

I: Sanjeev Upreti, *Ghanachakkar* and Madness

This research is a study of celebration of madness by the protagonist of Dr. Sanjeev Upreti's first novel *Ghanachakkar*. It is very difficult to differentiate who is mad and who is not because to diagnose a mental malady is not as easy as diagnosing a physical problem. The protagonist of *Ghanachakkar* is said to be crazy but no signs or symptoms the protagonist gets in the novel nor do we conclude it while going through the 247 pages of the novel. He celebrates his life deconstructing the conventional definition of 'madness.' The theme of the novel revolves around madness- both personal and societal. It is set around Kathmandu and represents a mixture of reality and fantasy which shape the nation's contemporary history.

Dr. Upreti's *Ghanachakkar* has dramatized the constructive trauma of a misfit, who aspires to cure the malaises of different kinds that corrode the creative possibility of society and people with pure lofty aspiration. The misfit intellectual is pressurized by evils and perversions of different kinds to embark on an adventure to uncover hidden ugly truths which bear crucial social implications. And his search is enmeshed in labyrinthine concentric circle. In this circle, he comes across several imbedded inner circles which continue to unfold eternally till the seeker reaches his destiny. Agya Poudyal in *Wave* argues similar kind of remark as:

The book takes you into the psyche of a psychologically unstable but not necessarily an insane human being. Referred only to in the first person, *Ghanachakkar's* protagonist is explicitly termed a lunatic. But the implicit sanity that his actions and thoughts carry should appeal to most readers as otherwise. There can be no second opinion that the protagonist's character is the most detailed character in the book.

Nevertheless, it doesn't overshadow the portrayal of important characters like student Ranganath and an ascetic Dilbarnath. (46)

Upreti has juxtaposed the lunatic plane onto normal social realities in a way that express defiance against the ruling elites for their monstrous exploitation of the common people. The dichotomous relationship he, so skilfully, contrives between the normal and the lunatic plane serves him well to challenge the feudal establishment.

We are free to create our own interpretation of ourselves in relation to the society, to create a project of possibilities, of authentic actions as the expression of trauma. According to Caruth, the individual has the potentiality to become more than what she or he is since “man is nothing else but what he makes of his conflicting thoughts. Each individual has to make his own society with a meaning of his own”(Introduction vii). Caruth divides living as authentic and inauthentic. She chooses authentic living stressing that one must choose and make a commitment to make life better. No sooner the character crosses one circle; he comes across another, which he calls as ‘*Ghanachakkar*’. He further says these *chakkars* are unalterable but one replaces the other and an individual never gets rid of it.

A senior lecturer of his department, the protagonist can do nothing for Rangnath, a university student, who claims that he deserves a division but has failed. He wants to get his copy rechecked. But the department head begrudges in an aggressive mood that there is no provision for rechecking. In such a state, he is blamed that he is on the verge of becoming mad. This troubles him a lot and the situation becomes quite complicated. His teachers, colleagues and even wife want to put him either in the lunatic asylum or in a hospital. Being afraid of his dreadful future he disguises himself as a nomadic Yogi and spends several nights in a *pati* (inn). Sharma and Poudel in their article “Ambivalent Mind” published in *The Rising*

Nepal view these issues in the novel as: “How does society behave towards one who tries to come out of their group for some peculiar reasons? When does one get bewildered on preexisting notions? These are the questions that haunt our mind now and then” (4). Actually it was his quest to find out the root cause of his traumatic state though he knew he was right and aware of all these troubles.

In order to make people believe he continues his fervent and feverish search. He remembers Dilbernath’s and Rainar’s talk of uncontrollable and unpredictable anarchy, which is the mystery that could be measured neither by Rainer’s *sakti chhad* (power measuring rod) nor by Dilbernath’s *mantra*. And Dilbarnath’s utterance destruction of tall tower, mobile, a sack, a restaurant, ministry, a mirror, a zenith- keeps on hunting him. Thus in the dim hope of getting an outlet he plans to visit restaurant and ministry.

In the library of ministry he finds a book rack. And the books are the portrayal of mad protagonist e.g. Pagal, Pagal Basti, Bahula Kajiko Sapana etc. The protagonist also sees all the ministers playing marbles of different colors. He is discouraged as he sees deteriorating future of his daughter and her contemporaries. This makes him more traumatic. The present political instability and irresponsibility of leaders is one of the main causes that lead him towards what the society called madness. And thus, he becomes misfit in the society because his ability and truth is not realized and valued by the contemporary society. Instead, he’s put into the lunatic asylum.

Ghanachakkar is a dramatization of madness of an intellectual trauma which is purely creative in nature. His trauma is caused by disorder, chaos, confusion, disarray, disorganization, disruption, anarchy, lawlessness, derangement, dishevelment and dislocation that have ravaged the nook and corner of the country. Foregrounding the same issue Bishnu Spkota in his article “*Ghanachakkar* mind” argues that:

“*Ghanachakkar* is history its characters are real, even in the mundane sense of the world real” (4).

According to trauma analyst Cathy Caruth, “trauma is characterized by an incomprehensible nature at the first time of its expression. The very locatedness of trauma is difficult to identify. It gets placed in the form of narrative”. To apply this perspective the author has vividly revealed his suppressed trauma through dialogic narration in his chaste creation *Ghanachakkar*. Trauma has a referential nature, the victim of trauma dislikes revealing his trauma. Therefore, it takes an indirect and subtle way of revelation. This tacit way of revelation is in the form of narrative. David Becker argues: “Trauma can only be understood with reference to the specific contexts in which it occurs,” including cultural norms, political contexts, the nature of the event, the organization of the community, and so forth” (39). The protagonist’s vision of the leader turning into an enormous onion is quite like a dream. But it’s true that the leader never found out the root causes of the grief of watch mechanic Raju and Arjun lama, inventor of himali malam Ram man dai, magician Kamal, woodcutter Natawar and postman Kale. It is very referential here because the leader allocates the false hope of getting a solid globular after peeling onion but the public are never successful in getting it. They only get innumerable layers one after another, every time they get a new vacuum, just suffocated emptiness.

