to get over my own shock. . . . King Mahendra, whom I consider my godfather, was no longer with us. Just thinking about that was very disturbing. The pain was personal and deep” (152). He there curses the officers of palace who did not allow him to meet the king. That was a bad day for him. He clearly remembers the day yet, but he forgets about 12000 who died in the name of war. “With whom you have heavily invested emotionally differs the memory” (Margaret 96). Margaret also claims that “The significance of the event for us depends on our being personally connected with what happened, and hence we share not only the memory of what happened but also our participation in it, as it were” (53). As such, our attachment with other shapes our memory and manipulates it when writing. There are a lot of people around us but we remember only a few of them. Are we obligated to remember people and events from the past? If we are, what is the nature of obligation? Are remembering and forgetting proper subjects of moral praise or blame? There is no any certain rule of remembering but our culture and society gives model for it. If you are attending a funeral of a person and you have to give words for him or her, you remember everything about him: height, age, color, work etc. but then you cannot remember the name of the dead, that act of forgetting goes totally wrong. That’s why there is obligation on remembering. Our remembering and forgetting is shaped by our culture. But an autobiographer remembers certain names show their relation with other. Most of them show their relation with people who were in power or who are in power.

Rookmangud includes most of the picture he has taken with powerful persons. He has included his pictures with Indian president, Indian army chief, king-queen and

other but only few with common people. Excluding common people and including powerful person shows his intention of being powerful and holding the power and creating the history of self. But he always claims him as poor son of poor parents and the people of lower class to win the sentiment of the citizens. But he has included picture of playing golf. Golf is known as one of the most expensive game in the world. He might have played several games with his teammates, he might have participated in other games but he does not mention them. What could be the purpose of including picture of one of the most expensive game and excluding other games? Picture of the golf shows his expensive and materialistic lifestyle and personality. He often wants to call him as son of poor but do not act like poor. He has included those pictures which show his high-class personality. His eighteenth picture of the book “with Prince Gynandra at Royal Nepal Army’s Liaison Officer’s residence in Hong Kong” is not an important part of his life but he includes the picture because it has royal person. He has next group photo with the then Prince Gynandra. Katawal often tries to dismantle the Army from servant of the king but still his mentality seems the same. The twentieth photo with the then King Gynendra “(King Gynendra visiting the Mid-Western Army Division with Army Chief Pyar Jung Thapa (first from left). I was the Divisional commander)” is not of any important function of both him and Army but his inclusion show he still thought king is supreme power. Or the researcher does not know whether king’s visit to Army Division is important aspect of life. Similarly marriage is known as one of the important life events. Marriage changes person’s life and it is known as beginning of family life. But Autobiographer keeps his picture with his wife in army dress but not a picture of their marriage. The included pictures show that his all life is lived as an army and not else. This is to show that he was devoted to army all the time. His life from the very beginning seems in such military order.

Throughout his life he acts like one of the patriotic person.

The autobiographer remembers the selective part from his life or from the life of other. What he/she needs to remember and for what purpose impacts his memory. The author in the book remembers his forefathers' bravery. There are different memories about his father and grandfather but he remembers only about bravery because he has to show himself as a brave person. Katawal writes "Your father is too bold for his own good" (63). His father dared to question *rani sahib* in his career and got punished of it. His memory about father and his portrayal of self is always against discrimination and injustice. He often goes against injustice and to verify his nature he remembers his ancestors' braveness. His father, grandfather and his nine generations have their history in the army. They all were brave like the writer. He remembers his great-grandfather Dev Raj Katawal who was killed in the war of Kathmandu. Katawal praises "We are the descendants of Dev Raj Katawal, one of Prithvi Narayan Shah's generals, who was killed during the siege of Kathmandu in 1767" (62). His remembering of this history seems to show how much of a contribution they have given to this country but the autobiographer remembers the history to show that he is a descendent of such a patriotic army who could die for the sake of country. This shows that their family could die for the nation. Rookmangud writes that "In fact, nine generations had given their blood, sweat and youth to the Nepalese Army" (62). This shows that they have long history in Nepalese Army. He does not say that they have got job in Nepalese Army rather he valorizes the position. Intentionally he creates positive images of his family to create his image.

