

**Tribhuvan University**

**Woman's Conscience in Bisheweshwar Prasad Koirala's *Teen Ghumti***

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U.**

**in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of**

**Master of Arts in English**

**By**

**Neelam Khanal**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**June, 2011**

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Central Department of English**

**Letter of Recommendation**

Mr. Neelam Khanal has completed his thesis entitled "Woman's Conscience in Bisheweshwar Prasad Koirala's *Teen Ghumti*" under my supervision. He carried his research from September 2010 to June 2011. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva voce.

---

Mr. Pushpa Raj Acharya

(Supervisor)

Date: -/ -/-

**Tribhuvan University**

**Central Department of English**

**Letter of Approval**

This thesis entitled "Woman's Conscience in Bisheweshwar Prasad Koirala's *Teen Ghumti*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Neelam Khanal has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Head/Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_

Central Department of English

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Contents

	<b>Page No.</b>
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
I. <i>Teen Ghumti</i> and Relevance of Third World Feminism	1-11
II. Female Conscience and Resistance in Koirala's <i>Teen Ghumti</i>	12-35
III. Indramaya as an Articulate Third World Female Voice	36-37
Works Cited	

## **Acknowledgements**

This world is the world of dependency; none can exist alone in the absence of another. Similarly, while writing this thesis I took help from different scholars, lecturers and my counterpart too. This thesis would not be exposed into the present form in the absence of inspiration and proper guidance of my respected teacher Mr. Pushpa Raj Acharya, lecturer of the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. I will always be indebted for his genuine scholarly guidance, responses and remarks.

In the same way, I would like to extend my profound gratitude to my honorable teacher Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, head of Central Department of English for granting golden opportunity to carry out this research on the subject of my keen interest. I am grateful to respected lecturers: Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Dr. Shiva Raj Rijal, Dr. Geeta Khadka, Dr. Taralal Shrestha, Saradchandra Thakur, Badri Acharya, Harihar Gyawali, Raj Kumar Baral, Hemlal Pandey, Prakash Subedi and others who assisted me by their scholarly encouragement and continuous inspiration. I cannot even remain spellbound to utter the names of my friends Binod, Hari, Indra, Jhalendra, Khagendra, Kishor, Laxmi, Nabin, Rajendra, Umakanta, Vaskar and others for their cooperation and advice. I also cannot forget my Uncle Pushpa Lal Chamlagain and brother Gobinda Khanal for their strong support.

Lastly, I cannot forget my wide-hearted Grandfather Dhanapati Khanal, Grandma Narbada, Father Lila Ballav, Mothers Renuka Devi and Bishnumaya who struggled hard to make me what am I today. Likewise, I am grateful to my loving sisters Chanu, Lalita, Yashoda, Sophiya and brother Neetesh who are always ready to support and bless me in every step.

June, 2011

Neelam Khanal

## **Abstract**

Koirala's novel *Teen Ghumti* (1968) is a radical text of its time as it gives agency and resistant spirit to women characters. True to the title, the novel is the reflection of the life of the protagonist whose three important decisions concerned with her life mark the resistance to the dominant discourses of the society. This research tries to see the failure of the Western Feminism to understand and address the problem faced by The Third World women who are entangled with the complexities determined by their local contexts. The homogenized category of the global sisterhood, the discourse of Western Feminism is reductionist and monolithic that dismisses the diverse problems of the Third World women like Indramaya. The protagonist is an articulate Third World female voice with whom the shaky edifice of the Western Feminism comes to its fall.

## **I. *Teen Ghumti* and Relevance of Third World Feminism**

This research analyzes the novel *Teen Ghumti* (1968), the first novel by Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala. The basic attempt of this research is to project the female resistance to the established social norms and values of the patriarchal society. Indramaya, the protagonist of the novel is in the quest for self autonomy or freedom does not remain within the rigid boundary of patriarchal social norms and values. For the analysis of this text, the research examines the socio-political circumstances of Indramaya and her resistance along the line of Third World Feminism as the theoretical framework. The basic assumption of the analysis is to examine the resistant female voice of the Third World female character Indramaya, the Western feminism is insufficient as the local circumstances of Indramaya different than that of the female worldwide.

The Western feminist approach is narrow to address the problems of the female worldwide as it is founded upon the basis of homogeneity; without caring about the local circumstances and reducing the problems of the female worldwide into the homogeneous category of global or universal sisterhood. As Terri A. Hasselar writes in her review article “Articulating Feminist Causes and Democratic Futures in Western and Third World Feminism”:

For Feminist Studies, the conflicts between Western and Third World feminisms have been an important area of critical inquiry. Critics such as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Chandra Talpade Mohanty have emphasized close, local, and historicized investigations of Third World women's experiences in order that Western feminist visions are not privileged. And yet, there remains a call from many critics for a universalized approach to feminism that will not only highlight the

contextual differences but will also allow for a shared feminist vision that could cross national boundaries, a democratic feminist cause.

(155)

The difference among the women worldwide is the result of the difference in their socio-political situatedness. Though, there are certain commonalities among the women as a whole, the western women are never been the victims of colonization and the caste system. So, Third World critics like Spivak and Mohanty criticize the limitations of Western feminism and call for the close, local examination of the female voices of the Third World.

To study the resistant voice of the Third World female character Indramaya with the consideration of the circumstances of Nepalese society mediated by patriarchal discourse, lack of democracy, and the social hierarchy due to the caste-system as a result of the divisive practice of Hinduism will be closely examined in the course of the research.

Indramaya, the female protagonist in the novel becomes victim of gender disparity and prevalent social norms and values. Though her parents claim that they do all things for her happiness, they never try to understand her feelings. In spite of her parents' disapproval, she decides to marry with Pitambar who is from the upper Brahmin caste. This move is the first Ghumti or mode of her life in which she starts challenging the social codes and enters into the phase of womanhood from her immature girlhood. Similarly, in the second and third modes of her life, Indramaya opts for illegitimate sexual relation with her husband's friend Ramesh for preserving her right to be a mother when her husband has been imprisoned and after her husband's release from the jail she opts to live with her daughter Rama instead of her husband for protecting her motherhood.



## **Koirala and His Literary Contribution**

Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala was a great freedom fighter and literary person who was born in 8<sup>th</sup> September 1914 in Benaras as the first son of Dibyadevi, the second wife of social reformer and flourishing businessman Krishna Prasad Koirala. Due to the democratic and nationalist stance in Koirala family, they were compelled to live in exile and became penniless. All those events had strong impressions which were deeply embedded on Koirala's heart and mind. That consciousness was further cultivated by Indian independence movement and he ultimately became a great statesman.

Besides being a great political leader, he is also one of the most well-read writers of Nepali literature. He has written short stories, novels and even some poems. He started writing stories in Hindi. When B.P. was a student in Benaras, he came into contact with Indian great writer, Premchand. He was an editor of Hindi literary magazine *Hansa*. His first Nepali short story was "Chandrabadan" and it was published in *Sharada*, the famous Nepali literary magazine of that time in 1935. Koirala claimed himself as a democratic socialist in politics and anarchist in literature because he gave more stress on freedom in writing rather than appealing for security. He had double identity of social realist and psychoanalyst in the field of short story. In modern Nepalese short stories field, Koirala was very good at presenting the character. He was a perfect surgeon of women minds which was beyond the chief concern and delivered the complex concepts. The study and the analysis of human mind which was formally started by Sigmund Freud were first practiced in Nepali literature by B.P. Koirala. So, he is also taken as an illegal son of Freud in derogatory language. In his stories, the emphasis simply goes to the role of libido in human life as a Nepali disciple of Sartre and Camus.