Trauma is physical as well as psychological wound that causes terror and shock, but that wound is not only the cause of individual’s memory but also the affection of political, social, and cultural aspects of the society because, as Lacapra says, “the trauma that paradoxically becomes the basis for collective and/or personal identity” (724). *Madness and Civilization* explores the changing relationship between madness and unreason. The true nature of both terms is rarely expressed or allowed to

speak, and frequently one forms part of the other. Unreason is defined as "reason dazzled" or confused in the period of confinement. In the modern period, however, unreason is pushed further beneath the surface of society, and is understandable only through certain artists; madness on the other hand, becomes mental illness, and is treated and controlled by medical and psychiatric practices. Unreason is somehow lost after the eighteenth century, a situation which Foucault laments. This is Foucault's central idea. Throughout *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault insists that madness is not a natural, unchanging thing, but rather depends on the society in which it exists. Various cultural, intellectual and economic structures determine how madness is known and experienced within a given society.

Foucault begins his history in the Middle Ages, noting the social and physical exclusion of lepers. He argues that with the gradual disappearance of leprosy, madness came to occupy this excluded position. The ship of fools in the 15th century is a literary version of one such exclusionary practice, the practice of sending mad people away in ships. However, during the Renaissance, madness was regarded as an all abundant phenomenon because humans could not come close to the Reason of God, As Cervantes' Don Quixote, all humans are weak to desires and dissimulation. Therefore, the insane, understood as those who has come too close to God's Reason, were accepted in the middle of the society. It is not before the 17th century, in a movement which Foucault famously describes as the Great Confinement, that "unreasonable" members of the population systematically were locked away and institutionalized. In "The Great Confinement" Foucault, analysing the formation of the confinement and madness, argues that: "Before having the medical meaning we give it, or that at least we like to suppose it has, confinement was required by quite something different from any concern with curing the sick. What made it necessary

was an imperative of labour” (128). In the 18th century, madness came to be seen as the obverse of Reason, that is, as having lost what made them human and become animal-like and therefore treated as such. It is not before 19th century that madness was regarded as a mental illness that should be cured.

In this way, society constructs its experience of madness. The history of madness cannot be an account of changing attitudes to a particular disease or state of being that remains constant. Madness in the Renaissance was an experience that was integrated into the rest of the world, whereas by the nineteenth century it had become known as a moral and mental disease. In a sense, they are two very different types of madness. Ultimately, Foucault sees madness as being located in a certain cultural "space" within society; the shape of this space, and its effects on the madman, depend on society itself. His central argument, however, rests on the idea that modern medicine and psychiatry fail to listen to the voice of the mad, or to unreason. According to Foucault, neither medicine nor psychoanalysis offers a chance of understanding unreason. To do this, we need to look at the work of "mad" authors such as Nietzsche, Nerval and Artaud. Unreason exists below the surface of modern society, only occasionally breaking through in such works. But within works of art inspired by madness, complex processes operate.

Madness is linked to creativity, but yet destroys the work of art. The work of art can reveal the presence of unreason, but yet unreason is the end of the work of art. This idea partly derives from Foucault's love of contradiction, but he feels that it reveals much about modern creativity. In an interview with *ECS* Dr. Upreti says, “When I started writing, a lot of bloodshed was happening around the country. A lot of violence and killings – it was maddening. That madness, which was taking root in the collective psychology of the entire nation, is the theme of the novel” (76). This

show the cause of the writer's psychological trauma. To suffer from trauma one need not to be the first victim rather one can experience even being the witness. It flows all along in a gradient made of confession and thus picks up the momentum so subtly that one hardly notices the process of enlightenment that the author has been going through. The tremendous effect of the text lies in the author's assertion that he is a lunatic and rises to the higher regions while explaining the more real than the real world.

While climbing on to each successively higher region, the author experiences layers of emotion like anger, romanticism, rebellion, all leading him and closer and closer to stage of enlightenment as he replicates the steps of Siddhartha on his way to Buddhahood. Upreti's autobiographical experiences by a miraculous poetic process transcend the human limitations of the flesh and trace the voyage to Nirvana. Upreti further says:

Many said it was my personal dilemma. I don't deny that, but what upset me was those who knew or heard about me, unwittingly or deliberately, tended to ignore that the disturbances in an individual mind and the chaos happening around are interconnected. Rather than take pains by delving into the madness, they found it more convenient to see the novel as a portrayal of my life and pass it off as autobiography . (76)

Upreti himself comes off as a self-indulgent, self-centered character uncertain of himself yet willing to know the whole truth, to be acquainted with worth and to provide for it. He is simply roaming here and there but sees no room for hope. Thereby, the author might himself is the victim of what we called psychosis.

Upreti accepts this work as autobiographical in the sense of trauma caused by the happenings around the country. So, he urges his reader to internalize the pain which his protagonist as well as he himself is bearing for corrective purpose. The writing style of the book is particularly impressive; it's not dry academic narration of most conventional fictions. However, at times the first person contemplation does get a little lengthy. Probably that is the only kink in the book. It is obvious that the book has not been written at the force of one breath. It expresses the writer's personal viewpoint on madness but definitely is not autobiographical in nature. We cannot stay untouched and unnoticed from what is happening around us. We do not have to be the first victim to analyse or to bear the pain; being a citizen or a human being as a whole it happen to disturbs our psyche.

How a single incident, seemingly less significant induces the human thought, his behaviour and habits is clearly illustrated in the novel. The novel starts with the failure of the genius Ranganath as the result of the uprising in the periphery of TU. On eyeing such ire, Upreti started penning the novel. The conception of this book is an apostle of reality in the heart ached civil war history of our country. *Ghanachakkar* features characters trying to bring together their exact wishes with the forces at work in our society. The entire description might appear a bit confusing and depressing but once we go thoroughly with cool brain professor's lyrical symbol is there. He would like to speak his sentiments freely and without reserves. The narration is psychologically loaded and astonishingly sharp and introduces a potent noble voice in contemporary Nepali literature.