In 12 years insurgency from 13 February 1996 to 21 November 2006 with the aim of overthrowing the Nepalese monarchy, there were several attacks, wars, retaliations, captures, lynchings, etc. The revolution resulted in deaths of over 17000

people involving civilians (mostly from the rural Nepal), insurgents, and legal powers (army and police personnel). General Katawal includes only Dang attacks and mission Kotwada in his book. These are the events where he plays heroic role. When he could do something, he presents himself as hero of the events. There was war in different places but only these wars are included where he did something special. He wastes no words for innocent people and armies who died in *Badhar-mudhe*. He does not remember the life of innocent victims and the militants of the both sides. As a responsible person of Nepal Army, Rookmangud Katawal is expected to show sympathy to these families who lost their family. As a commander of Army he would take the responsibility of army's wrong doings but he ignores the fact. According to Nepal Human Right Report 2017 BS there are still 840 missing cases pending and government has actuation of 594. In 2004 AD armies were accused of murdering 15 years girl named Maina Sunuwar. This is the only example of the violence incited by Nepal Army. Thus, remembering King Gynandra's foolishness of not being able to understand people's sentiment and ignoring the mistakes of Armies has some politics too. These remembering and forgetting are political.

It is true that autobiographers keep themselves in center and others at the periphery. Rookmangud also did the same but in his writing he uses Army chain of command in his favor. When he goes to Mission Kotwada he lied king and chief. He writes "your Majesty, I am leaving for Kotwada. The chief has ordered me to go. I lied" (299). He lies a king and the chief but later he teaches chain of command to Kul Bahadur Khadka when Khadka goes to get a letter of appointment from the prime minister being a hypocrite. Katawal writes that "don't you know the chain of command, mister? Who gives you the order to go there" (52)? Use of the 'chain of command' most of the times works in favor of him and helps him to get success in

life. This paper does not engage in political issue of ‘chain of command’ but claims that by remembering these events and including ‘chain of command’ as his tool, he praises himself. He claims that both the times the chain of command was for the welfare of the country but not for his career. He tries to show that he can tell a lie if the country is in danger. By remembering the past he adds some points in his patriotic images.

Rookmangud often attempts show positivity of royal family. He has received many things from the palace so he might be showing his gratefulness towards the palace. He wants to valorize the royal family and always project positive impression of the Shah family. His life became such a successful one because of King Mahendra and King Birendra. In the royal visit of king and queen in Hong Kong he meets king Birendra and queen Awaisorya. There he finds them very economic and not living a highly wasteful lifestyle. Katawal quotes the words of the king: “why did you book such an expensive hotel? His majesty asked . . . anything simpler and cheaper than that suite wouldn’t have been suitable for a Head of the State but even King Birendra felt it was unnecessarily expensive” (195). There was a rumor in Nepal that king, queen and royal family spend too much money in fashion, foreign brands and entertainment. And there was also a rumor that they have a lot of money in Swiss bank. Katawal writes “if they had so much money, why would they go looking for bargains” (202). But Rookmagud rejects that rumor and gives an example of their bargain to vindicate their thriftiness. Similarly when he went to meet prince Bashundhara from his school, and there he gets some money. He focuses and includes that: “When we opened our fists, all we had been given was 25 paisa” (204). Rookmangud gets angry and for not meeting his expectations of getting two or three rupees. “These people think 25 paisa is a lot of money”, the driver explained” (204).

This explanation shows that they were really good for the nation because of their calculative and economized attitudes. His explanations create positive images of royal family because he not only writes his anger of getting 25 paisa but ends with driver's explanations. Thus, it helps to create his positive attitude towards the palace. King Gynandra did coup in 2058 BS and Nepalese army was supporting that autocracy but later Katawal goes against elected prime minister and proudly says we stand between the autocracy and the democracy. This self-tag is nothing other than self-eulogize which helps him to create his identity as democratic person.

Official history and personal history lies between oral tradition and written documents. When there is link between oral tradition and written document, which is considered to be a reliable history. But in some cases oral or general understanding of common people and written documents mismatch. In these cases narrator choses the best or appropriate sources of history, either oral or written. Rappaport claims that "Paez history is not a set of texts but a constant movement between oral and written models of expression, constantly altered by the knowledge and experience of the narrator and the context in which narration takes place" (59). The narrator, a man of royal upbringing, chooses the easiest escape from the controversy. By supporting written histories he escapes from the national debate. In the case of Royal massacre he seems supporting official history which brings him in less controversy but the paper does not expect to reveal the fact of massacre from the author. Katawal writes "as far as my understanding of the events that night goes, Crown Prince Dipendra vented his rage against his mother because of her refusal to allow him to marry the girl of his choice. All other conspiracy theories are futile attempts to cast unnecessary mystery over the events of 1 June 2001" (266). The statement of the author supports the official history; but the common people doubt the official history. Kanakmadhi

Dikxit, founder of *Himal South asia*, a magazine, writes that “in the case of Royal massacre, Katawal, intimate and associated man of Narayanhiti palace, shows his understanding about the accident that Dipendra as a perpetrator. Even if that was proved by fact and logic there is still a controversy in Nepal. Hope, his understanding may help to end the controversy and departed soul may get respect and living be revered” (My Translation 1). Not only researchers but common people too may question the presentation of the General. The explanation of the author does not meet common people’s understanding. Thus, the paper claims that there might be different perspective of history and the context in which narration takes place. Nevertheless, whatever the fact is, his understanding about Royal massacre clears the blame and stigma of royal family.