During his imprisoned life in Sundarijal Jail, he wrote many novels and stories. B.P. was kept there during 1960-68 at first when King Mahendra overtook the power of elected government. Though, he was isolated from the external world he maintained his tranquility and continued writing on different aspects of life. He has written in various genres like essays, poems, diary, journal and autobiography. But in the field of short stories and novel he is highly successful. His writings like *Jail Journal*, *Atmabrittanta*, *Pheri Sundarijal* etc. are very interesting to the readers of any ideology.

His literary masterpieces are: *Doshi Chasma*, the collection of sixteen short stories which was published in 1949; *Teen Ghumti* (1968), *Shweta Bhairavi* (1983), *Narendra Dai* (1970), *Sumnima* (1970), *Modi Aain* (1979) and *Babu, Aama Ra Chhora* (1989). Another novel *Hitler Ra Yahudi* (1983), which is in the form of travelogue, remained incomplete. However, it was published. Another incomplete autobiography *Aphno Katha* (1983) and many other rare texts are being published.

One of the prominent scholars and analysts of B. P. Koirala, Dr. Bhoopati Dhakal "Kamal" introduces on B.P. Koirala's writing trend as:

. . . politically, Koirala is a voyager of democratic socialism and appear as a psychoanalyst and existentialist as a litterateur. So, both the facets of the Koirala's personality stand as one, taking the side of human-independence. In fact the brightest light radiated from all the Koirala's works is the light of female liberation and female consciousness. To prove the consciousness, Koirala has kept on writing one text after another. (My Trans.71)

The above outstanding lines of Dhakal express the deep insights upon the literary works of Koirala and that establish him prominent figure among the writers who can

grab the consciousness of reader, while writing that makes B.P. a notion rather than a person.

On the discussion of his strong writing capability especially on *Narendra Dai*, Sajha Prakashan states – "B.P. Koirala is not the subject of introduction the name itself is sufficient" (My Trans. n. p).

The Editorial of novel *Teen Ghumti*, Sajha Prakashan about the text exposes that the novelist Koirala is in favour of individual will rather than social will which can be quoted as:

Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala who regards literature as the highest subject matter rather than politics uses distinct writing style, linguistic pragmatism, sentence-formation and craftsmanship in comparison to his contemporaries. An individual will is greater than social will is the main message of Koirala. So, an individual's repressed desires, feelings and psychological waves should be given self-decisive freedom. (My Trans. n. p)

Even being a statesman as well as former Prime minister, how he advocates literature and keeps it on higher position than politics that clearly shows his love to literature. His heart was full of preference to writing, but Koirala never thought himself as a literary writer. He thinks literature never wants to put feet on the walked way and it chooses to build its own way. That is an anarchist nature; this idea is similar to the thought of the great poet Laxmi Prasad Devkota. While suggesting Shankar Lamichhane, he says, "Repetition of work on the same line has no meaning". Like Laxmi Prasad Devkota, B.P. was experimentalist and innovative and they always wanted to walk on new highway by rejecting the readymade path.

He was a great socialist but socialist literature is limited. His various political essays are included in *Rajtantra Ra Loktantra* (1960), *Thichieka Janta Jagisake* (1969), *Rastriyata Nepalko Sandarvama* (1970), *Kranti Ek Anivaryata* (1970), *Panchayati Vyavastha Prajatantrik Chhaina* (1978), *Prajatantra Ra Samajbad* (1979), *Rastriya Ektako Nimti Aahwan* (1980) etc. Most of them were banned at that time. People were taken to jail just by possessing Koirala's writings. It was Koirala's strong will power to create such strong anti-current literature which was totally pro-public.

His political writing expresses the democratic, socialist and patriotic view against capitalistic exploitation as well as opposition to communist bread-based politics. He thinks a man cannot live for breads only. He thinks socialism as a wave of the future and an answer to poverty. In an interview B.P. says, "The question of democracy separates communism and democratic socialism as how a river divides two countries having different castes and system" (My Trans. 83). He believes that the absence or presence of democracy provides two different pictures of the development process.

Koirala was influenced by Great Russian writer like Chekov, Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Turgenev and Gorky. Chekovian style of short stories influenced Koirala's style. Koirala was the first person to provide the introduction of existentialism in Nepali literature. Camus and Sartre were his favorite writers. Among poets he liked Shakespeare (not as dramatist) most. Romantic poets Keats, Shelley and Byron were enchanting characters to him. He prefers Wordsworth a little. Among Indian writers, Rabindranath Tagore, Premchand, Jaya Shankar and Sumitra Nandan Pant have exerted large influence on him.

Koirala states that politics and literature have no any relation. He says, "There is no any smell of politics in any writing." He further states about his dual personality in the following way:

I am cheerful in the world of imagination, than in the world of experience. I am emotional, romantic and thoughtful. Likewise, rebel too. My soul is influenced by two elements politics and literature. I sometime become Gandhist, sometime terrorist, sometime Marxist and later again become essential for soul to be static. Literature should show new path and it can do so too. It is continual experienced thing. Literature is free and personal thing. Though I may fall in inner conflict, I prioritize emotion and experiencing sentiments in literature.

(38)

Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala's novel *Teen Ghumti* (1968) shows quite a radical departure from what has been written by his contemporary Nepalese writers in Nepali literature to date. Contemporaries like Rudraraj Pandey, Rup Narayan Singh and Govinda Bahadur Malla 'Gothale' are overtly concerned with female characters. They sympathize with them. In their writings, the female aspiration, female dignity and female identities have no value. The female characters are unable to live as an independent being, their identities have been lost and they are passive sufferers of male domination and the traditional patriarchal norms and values. The female characters are lost in long pathos of identity crisis and the consequences in their lives have resulted in frustration and isolation those result in a terrible actions like suicide. And even though they continue to live, they do so in oblivion.

Koirala, being contrary to his contemporaries has demonstrated a different point of view about his female characters. Literature obviously sprouts from culture

and depicts the features of socio-cultural existence of human beings. It represents the distorted man-woman relationship by degrading the status of women. Pandey, Singh and Gothale have depicted the women as inferior and immature character in their intellectual potential. Their female characters have a little space in social, cultural and economic spheres. They have to remain usurped, dominated, invisible and ineffective acting merely as secondary agents of male authority. The culture depicted in their novel has carried out the masculine traits and continued to emphasis male interest, male ego and male objectives. The yardsticks of religion and social norms operate the future of female characters. The social control on them has restricted their movements and appearances to a large extent which lose their initiative and self confidence. The insecurity, helplessness and physical weakness made them subservient and socially further dependent. But Koirala's female characters have self-governing and very different with male characters (Bhattarai 106). His female characters do not need to live life in trouble, in disgrace and in agony but they have awakened the desires and a vigorous longing for freedom. They are not passive sufferers of their domination rather they revolt against it.