Ultimately, the central characters in Upreti's book are neither completely sane nor insane in the understood sense of these terms. His voice is simply that of a person who can shed every bit of his way of analysis and thoughts in a manner that is just a

little different. We could also say that the protagonist's account challenges the so called intellectuals and various self appointed sane humans. To show the protagonist's celebration of so-called madness, this researcher has divided this dissertation into four sub parts. First chapter deals wither general introduction regarding of the research paper itself, the author and the text. Second part deals with theoretical modality of the reseach where the researcher is trying to built theoretical framework on the basis of Foucauldian concept with madness. The third part deals with textual analysis of *Ghanachakkar*. Fourth chapter deals with the findings of the researcher during his study regarding the celebration of madness by the protagonist in the text.

II: Existentialism and Celebration of Madness

Madness as a Discourse

“Madness” is defined variously as a spiritual problem, a chemical disorder, a moral defect, and so on, not only has glosses over the various forms of mental suffering, but suggests how provisional our definitions are. And if we can look askance at the superstitions of our predecessors, might not those who follow us also seem perplexed by our “medicalizing” such phenomena. An individual suffers not only when others restrict his freedom of action but also when others define him: “Men are so necessarily mad, that not to be mad would amount to another form of madness . . . Is it not by locking up one’s neighbor that one convinces oneself of one’s own good sense” (Dostoevsky, *qut.* In *Madness and Civilization*, Preface). The epigraph above, used by Michel Foucault in his magisterial *History of Madness*, reveals his angle of entry into the subject. Not only does he recount the history of how we have understood or prejudiced, punished or treated madness, but deconstructs the idea of madness, and offers his own working understanding of the boundary lines which shift so uncertainly in all of us.

Although *Madness and Civilization* has widely been read as a criticism of psychiatry, and often quoted in the anti-psychiatric movement, Foucault himself criticized, especially in retrospect, the “Romanticism of Madness”, which tended to see madness as a form of genius which modern medicine represses. He did not contest the reality of psychiatric disorders, as some of his readers have concluded. Rather, he explored how “madness” could be constituted as an object of knowledge on the one hand, and, on the other hand, as the target of intervention for a specific type of power: the disciplinary institution of the asylum.

In *Madness and Civilization*, Michel Foucault argues that reason is based on the exclusion of the mentally ill, who are placed in institutions where society attempts to forget them: “It taught, then, how the soul of desiring man had become a prisoner of the beast; these grotesque faces set in the bellies of monsters belonged to the world of the great Platonic metaphor and denounced the spirit’s corruption in the folly of sin”(17). This came as a result of the classical age and the Cartesian concept of *cogito*, where sane people were supposed to be able to exorcise madness from correct thinking, and mad people were those who gave primacy to their hallucinations. They were once romanticized in art, like in the proverbial ship of fools, but now they are bound to reason. Roland Barthes, in his *The Pleasure of the Text* begins with these words:

Imagine someone . . . who abolishes within himself all barriers, all classes, all exclusions, not by syncretism but by simple discard of that old specter: logical contradiction; who mixes every language, even those said to be incompatible; who silently accepts every charge of illogicality, of incongruity; who remains passive in the face of Socratic irony (leading the interlocutor to the supreme disgrace: self-contradiction) and legal terrorism (how much penal evidence is based on a psychology of consistency!). Such a man would be the mockery of our society: court, school, asylum, polite conversation would cast him out: who endures contradiction without shame? Now this anti-hero exists: he is the reader of the text at the moment he takes his pleasure.

(1)

With, but a few minor revisions and reservations, this excerpt could be used to describe Michel Foucault’s concept of Madness. Barthes, of course, was not explicitly

writing of Foucault, but I find it hard to fathom that he could not have made the connection, at least fleetingly, as he was composing the passage. Or, more dramatically, perhaps Barthes had just been reading Foucault, taking his pleasure, when he had the thought of an anti-hero reading the anti-hero.

The concept of anti-hero has strong influence of existentialism that focuses on the lack of meaning and purpose in life and solitude of human existence.

Existentialism evokes the human reality that human beings are thrown into the world where suffering and pain is responsible only to himself. Besides being free, man is a finite and contingent being, existing in a world that is devoid of purpose. The pessimism, resulting from this position is like wise expressed by Camus' doctrine of "the absurd". Absurdity or contradictions arise from the clash between human hopes and desires and the meaningless universe into which man has been thrown.

Existentialism

Regarding the concept of Existentialism, Sartre illustrates the two important philosophical issues concerning freedom. The first is the individual's freedom which is restricted by others' judgments of his actions and the second is the definition of one's self-identity. Moreover, the individual-self is defined by our actions. If our actions come to half in death, they become our essence. Only our actions determine our essence because there are no alternative chances. The sense of loneliness, estrangement and alienation are the inflexible situation of being bound by our own actions. Thus, an individual is the sum total of his actions. That is, existence precedes essence which implies that the human being has no essence because he is no more than what he is.

Existentialism is less of an-'ism' than an attitude that expresses itself in a variety of ways. Because of the diversity of positions associated with Existentialism,

no single strict definition is possible; however, it suggests one major theme; it lays stress on concrete individual existence, freedom and choice. Ryan gives an explanation of existentialism:

Hence there is no single existentialist philosophy, and no single definition of the word can give. However, it may be said that with the existentialists the problem of man is central and that they stress man's concrete existence, his contingent nature, his personal freedom and his consequent responsibility for what he does and makes him to be. (639)

Existentialism really concerns what authentic route people may take in the world where values and certainties are smashed into fragments how people can cope with negative aspects of human existence like depression, frustration, pain, anxiety, alienation caused by modern society. Along with the consideration of the role of time and awareness of death, these questions seem to be the concern of existentialism.

These feeling of despair and streaming led to the idea that people have to create their own existence and values because of the shattered of the traditional values. As with Neitzshe, man creates moral values. Although he acts freely and defines himself through his actions, his activities occur in the social circumstances where his activities are judged by others. As a result, these social circumstances contribute to the definition of individual's self. Sartre in his article "No Exist" sees the conflict interpersonal relations as, "each individual aims to be free and to avoid becoming subject to others' control".(69) The sense of Other is the unavoidable human situation of being free which confines the individual's own judgment. There is no way to define individual's freedom without the consciousness of loneliness and alienation.