Wang insists that: “Autobiographical remembering is examined as a cultural practice in the developmental dynamics of the interplay between memory, self and culture” (1). Our culture or the culture where we are brought up shapes our memory. Our social belief, religion, nationality, cast, geographical status and culture shape our memory. Within certain culture one tries to find his identity. Memory is used to create or modify their identity. Rookmangud, the palace and army have tri-angular relationship. They are inter-related. Rookmangud Katawal is an Amry with royal upbringing which shapes and creates his identity relating the palace to his past history. We remember our past and past experience in which we lived. General Katawal’s memory of the king and his son’s memory of the king are quite different. Margalit theorizes:

United States have much better flashbulb memories than whites of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., while whites have better flashbulb memories of John Kennedy’s assassination. Even if it turns out

that flashbulb memories are not on the whole reliable, that fact would not undermine the point that we find it important to report (even falsely) the channels by which we become related to a shared event when that event is of immense importance to us. (53)

An autobiographer remembers what he/she has experienced or seen closely in his/her life. He/she memorizes the world from where they come through. In Katawal's view the Royal palace and the Army are the good places where he spends his life. His identity is made there. He has different flashbulb of royal massacre and 12 years insurgency than others, like: Maoist, CPNUML leaders have. Opponent celebrates one day to celebrate their glory and government celebrates on the other day. 27 Poush is celebrated as Unification day by some people and the People from the Kirtipur remember this day as the Black Day. Similarly, although there are people who totally hate Shah Kingdom and the then Royal family, he often tries to create positive meaning and images of both army and the former royal palace. His belief and culture make it. Demuth states that: "One crucial aspect of the self-concept expressed in autobiographical remembering is reflected in the way the narrator constructs his or her personal possibilities for activity and action initiative (agency) in regard to the reported life events" (322). This statement clarifies that the autobiographer creates his/her identity through his action of the past. He tries to prove that he was in good place with his flashbulb of present in royalty. Thus, the above mentioned example of royal family and army's positivity adds some positivity in Katawal's images.

The paper claims that he has forgotten many people; most of them are lower class people. He has included his meeting with former King Gynandra before he became the king. He has included the meeting where nothing special happened. Similarly his meeting with Dhirendra is also included as sub topic like Gynandra's

meeting in Hong Kong and Prince Dharendra. He remembers taking to disco request of the then Prince Gynandra “colonel, take us to a disco” (200) but he has not even clearly mentioned his own brothers’ name. He has mentioned the name of different people and meeting with royal family but in his about 50 years career he has not meet his own brothers or does not think mandatory to mention his meeting with them. It is obvious that we cannot include all the events in autobiography but describing the then King’s brother with sweet memories and forgetting his own brother is questionable. Similarly he remembers Princess Shruti and other members who were in power. He praises former Prime ministers: Krishna Prasad Bhattarai, Sher Bahadur Deuwa, Surya Badhur Thapa, etc. All of them are presented in positive manner and has positive images. He has remembered congratulatory word of the then PM Girija Prasad Koirala when appointed as the CAS but what happiness that brings in his family is forgotten.

Katawal remembers and confesses his bad past which has no meaning in present. He confesses the facts which causes no change in his identity rather presents himself as honest. By presenting banal and tiny mistakes he presents himself honest. He confesses that he used to smoke in his school days and he used to fight with his friends. the theorist of autobiographical memory claims: “Autobiographical memory and self are interconnected meaning system constructed in micro-and macro-cultural contexts of collectively performed and shared symbols, tools and artifacts. This process involves many layered interactions between an individual and the belief structures of the society” (Wang 3). This statement shows that how auto-biographers remember and present their past in the present. Memory is not an actual presentation of the past rather it is the meaning making process in the present. Memories of the writer are interpreted through the requirements of the then social context. Katawal