The female characters do not remain silent about their domination but they express their views and desires. The female characters are equal to male characters and if there is ill-treatment towards the female characters, at the end of the novel male characters suffer. In Koirala's first novel *Teen Ghumti* (1968), the female quest for freedom is portrayed, female identity is perceived. The novelist here represents Indramaya as a 'rebellious lady' who does not bow her head before social norms and values in order to introduce herself as a free lady. She becomes victim of gender disparity and prevalent social norms and values. Though her parents claim that they do all things for her happiness, they never try to understand her feelings. In spite of

her parents' disapproval, she dares to marry with Pitambar who is from the upper Brahmin caste. Similarly, in the second and third modes of her life, Indramaya involves in illegitimate sexual union with her husband's friend Ramesh to preserve her right to be a mother and after her husband's release from the jail she opts to live with her daughter (Rama) rather than her husband to protect her motherhood.

The outstanding novel *Teen Ghumti* (1968) has been analyzed from different perspectives since its publication. Different critics have read the text differently. The Editorial of Sajha Prakashan about the text exposes that the novelist Koirala is in favor of individual will rather than social will which can be quoted as:

Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala who regards literature as the highest subject rather than politics uses distinct writing style, linguistic pragmatism, sentence formation and craftsmanship in comparison to his contemporaries. The main message of Koirala is "an individual will is greater than social will. So, an individual's repressed desires, feelings and psycho instincts should be given self-decisive freedom."

(My Trans. n. p)

Emphasizing on Indramaya's decision to distinguish herself from the ocean of womanhood rather than to be submissive and hegemonized in front of patriarchal norms and values, one of the Nepali critics Indrabahadur Rai in his book *Nepali Upanyaska Aadharharu* asserts:

Indramaya, 45, in the novel has done three different difficult decisions at the age of sixteen; twenty five and twenty seven respectively which are important modes in her life. Indramaya in the context of those decisions remarks- 'in equal to other ladies, her life also remain ordinary and if we do not calculate her three decisions in life; she is

only a drop mixed in the ocean of womanhood. But her decision as an individual drop distinguished herself from the ocean of womanhood. For Indramaya, ocean is only the summation of drops. Each point, for being a point, decides about its own existence. . . . (My Trans. 252)

From the above assertion, it is clear that the protagonist Indramaya longs to distinguish herself as a free lady unlike other woman who remains being hegemonized assimilating worn out social norms and values.

Similarly, interpreting the text embodying conscious female decision Krishnahari Baral and Netra Atam remark, "Koirala's *Teen Ghumti* as the first novel has described female freedom in the context of female existence. Conscious decision of a woman as beloved, wife and mother and her readiness to accept any crises is exposed here" (My Trans. 219). From this statement too, it becomes clear that Indramaya, the protagonist is represented as an aware lady who searches for her own identity facing many difficulties.

Interpreting the text from Indramaya's ego or her quest for protection of existence, Krishnachandrasingh Pradhan asserts:

In *Teen Ghumti*, it is abstracted that Indramaya is motivated to leave her husband because of hatred instinct. Stepdaughter is intolerable for Pitambar. Indramaya thinks it is intolerable to live without her. Pitambar advises Indramaya to leave daughter, however she wants to preserve love instinct and motherhood at a time. She stands firmly in this demand of fundamental existence. . . . She is rather ready to give up Pitambar's husband hood but cannot accept him expelling Rama (daughter) who is rejected by Pitambar. (My Trans. 367)



In the above assertion too, Indramaya as an independent lady chooses her daughter rather than the husband Pitambar which seems to be a great challenge to the patriarchal norms and values. It also pinpoints her quest for fundamental existence.

In this regard, it becomes clear that though the text has been analyzed through various perspectives as mentioned above, the Third World Feminism approach has not been applied yet. There exists a strong need to carry out research on this novel from this new perspective. Without a proper study on these issues, the meaning of the text will remain in dim light. Keeping this fact under consideration, the present researcher proposes to carry out research from this approach.

## **II. Female Conscience and Resistance in Koirala's *Teen Ghumti***

The novel *Teen Ghumti* by renowned Nepali writer B. P. Koirala is the reflection of the protagonist Indramaya about her own past that lets the readers see through the past details of the life of the protagonist. The three strong decisions and the choice of her own life in each of the decision is both the resistance to the social codes based upon caste hierarchy and the established patriarchal codes of the society. Indramaya is an educated woman who resists the patriarchal codes of the society. She is bold woman who resists the traditional categorization of woman in male-dominated social circumstances and transcends her position from the victim of caste system to the independent woman. The novel is, thus, the narration of the ordeals of the third world woman to invent her own subjectivity and it is the journey of a Third World woman from the state of innocence to experience.

Since Third World feminism is not the binary opposite to the Western feminism and is very loose approach to incorporate the voices of the Third World women, this research draws on the various feminist critics as well as the third world feminist theorists. As Third World feminists insist upon the examination of the female subjectivities and resistance from the perspective of more local and close analysis going beyond the homogenizing categorization of women as a whole, their ideas will be incorporated to examine the resistance of Indramaya in the Nepali Third World contexts. Notable third world Feminist Chandra Talpade Mohanty argues about her criticisms of Western feminism as:

I did draw on Michel Foucault to outline an analysis of power/knowledge, but I also drew on Anour Abdel Malek to show the directionality and material effects of a particular imperial power structure. I drew too on Maria Mies (1982) to argue for the need for a

materialist analysis that linked everyday life and local gendered contexts and ideologies to the larger, transnational political and economic structures and ideologies of capitalism. What is interesting for me is to see how and why “difference” has been embraced over “commonality,” and I realize that my writing leaves open this possibility. (504)

For Mohanty, the Western feminism is insufficient to examine the real complexities of the Third world women as she attempts to “outline a notion of feminist solidarity, as opposed to vague assumptions of sisterhood or images of complete identification with the other” (3). The homogenizing image of the women in terms of the global sisterhood has been refuted and the “differences”, plurality and multiple subjectivities have been highlighted by her using the Foucauldian analysis of discourse amidst the vague assumptions of “commonalities” of sisterhood among all the women around the globe.

Indramaya, the protagonist of the novel *Teen Ghumti* is forty five and in her transition from the middle age to the old age. In her days of middle age, she begins the contemplation about her past life and the three strong decisions which demarcate her three modes of life. The title of the novel itself comes from those three important phases of her life. She begins her contemplation from the examination of her life as:

She can't say her as abnormal. Her life was normal and common like the lives of other women. If she didn't count the three decisions she made during her life, she would just be a single drop in the ocean of the overall female lives. But the independent decision made by the drop had separated the drop from the ocean. (My Trans. 2)

Thus, Indramaya sees her life as the departure from the experience of the common third world woman and she stands as the single voice out of the subjugation of the females with various borders in the third world society. Her plights of the identity determined by various categorization of women and various limitations born by the third world women is the portrayal of the condition of third world woman significantly diverging away from the categorization of women by Western feminism. She diverges away from the construction of women in society opposing the construction of women as Mohanty says, “as opposed to vague assumption of sisterhood or images as complete identification with the other” (3). Indramaya represents the complex female character and the margin who is untouched by the Western constructed feminism and the “notion of feminist solidarity” and whatever decision she makes it only becomes the resistance of the individual subaltern voice of the Third world.