The term “existence” comes from the Latin root ex “out” and *Sistere* from stare “to stand” (Cuddon 316). Thus existence means to stand out in the universe. It takes human being as an isolated existent into an alien universe. The feeling of despair and separation gave idea that people have to create their own values. Therefore, one has to make choices and create self. One exists up to the extent one makes choices. Existentialism insists that choices have to be made arbitrarily by individuals, who thus create themselves, because there are no objective standards to determine choice. Existentialism draws attention to the risk, the void of human reality and admits that the human being is thrown into the world in which pain, frustration, sickness, contempt; alienation, malaise and death dominate.

The connection of being and thinking was Greek insight and it is this very insight that the modern existentialists are trying to re-establish. The ancient Greek thought was revolutionized by Socrates who shifted the attention of the study of philosophy from nature to man. Socrates asked people to understand the need of the self. He made people responsible towards the self. In this context Richard Tarnas in *The Passion of the Western Mind* comments:

In Socrates’ view, any attempts to foster true success and excellence in human life had to take account of the inner most reality of a human being, his soul and psyche. Perhaps on the basic of his own highly developed sense of individual, and, selfhood and self control , Socrates brought to the Greek mind and new awareness of the central significance of the soul, establishing it for the first time as the seat of the individual making the moral and intellectual character. (33)

For Socrates, self is prior to everything. The joy springs from the heart, not from external circumstances, that is reputation, power and wealth. But before Socrates,

philosophers were concerned with the issue of cosmos. They tried to understand the functioning of the universe. But Socrates laid stress on human existence and individuality.

Existential elements can be seen even in the medieval age, especially in the philosophy of St. Augustine. Richard Tarnas, in *The Passion of the Western Mind*, supports it in the following passage:

Augustine possessed an existentialist's self-awareness with his highly developed capacity for introspection and self-confrontation, his concern with memory consciousness and time his psychological perspicacity, his doubt and remorse, his sense of solitary alienation of human self without God, his intensity of inner conflict, his intellectual skepticism and sophistication. Augustine who could doubt in everything, but not the fact of soul's own experience of doubting and knowing, willing and existing thereby affirms certain existence of human ego in the soul.

(144)

Medieval age was characterized by the belief in god. Everything was seen through the eyes of god. So man was expected to surrender before god for salvation. Augustine asked man not to go outside himself in the quest of truth. He affirmed the existence of human ego in the soul. He gave importance to the individual self.

Existentialism as a distinct philosophy began with the Danish Christian thinker Kierkegaard in the first half of 19th century. He swerved the study of philosophy to the subjective, emotional and living aspect of human existence as against Hegel's objective and abstract academization of reality. He discussed man's essence with the existential predicaments and limitations, hope, despair, anxiety. Gaarder in *Sophie's World* acknowledged that "he thought that both the idealism of the Romantics and

Hegel's 'historicism' had obscured the individual's responsibility of his own life" (377).

The phenomenological ideas of intentionality and individuality influenced existentialism. Stressing on the human existence, Martin Heidegger, Sartre, and Camus developed existentialism. Existentialism is the movement of 40's and 60's, literary and artistic as well as philosophical. Sartre is also a convenient representative of Existentialism and offers a definition for the word. It was unusual for existentialists to identify themselves as such. So Sartre takes a convenient place to begin with.

Sartre divides existentialist thinkers into two groups: theistic and atheistic. The theistic group includes Kierkegaard, Karl Jaspers, Martin Buber and Gabriel Marcel who are supposed to believe in the Christian faith. In the second atheistic group, Sartre puts himself with Heidegger, Nietzsche and other French existentialists who do not believe in god. The atheistic existentialists discard the concept of God as an authentic shelter. They regarded human being as optimistically forlorn, free and supportless creatures. The absence of God implies the loss of value.

Kierkegaard is an existentialist because he accepts the absurdity of the world as fully as Sartre or Camus. In contrasting philosophy from Plato to Hegel with authentic Christianity, he emphasized the concepts of individual, of choice, of dread and of paradox. He argues that human mind is free and he can make choices and decisions of his own. "It is only when we act especially we make significant choices that we relate to our own existence" (Gardner 380). According to him, the choice is, paradoxically, criterion less and it is individual himself who has to fix criteria by making choice. But he does not begin with the postulate of non-existence of God, but with the principle that nothing in the world, nothing available to sense or reason,

provides any knowledge or reason to believe in god. Soren Kierkegaard advocates that individual existence is prior to everything.

When a man comes to realize that he is solely responsible for his decisions and destiny he feels unnerved. Freedom is his bliss, into freedom to do this or that, but freedom to know him. So, he believes that truth is subjective. There cannot be any truth that is objective and universal. He only believes in the existence of God and not in Christian doctrine. He stresses that “Christianity is therefore not a doctrine, but the fact that God has existed” (Ellmann 857). Though he believes in God but takes as a matter of faith. Thus, he argues, “There are two options for the individual to choose either he has to choose God and get redemption from the angst and ethic-religious choice or has to reject God and go to perdition, and atheistic choice” (830).

Kierkegaard’s moral and religious seriousness offered a more promising basis for the development of existentialist themes than the basically nihilistic, egocentric, and hopeless approach of Nietzsche, Sartre. Thus, while Sartre achieved for a time a higher profile in the fashionable literary world, theistic Existentialists, like Nikolay Berdyayav, Paul Tillich and Martin Buber continued Kierkegaard’s work with updated approaches to traditional religions. Atheistic Existentialism really exhausted itself. The effort of will required for Sisyphus to maintain his enthusiasm. It is really beyond most human capacity, and better the solace of traditional religion than the vicious pseudo-religions of communism or fascism.