remembers: “Cigarettes were prohibited in school. But the prohibition only made it more exciting to break the rule. I had mild withdrawal symptoms and needed to smoke desperately. I started smuggling cigarettes into school and, since first boy was smoking, it became easier for my friends to do the same” (93). Here writer proudly says that he used to smoke and with no regret he tells that “prohibition only made it more exciting to break the rule.” But he excludes the fact which may spoil his images. In his 16 day war he calls different foreign military and non-military friends but he does not mention their names. What could be the reason of not mentioning their name? He writes, “from the car, I first called the President . . . then I informed *Girijababu*, and while negotiating Kathmandu’s traffic, managed to call all the top leaders of the main parties to tell them what was going on. I also informed my foreign military and on-military friends” (49). He excludes the name of those people whom he called, it is suspected that he might have called an Indian Army Chief Dipak Kapoor. He has claimed that as a national secret in different media. He presents himself as active, clever and accountable boy. In his first journey from village to Kathmandu he used to note down all the things and events which he had seen. He has clear memory of his first look of the bus. “A man was seated in the front with a round ring like a *nanglo* to steer the bus” (83). He remembers steering which was like a *nangloo*. Similarly remembers gear which was equally important like steering. Such a cunning person skips cleverly these names that may raise questions against him. Thus, this paper claims that he remembers the things which strengthen his identity. And by remembering these events which have no effect on present he seems honest and true.

General Katawal remembers the event, where a junior soldier asks him a smoke. He gives punishment to the soldier. But in his entire career he has not got any punishment. From his childhood he is very clever and Mr. Know all. Most of the time,

we remember our past when we face similar kind of event. While talking about the event of junior soldier he did not remember his any tiny mistake of his Army career. In the review of the autobiography of Katawal, Yadav Devkota in his article 'Rookmangud le Kaso Bhanenan; Laghusan khani Loktantrakai lagi (what Rookmangud did not say; a tiny doubt too for democracy) writes: "Katawal never gets any punishment in his career, he was never a junior officer he was always senior officer. At that time when he was lieutenant he fought with the Colonel, kinds of things happen in his life" (My Translation 2). Similarly, Bibek Kumar Shah, a former Army Secretary, responds to Rookmangud's fake documents by citing Rookmangud lamentation that "They seized my decreed document from my personal file. I faced injustice. I am a village man. In such a case none other than you General may help me'. Saying this he [Rookmangud] cried out loud" (my translation 195). But in his autobiography Rookmangud neglects this fact. On the other hand in the interview with Dil Busan Pathak he rejects this fact outright telling "if he looks like a crybaby". Thus, by hiding his weakness he presents his positivity to the reader and has not given chance to question on his personality.

Rappaport claims memory as "the relationship between past and events and their manifestation in the present" (64). As such, it can be said that we relate our past in relation to present, past can help solve the problem of the present. An autobiographer remembers his past which can help his/her current problem. Or they might describe their past in the present context. Katawal writes that "it's said that our ancestors were given responsibility for all the forts and the arsenals of every state that Prithvi Narayan conquered during his unification campaign. We were probably given that responsibility because we had proved our loyalty to king and country" (63). He has related his ancestors' history with his own history. He remembers his ancestor's

past which matches his present position. Similarly he writes that “I had heard as I travelled to Kathmandu that the Army Chief was the most powerful person in the country after the King” (86). This statement was written after him being a chief of Army but if he was an actor he might have talked about a super hero.

Similarly he creates myth of Katawal that “back then, the people who projected a *kot* (fort) were called “*kotwal*”. Our ancestors won the king’s confidence and started writing their surname “Kotwal” which was subsequently modified until it became “Katuwal” and eventually “Katawal” which is our surname today” (63). This is how people create myth about the past and lives in present. Rappaport insists: “Historical memory is not the past, but the present and future” (116). But according to Wikipedia, “the term “Katawal” has come from the name of the ancestor of mythological Hindu warrior Shri Seth Katawal, he considered Hindu to be the ultimate devotee of the God of Shiva”. Wikipedia includes that ‘Katawal are those who used to slaughter animals, that another type explanation which challenges his description of their past.

Therefore, this analysis of Rookmangud’s autobiography through the lens of Politics of remembering reveals the effort of the writer, selective inclusion and exclusion of the past, prioritizing and eulogizing his self to create his new and separate identity. The autobiographer politicizes his past and transforms his royalist identity into being a devoted and patriotic army. By recalling his past he tries to dismantle his identity of royal-made man and creates separate identity of self-made man with his own capacity and ability. To create his identity he presents his story in achronological order. The turning point of his life which is known as *Katawal Kanda* or Chief of Army incident is presented as '16 days war', which is said to have brought great change in Nepal. That is one of the important incidents at the ending time of his

tenure which is given priority in the beginning of the book. The prioritization shows that he had not done anything important than confronting the Prime Minister. Similarly, the topic 'he will ride a horse someday' shows that the narrating I (narrator) presents the narrated I (narrator's past self) as an ambitious boy. The presentation of self by the writer indicates that his life is like a movie which is well managed from the beginning of his life. The narrator shows like he was born courageous. In his childhood he revolts against his brothers. Similarly he shows his daring in meeting with king. When he meets the King he had some patriotic sense in his mind. In that time in Gurukul, the instructors (especially Priests) used to tell them story from *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*, but he knows nationalistic poem which is admirable.