Western feminism supplants other culturally, politically, and historically shaped notions of womanhood and feminism, effectively erasing them within Western feminist dialogues and beyond, as the reach of Western feminist scholarship is far. Conjointly, when Western feminists place themselves at the center and cast Third World women into the periphery through inaccurate and ahistorical concepts, a universalized image of the typical Third World woman begins to arise. Mohanty relates:

This average Third World woman leads an essentially truncated life based on her feminine gender (read: sexually constrained) and her being ‘Third World’ (read: ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, domestic, family oriented, victimized, etc.). This, I suggest, is in contrast to the (implicit) self-representation of Western women as

educated, as modern, as having control over their own bodies and sexualities and the freedom to make their own decisions. (22)

Indramaya is the typical representative of the Third World woman who disrupts the monologic, hegemonic discourse of Western women about the Third World Women with making important decisions of her life by her own. She resists the socio-political domination, the constrained sexuality, and goes against the tradition which is reflected in her three bold decisions about her life. First, she refuses the social codes which don't let the women the freedom to choose her husband marrying Pitambar at her own will leaving the society behind. Second, she decides to establish the sexual union with Ramesh protesting the sexist hegemony of Pitambar and gains the motherhood that was impossible from her husband. Third, she decides to leave her husband resisting the tendency of her husband to control her sexual autonomy and always treat her as inferior and she gives her daughter the freedom from the patriarchal interference in the decision making. She raises her daughter alone resisting the traditional notion of female dependence to their husbands and gives her daughter the feminist democracy letting her to decide about her husband by her own. These three decisions mark three modes of her life and due to these decisions she departs away from the common traditional lives of the Third World Nepali women.

As Alexander and Mohanty advocate for "shifting the unit of analysis from local, regional, and national culture to relations and processes across cultures. Grounding analysis in particular, local feminist praxis is necessary, but we also need to understand the local in relation to larger, cross-national processes" (xix), this analysis first sets out with the caste-system that has local situatedness in South Asian societies. Caste-system is not the potential barrier for Western feminists and the assumption of the female who is limited by caste-system of Hindu society doesn't

come under the Western feminism. When Indramaya takes the first decision to marry Pitambar caste-system comes as the hurdle for her and she needs to face the consequences alone going against the social code of Nepali society leaving her family behind. When her mother opposes her decision saying, “How it is possible, Indramaya? He is Parbate Brahmin and we are Newar Vaishya” (My Trans. 3). At that moment Indramaya feels that even her parents who are her nearest ones were alien to her. The social codes based on the caste-system locate her in lower position of being Newar and Pitambar in the privileged class as Brahmin. She has been narrated contemplating in her resistant attitude as:

The world of her mother and father in which she had been breathing till now was alien territory for her. The barriers of social codes were trifle for her as she had been completely immersed in the love of Pitambar; her parents were trying to pull her out to the bank of river in which she had been drowned, throwing the weak rope of the same trifle social codes. (My Trans. 3)

In such state of life she had taken the first decision of her life to leave her family and gain Pitambar as her husband. It is the first mode or first ‘Ghumi’ of her life.

In this mode of life she had been in the condition of dilemma either to choose family or the love. The love became the pinching question for her that wanted her answer only in ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Either to choose society or the love gave her alienated contemplation and assessment of her situatedness in society and questions its codes. Her life was in the transition of the girl to womanhood. She keeps on thinking; forcing herself away from the friends and choosing the alienation. She sees her father and mother were blocking her way to go to society using their rights and powers to dominate the stubbornness of a young girl with the domination of the social codes.

The subjugated, subordinated people in the Nepali third world society are the highlights of the society of Indramaya. The people in the society are abided by the king or the ruler of the nation, so, they belong to subordinate class of the ruled. On the contrary Pitambar is a political activist who goes against the social agreement to be ruled by the King and fights for democracy. Beside the caste system, the political belief is another factor for Indramaya's mother to refuse Indramaya's proposal to refuse him. She questions his political ground as she says:

You should know one more fact. We are the King's people and we have the reputation in the society because of our old relation with the palace. Pitambar is a man of political party whom palace hates. Since there is negative attitude of the palace to him, I am warning you for your own happiness how long might he keep hiding? (My Trans. 6)

The possibility of Pitambar's arrest has been shown to Indramaya to dissuade her decision to marry him but she doesn't care about the possibility of further negative consequences and boldly decides to marry him refusing the codes of the society.

It is in such the difficult circumstance, Indramaya takes the bold decision to marry Pitambar leaving all the family behind. The act of her resistance to the social codes is the outcome of her own conscience as she is alone in her difficult circumstances. When she went to Pitambar one evening without caring about any further consequences to marry him at her own will, she entered into the phase of womanhood from girlhood as it implies she is no more dependent on her parents to decide about her own life. Thus, it becomes the first, important mode of life.

When she started married life, Indramaya had been the neglected creature for her family. She started to engage herself in the household activities and political debates and gatherings of Pitambar and his friends. Though the male activists

respected Indramaya addressing her with near words like 'sister' and 'sister-in-law', their overall attitude towards the females attested the same patriarchal codes of the society. They regarded females as 'other' and inferior to males. They relegated the feminine virtues to the proofs of cowardice. She narrates in one conversation how males construct the identity of females defining them as coward. She recollects the conversation:

Some would address me lovingly, "Sister! What do you know about practical politics? The tyrant has only understood the fear."

Indramaya would laugh and ask, "Hasn't the people understood the fear? Isn't the tyrant capable of generating far more fear than us?"

All would laugh and speak in collective voices, "See the attitude of coward woman, see!" (My Trans. 11)

Even though Pitambar and his friends were engaged in radical activism against the rule of the king and they believed upon the power of arms, they had the same patriarchal bias for women. They regard women as coward and ignorant and boast about their superiority. Women in the Third world society, thus, are expected to accept themselves as 'Other' as Simone de Beauvoir asserts:

In men's eyes and for the legion of women who see through men's eyes it is not enough to have a woman's body nor to assume the female function as mistress or mother in order to be a true "woman". In sexuality and maternity woman as subject can claim autonomy; but to be a "true woman" she must accept herself as the Other. (1000)

In this way the subjectivity of a woman has been constructed. Indramaya with the strong stance and weapon of logic fights against such otherness of her self in the society. The sharp contrast between the males and females is portrayed in the novel.



Males regard females as their commodity and they are full of jealousy if they even try to feel easy in the male company. They try to control the whole actions of the females and create the multiple layers of barrier between their wives and the society. Pitambar shows his prejudice over his wife Indramaya as she starts mingling with them with certain distance to them and enjoys the male community of his friends and the conversation with it. He is too unjust not to see that she is already cut off from the society crossing the social codes when she decided to marry him. Full of prejudice, he questions her pleasure she had just begun to gain in the company of his friends as seen in the following conversation as:

One day, Pitambar had spoken to her with bitter prejudice coming to the kitchen, “You enjoy a lot in the gathering of the friends, don’t you?” Indramaya was touched by the little abnormality of Pitambar’s voice; but she replied plainly, “It is my only society. I am happy in this society.”