Another French existentialist Albert Camus reflects the loss of certainties in the post-modern world. He thinks that the modern world is full of injustice: millions work in repetitive exploitative jobs so human existence is absurd. He thinks that we should rebel against the absurdities by refusing to participate in them. To get liberation from the anxiety of the absurd world, one may go to the rules of God or he

may submit himself to the hand of death. But either of these choices is ridiculous and bad for the absurd man. The living of the absurd man depends upon the maximum struggle against this absurdity. The world is full of absurdity, but Sisyphus teaches revolt against action that offers freedom and justification of continuing life.

In *The Myth of Sisyphus*, Camus asserts that by refusal to surrender, Sisyphus the representative of modern man, can create meaning through a free act of affirmation in which he gives meaning to a situation which until then had none.

Camus, in "The Myth of Sisyphus", says:

I leave Sisyphus at the foot of the mountain! One always finds one's burden again. But Sisyphus teaches the gods and raises rocks. He too concludes that all is well. This universe hence forth without a master seems to him neither sterile nor futile. Each atom of that stone, each mineral flake of the night-filled mountain, in itself forms a world. The struggle itself toward the heights is enough to fill a man's heart. One must imagine Sisyphus happy. (70)

Sisyphus is given the choices. He does not surrender to God and makes a choice. He believes that choice leads us to absurdity but joy comes out of that absurdity. As Ellmann and Fieldelson remarks, he sees man "arriving through admission of absurdity, at an affirmation of his own worth" (806). He focuses on struggle against absurdity for humanism and optimism. He compares the situation of human life to that of the mythical figure Sisyphus revealing that our life is a series of meaningless actions culminating in death, with no possibility of external justification. According to Camus, the human future is unique and dread full.

In Camus' view, each individual has a design in their own life as a project. The choice and responsibility of that project falls entirely on them. He was concerned

with the freedom and responsibility of the individual, the alienation of the individual from society, and the difficulty of facing life without the comfort of believing in God or in absolute moral standards. So, he evaluates modern man and his situation in the following passage:

A world that can be explained even with bad reasons is a familiar world. But, on the other hand, in a universe suddenly divested of illusions and lights, man feels an alien, a stranger. His exile is without remedy since he is deprived of the memory of a lost home or the hope of a promised land. This divorce between man and his life, the actor and his setting, is properly the feeling of absurdity. (13)

Camus believes that human being is an isolated existent in an alien universe. The universe does not possess any inherent truth, value or meaning. “This universe”, states Camus, “henceforth without a master seems to him neither sterile not futile” (Ellmann 852). Camus reached to a conclusion to declare the condition of man absurd when he realized that the speculative system of past provided no reliable guidance for life. When the absurd man becomes aware of his futile living, he is naturally filled with anxiety and helplessness. Then one realizes that forlornness, anguish, despair are the characteristics of life. To get liberation from the anxiety of the absurd world if one chooses to submit oneself to the hand of god or death, for him, either of these choices is ridiculous. He believes that one needs to accept the challenge but not to commit suicide and bow before God.

Another influencing philosopher was Nietzsche who strongly emphasized that life should be the center of everything. Nietzsche proclaimed the ‘death of god’ and went on to reject the entire Judeo-Christian moral tradition in favor of a heroic pagan ideal. Garder remarks in *Sophie’s World* as: “Nietzsche, both Christianity and

traditional philosophy had turned away from the real world and pointed toward 'heaven' or the world of ideas" (455). He stress on this world but not heaven or the world of ideas. For him since the God is dead, there lie many possibilities and choices. Nietzsche says that life is all irrational and cruel features hover round it. Nietzsche stresses upon the individual who confronts existence heroically. In his famous essay, "The Death of God and Antichrist" he writes:

The Christian conception of God-God as God of the sick, God as a spider, and God as spirits is one of the most corrupt conceptions of he divine ever attained on earth. It may even represent the low- water mark in the descending developing of divine types. God degenerated into the contradiction of war against life, against nature, against he will to live! (912)

For him historical knowledge does not serve life He called Christianity a 'slave morality' and half that religion provides not truth because God is dead and Christianity has become the shelter of weak and disable people.

Heidegger was known as the leading existentialist thinker. He explained the distinction between beings and Being that shows his interest was in the 'question of being'. For him being is not realized in normal situation. It does not occur all the time. It is realized in the state of boredom, anxiety as he states in "*What is Metaphysics?*": "The oblivion of Being (individual) into the beings (group) has made us lost in the unreal universe" (Ellmann 879). He believes that we have been living in an incompressible, indifferent world. The universe is alien to us. According to Heidegger, to consider individual only the representation of mass is the recurrent mistake of metaphysics. The principle object of investigation, for him, is the search of being and more particularly man's being (Dasein). He held the belief that "man

should face explicitly the problem of being; he has to determine his own existence, create his own possibility and make choice and commitment” (Perryetal 756). Human beings can never hope to understand why they are here in the world. Instead, each individual must choose a goal and follow it with passionate conviction.

Atheist existentialists believe that human existence is self-conscious without being pre-defined, we as autonomous being are ‘condemned to be free’ - compelled to make future directed choices. Every individual simply follows custom or social expectations in order to escape this angst; we have escaped the responsibility of making our own choices, of creating our own essence. But according to Sartre, the individual has the potentiality to become more than what he or she is since “man is nothing else but what he makes of himself” (15). Each individual has to make his own universe with a meaning of his own. Sartre did not believe in God, so there was no place for the essence of humanity to be before human existence. To us, existence comes first, the essence later. Indeed, the essence is whatever we decide it is going to be. Human existence or being differs from the being of object in that human being is self-conscious. This self conscious also gives the human subject the opportunity to define self. The individual creates his/her self by making self-directed choices. Sartre claims, “there is no reality, except in action” (32). Sartre divides living as authentic and inauthentic. He chooses authentic living stressing that one must choose and make a commitment to make better.

Establishing existentialism as the humanistic philosophy, he argues that “by existentialism we mean a doctrine which makes human life possible and, in addition, declares that every truth and every action implies a human setting and a human subjectivity” (10). Then existentialism gives dignity to man. It encourages human

action. He thought that there was no fixed human nature or essence and so the individual has to choose his/her being.