On the one hand the autobiographer remembers his ancestor Dev Raj Katawal, who was devoted army and spy of Gorkha and was killed in Kathmandu. He remembers his positive past of their ancestors to create positive images of him as an individual from an honest and civilized family. On the other hand he creates a myth of their surname, Katawal. According to him Katawal is the guard of Fort in ancient history but Wikipedia shows them as Kattawal (the person who carries *Katta*. *Katta* means large weapon specially used to slaughter animals). He has created meaning of past in relation to present.

Rookmangud presents himself as the backbone of the country. It is true that Army is backbone of the country but he eulogizes himself more than he did. By forgetting his, Nepal Army's and the Royal family's negativity, he eulogizes his past. He tries to deny his royal affinity to make his separate identity but while doing that he has some sympathy and gratitude to the Monarch. King Mahendra gives him access to study, King Birendra helps him in career and President Ram BaranYadav helps him in

16 days tussle. So, he is thankful to them. By putting other in periphery and self in center he eulogizes his self to create his identity in Republican Nepal.

Even if, the autobiographer creates his identity by recalling his past, this autobiography captures the socio-political context of the then Nepalese society. The book helps us to know some history of Nepal Army and Nepalese Shah Family. This autobiographical text of the former Chief of Army Staff also encapsulates the 12 years insurgency and its impact upon the society. Although this book carries researchable areas like ‘personal memory as National history’, ‘autobiographical truth’ and ‘memory, culture and self,’ this paper only concerns upon the aggrandizement the narrator has made to his self in his act of remembering and forgetting events from his past. Readers will find this paper significant as they find out how an autobiographer plays with memory and creates his identity by playing with memory.

Works Cited

- Baral, Lok Raj. "The General's Odyssey." *Kathmandu Post*, Aug. 20, 2014. kathmandupost.com/tag/lok+raj+baral
- Dawadi, Amrit. "What Direction is Katawal's Autobiography on?" *Suraak*, [suraak.wordpress.com/2014/09/10/ कटवालका-आत्मकथा-कता-तिरर](http://suraak.wordpress.com/2014/09/10/कटवालका-आत्मकथा-कता-तिरर)
- Demuth, Carolin and et al. *Autobiographical Remembering and Cultural Memory in A Socio-Historical Context*, London, 2012, researchgate.net/publication/254407492. Pp 315-338.
- Devkota, Yadav. "What Rookmangud did not Say: A Tiny Doubt too for Democracy." *Sanchaarpatra*, Chitwan, 2014. 3 sept. 2014.
- Dikshit, Kanakmadi. "Katawal's Incomplete Book." *Majheri*, Aug. 31, 2014. www.majheri.com/node/15278
- Dikshit, Kunda. "A General's Labyrith." *Nepal Times*, Kathmandu, July 30, 2014. archive.nepalitimes.com/article/nation/rookmangud-katawal-memoir,1567
- Dhakal, Amit. "While Reading the Katawal's Autobiography". *Setopati*, archive.setopati.com/raajneeti/16062/
- Gautam, Sarala. "Social Truth Told by a Soldier." *Majheri*, Aug. 30, 2014. www.majheri.com/node/15274
- Greenwald, Antony G. "Fabrication and Revision of Personal history", *The Totalitarian Ego*, USA, Department of Psychology, 1980. p.6.
- Katawal, Rukmangad. *My Story*. Nepa-laya, Kathmandu, 2014.
- - -. Interview by DilBhusanPathak. *Tough Talk with DilBhusanPathak*, 1 Sept. 2014. youtu.be/sT517blAn8.
- Margalit, Avishal. *Ethics of Memory*, London, Harvard University Press, 2004.

- Rappaport, Jonne. *The Politics of Memory, Native Historical Interpretation of Colombian Andes*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Shah, Bibek Kumar. *Maile Dekheko Durbar [The Palace I saw]*. Kathmandu, NISS, 2016. p.195
- Smith, Sidoine and Julia Watson. *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives*, University of Minnesota press, 2001.
- Wang, Qi and Jens Brockmeier. *Autobiographical Remembering as Cultural Practice: Understanding the Interplay Between Memory, Self and Culture*, 2016, 10.1177/1354067X02008001618, [researchgate.net/publication/24772939](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24772939).