Pitambar ridiculed her, clarifying his poisonous feelings, “Why don’t you enjoy? You are the only woman in such a big male society and you feel your value has highly increased, don’t you?” (My Trans.14)

Such position of Indramaya in which represents the condition of the Third world woman. Her only business is to please her husband, to be confined in a narrow boundary of the four walls without hurting the male ego or patriarchal codes. It is the form of patriarchal oppression. The females are not allowed to enter into the important spheres of the society which is very suggestive of the political and civil oppression which is observed by Mary Wollstonecraft as:

The mighty business of female life is to please, and restrained from entering into more important concerns by political and civil

oppression, sentiments became events, the reflection deepens what it should, and would have effaced, if the understanding had been allowed to take a wider range. (398)

In such the situation of political and social oppression, the identity of Indramaya has become constructed identity which is in the need of reflection, reconsideration and attempt to reconstruct it. Unlike her, the condition of Pitambar is totally different; he is free to do anything he likes. He also has the numerous extra-marital affairs but Indramaya doesn't show such bitter prejudice over him as he shows upon her for so trifle cause of her mixing up with the male society. When Indramaya learns about Pitambar's extra-marital relationship with other women, she takes the matter coolly, without any prejudice. Women have to bear the moral and sexual infidelity without any negative reaction and try to cure such problems with further submission to their husband's will. Thus, women are oppressed and males are all powerful, transcendent.

With the instance of the prejudice in her husband for her healthy interaction to the society of males and lack of prejudice in her for the morally and sexually illicit relationship of her husband, the strong gap between the male and the female is visible. The ignorance of the male domination starts to evaporate from Indramaya and her consciousness reaches to the new height. She starts to see difference between the male and female love. Her new subjectivity and her journey to mature self start to shape. When she was growing to her womanhood from girlhood, she had resisted the social codes and barrier of the caste, and started to live with Pitambar without formal marriage. Now, she starts to see the male dominated society as hierarchically divided into ruler and the ruled and love as for these two unequal classes is guided by their class ideology. Indramaya started to brood the unequal horizons of love as:

It is because of the inherent distinction between the male and female nature, the love has been so different between them. Male is ruler by nature. The state of male nature is always flying high towards transcendence and male needs to find himself always flying high to feel secure in his reputation, and position to see the security of his manhood [ . . . ] Unlike them, we, females, have just opposite tendency. We know only to dedicate and sacrifice and remain inferior. Our normal condition naturally demands the descend, the transcendence. In such condition, where does the pride of our love lie? (My Trans. 16)

Indramaya sees there is no place for the women in the society to love freely and the love between the males and females is mediated by the ruling patriarchal discourse. There is the hierarchy even in the love of male and female. Male love is the weapon for his elevation of his social position so that he could be the ruler forever. If woman has any genius, she needs to separate herself from the patriarchal society and find her own room to use her creativity as Virginia Woolf suggests, if a woman has the genius, She “would certainly have gone crazed, shot herself, and, ended her days in some lonely cottage” (48-49). The longing to find place for her love and find her own room is developed in Indramaya as she is getting disillusioned with the patriarchal way of unequal love. Thus, it leads her to the second mode of her life in which she bears a daughter from the sexual intercourse with Ramesh, Pitambar’s close friend, when Pitambar has been imprisoned for his political activism.

The second mode of the protagonist’s life is the bitter protest of the patriarchal codes of the society in which women are always regarded inferior and the males always maintain their transcendent position. Pitambar and Indramaya are married for more than one year and Indramaya is unable to bear a child. Pitambar is busy most of

the time and Indramaya feels lonely. She doesn't feel jealous for Pitambar even though, she is continually informed that Pitambar has the extra-marital relationship with the women in the town but Pitambar feels jealous of her healthy communication in the circle of Pitambar's male friends. When Indramaya expresses her desire to be mother to a child and wants the co-operation from her husband Pitambar, he dismisses her demand with the charge that she might have been infertile, barren woman. He sees himself as complete man in the chauvinist male fashion and all the faults are the results of woman's weaknesses for him. In this sheer inferiorization of woman, she feels she is totally marginalized and insignificant. Male is the 'self' and the female is the 'Other'. As such, we can see the subalternity of the woman in the Third world. The instance of Indramaya's social situation can be seen as characteristically the feature of the Third world women. To highlight the Third world representation in Indramaya, we can draw on the assertion of Mohanty about the potential commonality among the Third World women as:

What seems to constitute "women of color" or "Third World women" as a viable oppositional alliance is a common context of struggle rather than color or racial identifications. Similarly, it is Third World women's oppositional political relation to sexist, racist, and imperialist structures that constitutes our potential commonality. (49)

Indramaya as Mohanty suggests is gradually exposed to the sexist domination of the patriarchy embodied in her husband Pitambar. She recalls her bedroom conversation with her husband and comes to the realization of her social position. As Indramaya talks about the silence of home full of loneliness is because of the absence of the children Pitambar aggressively replies her that she was the person who was responsible to choose her way of life. Indramaya was shocked and hurt. She controls

her tear and asserts she has no lamentation over her decision. She recalls the strong accusation of Pitambar in the bedroom conversation between them before Pitambar was arrested, as narrated:

Pitambar spoke little mildly, “When did I say I have the lament marrying you? But why do you say there are no children at home because of me? There may be defects on you; may be barrenness...”  
Indramaya mildly protested, “Children are the finest creation created by the co-operation between the husband and wife. Why don’t you co-operate with me? Pitambar replied turning to the other side, “I am too tired today.” (My Trans. 20)

The repression of the desire of a third world woman has been exposed on the above instance of conversation. That night began the transition in Indramaya’s self realization and her subalternity. She couldn’t sleep that night and kept on messaging her husband’s body. He slept well but she slept the night just staring the ceiling. She lacked the voice because of the realization of her subalternity. Her condition is very pathetic because of the ideological construction of gender as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak asserts, “[. . .] the ideological construction of gender keeps the male dominant. If, in the contest of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow” (32). The silence and the subalternity of the third world woman like Indramaya is attempting to burst out of the continual repression but in the context of her third world circumstances, she is alone to resist her subaltern position constructed by the ideological construction of gender.

The morning after the night of silence gave her new autonomy as Pitambar was arrested that morning. Her third world situatedness continually demanded her of the various responsibilities and new her responsibility shifts from the household care

of her husband with submission, to the care of the imprisoned husband, still, amidst the expectations from her, she gradually comes to the contact of Ramesh and decides to bear a child. The morning, thus, is the beginner of the new mode of life that leads her to find voice for her subaltern subjectivity. She refuses to be the subservient sexual slavery to male and bearing a baby from a man other than her husband, she shatters her husband's unjust and hegemonic charge of her infertility.