Since our involvement in the world creates essence, there is no predetermined essence to govern our existence; Sartre makes a clear distinction between being-in-itself (en-soi) and being-for-itself (pour-soi). En-soi applies to things; this means a thing is basically what it is. In case of human being existence precedes essence. Therefore man is pour-soi: “The best way to conceive of the fundamental project of human reality is to say that man is the being whose project is to be God” (63). According to him we first exist, appear on the scene, make a choice and create our identity. It is through our choices that we create meaning in our life.

The existentialists conclude that human choice is subjective because individual finally must make their own choices without help from such external standards as laws, ethical rules, or traditions. Because individuals make their own choices, they are ‘free’, but because they choose, they are completely ‘responsible’ for their choices. Macintyre says, “Even if I do not choose, I have chosen not to choose” (149). The existentialists emphasize that freedom is accompanied by responsibility. Due to freedom, man can expose unlimited potentiality, yet, existentialism attempts to find happiness and meaning in a modern world characterized by alienation, isolation, loneliness, frustration, inauthenticity and absurdity. But the existentialists take freedom as a curse. Sartre says “We are condemned to be free” (56). According to this philosophy man is a sole director of his destiny. In fact, existentialism goes back to man’s pre-philosophical attempts to attain self-awareness and understanding of existence that deals with man’s disillusionment and despair.

III: Celebration of Madness in Snjeev Upreti's *Ghanachakar*

Sanjeev Upreti's *Ghanchakkar* has broken some literary conventions with an exceptionally detailed description of the characters and a differently dealt plot. The definition of madness has always been determined by discourse produced by the power holder of the society. The protagonist of this novel is said to be crazy but he goes on celebrating his madness and tries to find the causes behind it. He commemorates his life deconstructing the conventional definition of 'madness.' The novel shows the madness not only of a person but also of a society which is the major cause of his so-called madness.

The form of human alienation that the author is able to manifest is superb and as such, underscores the political undercurrent of his thinking. He celebrates Rousseau's 'Common Man' like perhaps in continuity with the Age of Enlightenment. To him, human being is equal. And the moment man refuses to recognize a human being as a human being, the anger in him builds up massive pressure to form energy of madness devastating given realities into an unknown realm. The dichotomous relationship that the author has established between the mad and the normal for the purpose of total defiance seems to be something like consciousness classification of the same -mind where the conscious mind works as a two- way transmission of the emotional thrust finally launched through the unconscious mind. The massive energy needed to level up disparities can be had only when a collective emotion changes into the energy of madness for the specific purpose of launching the up thrust, disarming human rationality bordering onto timidity. A battle is won only when you first win it inside you. The protagonist, I, discovers something wrong within himself. First symptom is found when he enters into the class room to teach students:

“Globalization and endless search: I started oh! This is the section c. oh yea; I had to preach on the topic of reincarnation on the oriental myth ...” (My Translation 3).

Similarly he also feels uneasy while teaching. He further says, “today, in fact, I am unwell” I told, “today’s class is canceled” (My Translation 3). He murmurs and talks to himself in between his lectures and often moves out to places that are less frequents by the so called sane people. This is happening because he is disturbed by the chaos and inhuman activities occurring inside the country.

He murmurs and talks to himself in between his lectures and often moves out to places that are less frequented by the so called sane people. This is identified not only by the protagonist but also by the students and teachers at the department. Head of the department, Prasad sir, tries to draw his attention on regular work and says:

You are not doing good avoiding the meetings and seminars which are your parts of life and getting rid of the responsibilities, sir shouted at me gazing with serious tone, I heard the rumor that you are seen wandering around the Bagmati and Visnumati riverside and sometimes contemplating seeing the burning corpses at the Aaryaghat. Yesterday, a student informed me that you were wandering around the Pashupati jungle by bunking thesis committees meeting. (My Translation 8)

These initial symptoms bother other his relatives and well wishers but the protagonist decides to find out the cause of his trauma. Not only this, his best friend Bimba also tries to bring him right track. In one of the incidents, Bimba says: “The editor was saying that your article is of no use, the ideas are disjointed, no central binding logic at all” Bimba told, “and it contains more than 800 words. Haven’t we decided already that it must be written within the prame of 800 words?” (My Translation 23). These

incidents show that the protagonist, despite his friend's suggestions, is celebrating his madness and goes on thinking that has disturbed him.

He believes himself and decides to go for a journey to discover the reality that has been worrying him. His search, initially, is to find out the reality about the word "Khoj" that he sees around. This very word is the first trigger to his so-called madness:

That day I came out of the class hesitatingly, the very word emerged which used to startle me before, life were frowning and the very word emerging out of the lips – khoj khoj khoj. I thought the very word makes me easy some to the problem. It will erase (avoid) my incompetence and impatience (My Translation 34)

This act of leaving class without bothering students' expectation shows that the protagonist is moved by his mood rather than his responsibilities. He does whatever he thinks is right. While teaching inside the class room the word *khoj* hits his mind continuously. This word *khoj* means 'search' but what? This is not clear to the protagonist himself. So leaves class without any apparent cause. Then he starts his motorbike silently coming out of the classroom and headed to the city. At the moment he hears the students talking; "is our teacher all right? Why he suddenly come out of the class? Or does he have some mental problems?" (My Translation 34). This act adds the proof that his mental condition is getting worst. Though some negative rumors were already spreading around, he doesn't bother about those thing because he is clear about his intention and that is to find peace within by celebrating so-called madness.

Even his wife and colleagues are skeptical of his nature and are thinking of sending him to an asylum. A senior lecture of his department, the protagonist can do

nothing for Ranganath, a university student, who claims that he deserves a division but has failed. He wants to get his copy rechecked. But the department head begrudges in an aggressive mood that there is no provision for rechecking. In such a state he is blamed that he is on the verge of becoming mad, this troubles him a lot and the situation becomes quite complicated. His teachers, colleagues and even wife think that he should be sent in an asylum.