The second mode of her life is the phase of strong resistance to the construction of her gender role by patriarchal values of Pitambar. The challenge posed by Pitambar's questioning of her capacity to bear children and prove her fertile becomes the psychological agent that leads her to decide about her sexuality herself and she bears a child from Pitambar's friend, Ramesh when her husband is imprisoned. Thus, she disrupts the stereotype of women as subservient in their sexuality to the males. The orientalist representation of the orient women as passive and compliant to the decisions of males about their sexuality is resisted by Indramaya with retrospection about her position in the Third world society.

Indramaya is in very difficult condition to decide about her sexuality and new self leading her to motherhood. She is in the position of shattering the earlier faith on her marital life and her equal position in her husband's house. Her difficulty for the shattering of her earlier self and the existing faith has been narrated with her reflection as:

To stand against own faith is more unbearable than to go against the social codes. The piece of heart would merge with the faith and the decision to go against the heart makes the decisions unbearable. The faiths in the heart wouldn't be different and alien . . . . Decisions can be made with a kind of neutrality, keeping the heart pure and

unaffected, without breaking the self into the fragments. (My Trans.

24)

It is very hard to decide against the social codes as she has already experienced in the situation when she left the society behind and married Pitambar. That was her first mode of life but in the second mode of life, her heart is divided between her faith and the awareness of sexually othered self and she has to liberate her from the 'otherness' but at the same time, she needs to keep some of the faiths preserved for the imprisoned husband who would come to claim her love after he would be free. Further, he would need more love after he would get out of the prison. Thus, the shattering of the faith upon the sexual equality and motherhood with Pitambar and still to keep her faith intact for his love is giving difficult turn to her life. Here, we see the limitation of Western feminism that tends to characterize all the women of the world as homogeneous group, the assumption that all the women of the world have the similar experiences of the marginality and domination. The reduction of Indramaya as the woman facing the similar problems like the women of the west is the failure of the feminist thoughts to understand the various local circumstances determining the subjectivity of the third world woman. For a Western woman, only the revolt against the constructed sexual marginality and still keep loving the same husband is not possible. Western culture is too individualistic and the only the sexual fulfillment and motherhood are related to love for Western Women and the love heads to collapse if it doesn't serve the needs of a Western Women. In the case of Third World woman Indramaya, Pitambar and her love to him is the spiritual bond, still, she subverts the sexist ideology of Pitambar with illicit physical intercourse to gain motherhood from a man other than her husband and attains her motherhood giving birth to a daughter.

She sees the relation between her and Ramesh as antithesis to her to Pitambar. Her relation to Ramesh has been the self discovery and the cut of being discovered without striving towards it. Her situation in this relation has been narrated as:

“Indramaya feels her position in the relation to Ramesh was opposite to that of Pitambar. She never moved single step towards it; only she let herself to be discovered. Just to stay waiting with the hope of her discovery is the negative enthusiasm, isn't it? If it is, she felt herself guilty; it was only in a small share of being discovered” (My Trans. 25)

We see Indramaya as very logical and judicious woman in her decisions. When Pitambar had been arrested, she runs the household activities facing the entire economic crisis and the situations responsibly. Her poverty and loneliness don't deter her to face life with responsibility. In this phase of her life full of difficulty, we are introduced with a charitable, compassionate and poor woman who earns her living selling fast-foods. When Indramaya is living pathetic life full of hunger, she goes to the old woman's shop with her only pair of earrings and requests her to provide her Chiura and potato-curry for a few days in exchange to her earrings. But, the old woman provides her the food refusing the earrings as the exchange of the food. The compassion and the humanitarian attitude is typical to the third world women who are not contaminated by the Western consumerist values and are free from their economic interests. When the woman offers the chiura and curry, the woman says; “I'll keep on giving the foods as long as I can; you can come as long as you need. Those poor men are arrested for people like us, aren't they? (My Trans. 30-31) Thus, we see the third world women conscious of the geo-political circumstances and support the politics.



The feeling, compassion, surpasses the mechanical consumerist logic of the Western women. The charity and the spiritual bond exist in them.

In such difficult time of crisis, Ramesh enters into her house. He had also been arrested but he had been released earlier than Pitambar. The life of Indramaya becomes bearable as Ramesh starts supporting her. Even though Ramesh is distanced with Indramaya with the formal relationship at first, he leads Indramaya to discover her sexuality and the desire for motherhood with continual violation of the boundary of the formal relation. For Indramaya he remains only means to help her to the position of mother but her love was always for Pitambar. For the discovery of Indramaya's sexual self Ramesh's resistance to the distance of formal relation plays vital role. Gradually, the formal address of 'sister-in-law' started to vanish and Ramesh started to address her only as Indramaya. First, Indramaya tries to counter Ramesh's view of intimacy. For, Ramesh, the formal relations are superficial and the person who loves other should not be restricted to formal relation. There should be no physical distance between the lovers. Indramaya attempts to stop the initiative and insistence of Ramesh with formal logic as Indramaya recalls:

I kept on debating for a long time, "Ramesh! A Hindu woman sees two different forms of God. First, the power situated outside that comes to help her in crisis, full of compassion. That god remains neutral and even being compassionate it doesn't become the personal possession. Next, the God in the form of husband, which is full of intimacy and is the personal possession. Even if I addressed you as God on the day of your arrival, why you understand it only in the latter sense?"

He would say, "Indramaya! It's only your logic, not the feeling from heart." (My Trans. 31)

Two distinct observations can be made from the above conversation between Indramaya and Ramesh. The first observation is that the third world women are lower in the hierarchic order than their husbands and this sense of belonging to the marginal lower position is shaped by religious belief that the husbands are like the God. The positions of the third world women, thus, have been confined within the worship of their husbands with their sexual faithfulness to them. Thus, they need to repress their desires and maintain the distance with the males other than their husbands. They are in marginal position economically and, thus, need to be subservient to the males of the society. So, the better understanding of being the third world woman has been repressed in Indramaya because of her socio-political context. The value of understanding of being a woman has been underscored by Chandra Talpade Mohanty in the introduction of her book *Feminism without Borders* as:

It would require a clear understanding that being a woman has political consequences in the world we live in; that there can be unjust and unfair effects on women depending on our economic and social marginality and/ or privilege. It would require recognizing that sexism, racism, misogyny, and heterosexism underlie and fuel social and political institutions of rule and thus often lead to hatred of women and (supposedly justified) violence against women. (3)

There is no clear understanding of the political consequences being a woman in Indramaya at first as suggested by Mohanty. But she strives to find her new subjectivity of motherhood with disruption of patriarchal sexist discourse that questions her fertility, her capacity to reproduce and to become a mother. The disruption is, further, just proves to be partial one as she goes against Pitambar's doubt over her ability to reproduce still hopes to get his love. Even in her third mode

of life, she feels difficult to choose between her husband and her daughter, she chooses her daughter and becomes independent from Pitambar but she still loves him as she had once married him and given him the position of God. Thus, the sense of resistance has been mixed up with compassion and love. Thus, the Western feminism fails to understand the complex circumstances governing the subjectivity of the third world women and, thus, it is inadequate to address the problems of the third world women in its homogenizing categories of the women as a whole. The women's subjectivity is multiply mediated and feminism needs to incorporate all the heterogeneous female voices rather than to homogenize them. The third world feminism sees the complex formation of women's subjectivities in post-colonial circumstances which are very complex to include in certain homogenizing categories. The subjectivity of Indramaya is more complex than the women of the post-colonial third world society because Nepali society has never been colonized and thus, lacks the direct colonial mediation.

The second observation from the above conversation between Indramaya and Ramesh is that the males in the society have the agency and the awareness about the repression of the desires of the females. Ramesh clearly knows the repressed desire of Indramaya and so, he continually charges at the repressed desires so that they would explode and Indramaya would surrender before her desires letting Ramesh the chance for physical union. Thus, the male participation in the repression of desires and the playing with those repressed desires to fulfill their own self-interests is ironically highlighted in the novel.

Ramesh's intention of the physical union becomes articulated when they continue to live together. But his intention was not so barbaric that he could rape her. He gradually nurtured the grounds of Indramaya's repressed desires. One day,

Indramaya terms his attitude as rape of a lonely woman but Ramesh counters her as narrated by Indramaya:

I replied determinedly, “Are you preparing to rape a woman as you find her lonely, Ramesh?”

He replied mildly, “You? You lonely! You know well, nobody can rape you; then how can a person who loves you whole-heartedly? But you are raping yourself and me, very successfully. You know well that my position at your house is very nominal and if you don’t like me you are able to chase me with a single word from your mouth anytime”.

(My Trans. 40)

Thus, Ramesh’s relation and the love acts as the foil to Pitambar’s love for Indramaya and she discovers the fulfillment of her self in Ramesh. That leads her to violate the social codes and the god-like, transcendent position of males in society. She lets Ramesh the role of the fulfiller of her desire of motherhood with physical union to him. It is her second mode of life in which she disrupts the patriarchal codes sleeping with a man other than her husband in the same house in which her husband gained authority over her body.

The third mode of her life is the scathing critique of the ruling attitude of the males controlling females in the patriarchal social codes. The defeat of Pitambar is clearly visible from the day of his return from prison as Indramaya has just given birth to a daughter. Pitambar becomes shell shocked when he leaves the defeat of his sexually superior assumption about Indramaya’s barrenness as she was in hospital with the proof that she wasn’t barren. Indramaya had the hope that Pitambar would be glad to see the daughter but he coarsely looks at her and thus, he has the anger of the defeat. Indramaya’s happiness also vanishes with his cold manner. Then, she

starts contemplating about the quality of love amidst the continual cold and rough manner and becomes critical of the superficial love that prevails only within the social codes to impose the authority over the females. She questions the superficial love of Pitambar as:

Why has he been unable to enter the love more seriously than the marital relation imposed by the social codes? Why he is unable to pay attention to the quality of love? Why does he only claim the marital rights and collecting the husks throwing the Kernels? Why is he trying to forget the fact that the relation between Indramaya and Pitambar had been established on the basis much higher than the social codes? (My Trans. 62)

The sexist domination of the males upon the females has been the axis of the patriarchal social values. Even after Pitambar has been badly defeated he wants to attain his earlier dominating self again. As he is unable to wrestle with Indramaya with logic, he desperately attempts to blame her with the charge that she might have slept with Ramesh for money when Pitambar had been in prison. Such dominating attitude of her husband is vehemently resisted by Indramaya. She frustratingly reacts to Pitambar when he attempts to prove her sexual choice as a crime. To counter Pitambar she gloomily speaks:

Sex ...sex...sex! Can't you free yourself from the thinking of sex for a single moment, Pitambar? However important is the sex for human life, it doesn't have such a right that it could give the man the prestige of a husband. Haven't you seen from your experience that mere sexual relations couldn't make you the husband to all the women you slept

with? Nor all the customers of a prostitute are her husbands. (My  
Trans. 67)

Thus, the democratic love free of the domination based on sexist discourse is the major quest of Indramaya. She is the strong voice of the Third World women. In her third mode of life, she revolts against the continual sexist torture of her husband Pitambar and chooses to lead her life free of intervention of her husband. She gives her daughter the autonomy to choose her own husband and her life. She, thus, transcends her position from the narrow prison of social codes to the feminist democracy.

Feminist democracy suggests a different order of relationships among people. It suggests understanding socioeconomic, ideological, cultural hierarchies of rule (like those of class, gender, race, sexuality and nation), their interconnectedness, and their effects on disenfranchised people within the context of transformative collective or organizational practice. In Indramaya's context the collective transformational practice of the democracy is not possible but she practices it going beyond the organizational practices of marriage.

Jacqui Alexander and Talpade Mohanty phrase the approach to formulate the feminist democracy as, "In formulation of feminist democracy, agency is theorized differently. Women do not imagine themselves as victims or dependents of governing structures, but as agents of their own lives" (xxviii). Indramaya's resistance of the social codes is the demand of the revision for the agency of the males of the society and when she is unable to reassess and reform her agency within patriarchal society, she decides to live her life that is free from the masculinist intervention. Thus, she becomes the agent of her own life with the use of her own conscience.

The main contribution of Third World feminist dialogue with regard to assessing the actions of women in postcolonialist and patriarchal societies is rupturing the previously uniform homogenized category of Western feminism “all women and any women.” The feminist Third World dialogue recommends that gender concepts also be examined in relation to additional categories, such as ethnicity, status and culture. The additional categories help feminism to make it more inclusive and to incorporate the multiple voices of Third World women like Indramaya. The diverse local factors playing the roles to construct the various subjectivities of the women become the crucial entities to examine the female resistance in the Third World contexts.

So, feminists of color and Third World feminists began to point out the hegemonic forces of Western feminism, the concept of a global sisterhood of women became disputed. Some feminist authors, such as Robin Morgan in her anthology *Sisterhood is Global*, conceive one unified international women’s movement based on women’s common condition under a universal “patriarchal mentality” (1). This conceptualization of a united women’s front has been criticized and disrupted by Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Mohanty, as well as other feminist scholars, as Alexander asserts; “. . . an approach [that embraces] the articulation of many voices to specify an inclusive feminism — calls for ‘global sisterhood’ are often premised on a center/periphery model where women of color or Third World women constitute the periphery” (xviii). This argument harkens back to the instance of othering in feminist theorizations of Third World women and their experiences, as well as the privileging of one type of feminism (Western) over alternate feminisms that may embody needs specific to its women participants.

Global sisterhood, also referenced in literature as universal sisterhood or international feminism, came under fire in Chandra Mohanty's *Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience* in which she posits an alternative conceptualization to Morgan's global sisterhood. Mohanty calls this framework the "politics of experience." Oppression is experienced differently by different women and varies according to the separate experiences, a view that influenced Mohanty's derivation of Adrienne Rich's politics of location as Rich points the monologic discourse formation about women as she says, "The faceless, sexless, raceless proletariat. The faceless, raceless, classless category of "all women." Both creations of white Western self-centeredness" (8). Mohanty's politics of experience is grounded in historical, geographical, and cultural loci (460) in which women's experiential differences are accounted for and political agency is emphasized, a change from the ahistorical context within which global sisterhood functions. Mohanty disputes claims to a global sisterhood, stating that the assumption of women's sameness is "predicated on the definition of the *experience of oppression* where difference can only be understood as male/female" (463). This problematic assumption is for a number of reasons. The close examination based on the analysis of local circumstances is needed to understand the resistance of the Third world women like Indramaya going beyond the homogenizing tendency of the western feminism is thus underscored by the Third World feminists resisting the so-called 'Global'.