But he continuously tries to prove that he isn't actually insane. In doing this he visits the ascetic Dilbarnath and spiritualist Freinz Reiner. Both have their own set of predictions for him. Surprisingly, as their predictions start turning into reality, his madness intensifies to heights. The story moves ahead when he leaves his houses to prove his sanity: "I kept my *trishul* at the floor at enaddening ecstasy for a while. Then, I picked up the mobile and threw it through the balcony to the open space bushes" (My Translation 54). Mobile is a symbol of civilized life and signifies that the person is in touch with other people but throwing the mobile suggests that the protagonist is discarding the so-called civilization and wants to enjoy his freedom recklessly being out of touch with this utilitarian world.

While celebrating his madness, the protagonist also criticizes political scenario of Nepal. He uses royal palace as first place for political satire. When he first enters into the place he sees a lot of people running with him towards the palace but finds alone at last: "[. . .] after while the sound of feet got lessened. I realized in time- it was only me who was running through the passage of duck shadows" (My Translation 65). In fact, he is running towards the palace because he believes that this palace, where royal massacre occurred, itself is the root of all this miss happening and disorder. And the political instability itself is one of the causes of his mental disorder. He believes

that by throwing monarchy political stability can be obtained. So, he without any fear enters the palace where he sees

The wrestlers (guards) were mixing the hashish into hallo. Some were taking the tobacco out of the cigarettes while others filling it to the cigarettes, one was singing a dohari. They were drowning in the ecstasy romantically and freely. (My Translation 67)

His first view inside the palace is very inappropriate so the reader never know whether he is in fact experience these scenes or just dreaming. This kind of experience can be nothing but celebration of madness because inside a palace we hardly find guards having narcotic and dohari.

But his exotic journey starts from this incident. After interning into the palace he sees a huge mirror and when he looks towards it “surprisingly, reflection of mirror was carrying the revolver and automatic gun. What a surprise what a memorable scene! Again, contemplating to the mirror” (My Translation 69). This can be just his view regarding the Royal Massacres because one the report regarding this issue concluded that late Prince Dipendra did this with a machine gun. So analyzing these evidences it is clear that the present political instability and irresponsibility of leaders is one of the main causes that lead him towards what the society called madness. And thus, he becomes misfit in the society because his ability and truth is not realized and valued by contemporary society.

After confronting with the Royal palace and images related to the butchery, the protagonist runs from there. Then he tackles with another problem of Nepalese politics, i.e. corruption and self-centered tendencies of politicians. When reaches near Ghantaghar, just in front of that he sees a huge tower of achievement which is made up of paper. He gets amazed because before that he never realized that the tower

exists there despite the fact that he has walked that street thousands of time. He goes on believing his senses and at the same time he himself whether he is really a mad or not because such kind of scene is very atypical. He says to himself:

Am I really a mad? What it be besides a madness which else visualizes the unpredictable scene. Whether other people are like me or not? The nerve of my brain began to review; mind was likely to burst. I pinch twice. Auch! Again I felt the pain. (My Translation 57)

In this tower incident, the protagonist, who is a promising university academic, does not find himself abiding by the “norms” that other people follow; the difference between people so-called “normal” and “abnormal”. So the protagonist in a sense deconstructs this binary opposition between the normal and abnormal in the novel and that is why without any hesitation he acts according to his wish.

Along with celebrating his madness, the protagonist is showing the malice towards politician because these are the people who are throwing his country into the garbage of chaos, disorder and frustration. They are the people who have corrupted themselves and other and ultimately leading his country towards an unsuccessful nation. While portraying the personality of politicians the new ministry office is very crucial. The protagonist learns that a new ministry office has been established near Dharahar. When he enters into the building he gets amazed by viewing the activities of the ministers:

Some men were hoary, some hard –headed plugging with the red, green and blue marbles. I stared at the window's glass, yes, that red marble striped the yellow one. The green marble entered inside the hole. The middle-aged and oldies began to clap. Why these people at

night even in the hall of ministry office are playing marbles? (My Translation 140)

These scenes, in fact, are the findings of the protagonist regarding his mental disturbance because the disaster happened in the palace, loss of lives during Maoist insurgency and political instability hit his mind frequently. Now, the experience with the minister in that new ministry office gives him insight why he is hunted by incidents. This shows that he is directly affected by what is happening inside the country. An individual can not be dissociated itself from the society so in the case with the protagonist. He is hunted by the inhuman activities happening around him done by so-called sane people. And in fact he wants to come over of it so his disturbed mind does abnormal activities in the eyes of the society but the fact is that he is searching a way out of these obstacles. His thoughts and activities question who are sane and who are insane; people who are killing own brothers and sisters are sane or the person who gets hurt by seeing this is insane? People who plot Royal Massacre are insane or the person who gets broke down emotional with that incident is insane? Those people who violate human rights are insane or the person who advocates human rights for all is insane?

Incidents like the tower of achievement, his view of a politician as an onion and the transformation of characters into aquatic creatures gives the story a comical farce proves that this novel is also a political satire, for it has a lot of symbolical and metaphorical meaning of madness attached to it. The experience of the protagonist, in parts, reflects not the madness of an individual but that of the society and our way of thinking. He sees that a new political leader, upon whom many people have hope very much, has turned into vegetables. He says:

The ultimate solution to all our problems, the final remedy of all possible injustices, repressions, ills and sickness has finally arrived . . .

The new leader of the nation is expected to arrive at the Basantpur durbar square very soon . . . He will bring the rebels and the warring political factions into an agreement and ensure a lasting peace . . . Our new hero will bring food and medicines and clothes and hope for all.

(My Translation 149)

But in no time the expectation of the people breaks into pieces as the new leader also turns unfruitful to the nation:

I closed my eyes with fear. A towering and expanding figure came to my mind which have been pressing me and heading towards the home, rental room, parliament and road. Once I thought that was a gigantic onion. I changed my thought again; no that was the gigantic potato. Again my mind provoked another thought – No, this is neither onion nor potato but a new type of vegetable which is getting expanded diffused and surrounded the people, bank, bus etc. (My Translation 189)

This new leader was new hope for all people because earlier leaders failed to accomplish their political goal. But even this new leader turned into vegetables, and the protagonist sees sometime onion, sometime potato and at last something new vegetable. This can be read as the frustrating state of the politics. Whether earlier or new, the politicians' attitudes are same; all are failures. The protagonist further says:

Only after that I understand. He was not so, neither he was a politician nor diplomat or king. Rather he was only a piece of an onion, I saw

that clearly on the stage. There was dais in front of the stage and the gigantic piece of an onion was standing beside it. (My Translation 159)

This disillusionment about a leader; from a promising leader to onion is the frustrating mentality of the protagonist about Nepalese political scenario. Till the date, he does not see any devoted leader who can save Nepal from this garbage.