Indramaya, in the realization of her limitation in the family dominated by the patriarchal hegemony starts to see the lack of any possible communication between her and her husband, thus, is constrained by the legitimation crisis in her local context of Nepali Third World. She feels, "Pitambar and she have been changing to the creatures of different worlds. There could be no possible communication between



them of their thoughts, emotions and languages” (My Trans. 69). There is no mutual understanding between the husband and wife due to the ground they stand are different which don’t allow them to communicate. As Amanda Anderson, in *Tainted Souls and Painted Faces: The Rhetoric of Fallenness in Victorian Culture* (1993) discusses the theory of communicative competence formulated by Jurgen Habermas, she underscores the need of recognition of the relationship between language and thought. Habermas’s theory of communicative action focuses on “mutual understanding,” a concept that extends beyond the realm of language to that of thought. In fact, Anderson claims:

Habermas’s account of the relationship of reciprocity and recognition that are presupposed in any action oriented toward reaching understanding disallows the radical rupture between ethics and epistemology . . . [His] discourse ethics insists that the higher level of argumentation required in any self-reflexive democratic process is an extension of the more primary mode of action that is oriented toward reaching understanding. (222)

Since Indramaya feels there is no democratic process “oriented towards reaching understanding”, she chooses her own life leaving her husband in the third mode of her life. She disrupts the social discourse that females are dependent to their husbands, live sexually contained life and the Western feminist biases that the Third world women can’t make decisions about their lives. New discovery of her independent self is radical and typical Third World model of resistance. It is the outcome of her rigorous self-assessment and use of her conscience accordance with the development of the local circumstances and rational self-analysis in her retrospection.

### **III. Indramaya as an Articulate Third World Female Voice**

Examined from the local contexts determining the local contexts as per the Third World Feminist assumption, the protagonist of Koirala's novel *Teen Ghumti* (1968) appears to be the articulate representation of the Third World female voice. Indramaya, the protagonist, continually discards the self that is always constructed by the different hegemonic discourses in the Nepali Third World and heads ahead to find her independent self. She is forty five, and her daughter is in her late teenage when she begins the retrospection of her past life and her struggle against the various social limits put upon the females by the codes of family, society and patriarchy. She feels herself as a separate from the females of the society as they lack the proper education and consciousness of their reality. Females, in the Third World society, lack the agency of their life as they are appropriated by various forms of domination in every walk of their life. The protagonist is able to articulate resistance against the limitations imposed upon her life with the use of her conscience and judicious retrospection.

As Third World Feminist Chandra Talpade Mohanty argues "for the need for a materialist analysis that linked everyday life and local gendered contexts and ideologies to the larger, transnational political and economic structures and ideologies of capitalism" (504). With her Third World context and her continual examination and understanding of it, the protagonist makes her resistant and true Third World female voice. Out of her experience, she keeps on maturing her understanding, at least one ideology at a time, in her local context. In her first mode of life, she is a young girl with strong sense of protest. She understands the family ideology appropriated by caste system and decides to go against the family and society and so, she decides to marry her friend Pitambar. She enters into the phase of womanhood leaving the girlhood behind.

She never looks back and in short span of time, she understands that the love is not possible between the husband and wife as it is already appropriated by the patriarchal discourse. The motherhood is her right and her husband is not ready to accept that she is deprived of the right by his weakness. She strongly resists the patriarchal, sexist construction deciding to gain motherhood with her illegitimate union with her husband's friend when her husband is in prison. This marks her second mode of life. Her local problems and the ways of resistance are different than the females worldwide. So Mohanty highlights her project of Third World Feminism to "outline a notion of feminist solidarity, as opposed to vague assumptions of sisterhood or images of complete identification with the other" (3). The position of the protagonist is very close to Mohanty as she reflects about her life that she is different drop in the ocean of females as a whole as "But the independent decision made by the drop had separated the drop from the ocean" (My Trans. 2). So the protagonist herself discards the Western Feminist assumption of the homogenizing category of global sisterhood.

In the third mode of her life, she understands the sexist domination of her husband as he is unwilling to accept the daughter born by her from the illegitimate relationship with his friend Ramesh. She resists the sexist discourse of her husband with the bold decision to live her life by her own with her daughter, with the refusal of the economic dependence to her husband. She envisions the feminist democracy for her daughter free of any form of domination in the society. With the use of her conscience and continual reflection and revision of her self, she becomes the agent of her own life and becomes the articulate female voice of Third World.

## Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. New Delhi. Harcourt India Pvt. Ltd., 2000.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge, 1997
- Anderson, Amanda. *Tainted Souls and Painted Faces: The Rhetoric of Fallenness in Victorian Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Ashcroft, Bill, et al. eds. *Key Concepts in Post Colonial Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Atam, Netra and Krishnahari Baral. *Upanyas Siddhanta Ra Nepali Upanyas*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2058.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. "Selections from *The Second Sex*." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. ed. Hazard Adams. Florida: Harcourt Brace, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Second Sex*. London: A Millennium Project, 1993.
- Bhattarai, Dr. Tulasi. *B. P. Koirala: Chintan ra Prayog*. Kathmandu: Himshikhar Prakashan, 2058.
- Dhakal, Bhoopati "Kamal." *B. P. Koiralaka Upanyasharuma Bichar Paksha*. Syangja: Jaya Nepal Prakashan, 2056.
- Habib, M.A. R. *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory*. Oxford. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2008.
- Hasseler , Terri A . "Articulating Feminist Causes and Democratic Futures in Western and Third World Feminism." *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature*, 28: 4, (October )1997.155.
- Koirala, Bishweshwar Prasad. "Interview" . *Arunodaya* Issue, 1-2, 2035: 82-89
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Narendra Dai*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2049.

- \_\_\_ . *Teen Ghumti*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2064.
- Mies, Maria. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in International Division of Labour*. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1986.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28:2(1), 2003. 499-535.
- \_\_\_ . *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham & London: Duke University Press. 2003.
- Pradhan, Krishnachandrasingh. *Nepali Upanyas Ra Upanyaskar*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2061.
- Rai, Indrabahadur. *Nepali Upanyas Aadharharu*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2058.
- Rabinaw, Paul, ed. *Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *The Spivak Reader*. Eds. Donna Landry and Gerald MacLean. Great Britain: Routledge, 1996.
- \_\_\_ . "Can the Subaltern Speak? Speculations on Widow-Sacrifice." *Wedge* 7-8 (1985); rpt. as "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988. 271-313.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1999.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. ed. Jennifer Smith. London: Cambridge University Press, 1928.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. "A Vindication of the Rights of Women". *Critical Theory*

*Since Plato*. ed. Hazard Adams. Florida: Harcourt Brace, 1992.