From the confrontation of the protagonist with different aspects of Nepalese politics, he comes to the conclusion that it was not him who is mad rather the whole society has turned into mad:

I clearly vividly came to know the world has turned into a mad.

Otherwise the magical tower wouldn't fall in front of the Ghantaghar?

How could the nightmarish Royal Massacre be occurred? Why would the people play puppet at the restaurant? (My Translation 141)

Though he is fixed as insane in the society he has more critical thought than common so-called sane people. In fact, for a different perspective of the world around us and the world inside of us, they are the one who dare to change the semblance of the entire world at the cost of being termed social outcasts and in this sense they are the true seeker of knowledge.

Celebrating madness becomes very enjoyable to him also. While living in a *pati*, he starts foretelling and he enjoys it so much that days go in a moment. He narrates his own experience as:

NO, I had begun to predict two days back. But how could I manage to collect one thousands so fast. I saw around my room. A water bottle, pair of the new swales, a *gamchha* and a new *radi* (blanket), hadn't I bought it at the Kalimati's shop? Or are these the gifts of my

customers? And the water bottles? By when the customers pilgrims began to carry the water bottles for me? (My Translation 102)

The protagonist is not fully aware about what he is doing and what will be its consequences. He passes days looking at hands of people and telling their future without any knowledge of it but even then he takes pleasure in it. This kind of carefree life is nothing but his own choice and he rejoices it.

Questioning the civilization boundaries offers a way to look into the 'realities' of the times we live in now. The activities of the protagonist try to intellectualize the notion of madness and glorify madness. There is an intellectual defense of madness. He says, "It's not only me who has gone mad, it's rather the times we live in that have gone mad," (My Translation 57). This intellectual treatment of madness is acceptable in this postmodern era. He himself comes off as a self-indulgent, self-centered character uncertain of himself yet willing to know the whole truth, to be acquainted with worth and to provide for it. He is simply roaming here and there but sees no room for hope. Thereby, he is the victim of what we called psychosis.

Not only being in free state, the protagonist celebrates his madness inside the asylum. After his relatives capture him roaming here and there as lunatic, he is sent to asylum for medical treatment. When some of the people who recognize him, along with his colleagues at Basantapur, become able to catch him argue that he must be sent to asylum. Among them Prasad sir was at the front. He says, "The proper place for this person (the protagonist) is neither hospital nor jail but an asylum" (My Translation 166). After reaching to the asylum his madness goes to climax. His frustration reaches to the peak because his *khoj* is not completed yet. He has so many things unanswered but the life of asylum destroys all hopes.

When a person loses his/her hopes then s/he has only one way and that is death. The protagonist also chooses this way and takes large amount of medicine:

I took out the bottle from the wardrobe to the hand and pour the jug's water to the glass. Now I am counting the tablets – one, two, three --- twenty three altogether. With firm and audacious heart, I swallow all the tablets with water. The deep sleep covered me up when I was about to swallow the last one. Then I fell on the bed. The heart is beating fast with a loud voice. The black shadows were dancing before my eyes. The vision has been depleting and the body being senseless. (My Translation 200)

This choice of taking huge amount of medicine is also his celebration of madness.

This attempt leads him into more complex psyche. Now he experiences the silhouette of death from near. He further says:

I felt as if the black currents of death have been pulling me deep inside. Oh! This is death, I realized, the dark power of death might come to have domination over human body in this way. I am getting submerged into an unconscious and slumber. (My Translation 200)

This realization is also a combination of fact and fiction since the protagonist is deconstructing the traditional stereotype image of mad. Thus the way the *Ghanachakkar* mind of the character is hooked with the invisible forces of this valley is simply fascinating. Its only defense could be an intellectual one.

The experience of madness and unreason is complex. Almost all people have criticized the behaviors of the protagonist for what they see as his chronic obscurity, but at least part of the problem comes from his attitude to language and discourse.

Those who are labeled as mad can become trapped within their own delirious discourse and within the structures designed to confine them: perhaps the experience of being trapped inside some of Foucault's more difficult sentences is meant to echo this. Similarly, the protagonist of this novel also trapped by his own words and languages. After swallowing tablets he sees that the whole Kathmandu valley is drowning into water: “Oh! What an amazing and unbelievable series of scenes . . . ! Everywhere water! Unbelievable waves of water are drowning this valley” (My Translation 201). He is seemingly losing the balance of his mind and the readers are condemned to trust the narrative of this so called lunatic.

His madness reaches to the climax when he finds his own image who presents in front of him as a reporter in the asylum. He does arguments regarding his own name, friend's name, department and name of the teachers. This conflict is within himself and this is proved by the reaction of the nurse. She argues: “What kind of question and reporter? . . . no one entered into your room. When you were taken out the tub you have been talking to yourself” (My Translation 224). This confrontation between him and his self is in fact becomes resolution of his life as this conflict reminds him his original name, profession, responsibilities, friend's and teacher's names. And the important fact is that till this time the political condition of Nepal also becomes easy and rebels are in peace process and people are more aware about their political rights. This gives him more solace. To this end, the protagonist's mental condition is supported by various metaphors and classical allusions.

The setting of this novel is the Kathmandu valley and it has incorporated time frame of the past few years. This is a documentation of facts about the oldest university of this country, the myth and especially Nepal's history beginning with the royal massacre through subsequent political changes and instability. The narrative

technique also helps to express the protagonist's celebration of madness as it is presented in stream of consciousness, where events in the novel are things that take place in the minds of the character. It is a dramatization of an intellectual trauma which is purely creative in nature. His trauma is caused by disorder, chaos, confusion, disarray, disorganization, disruption, anarchy, lawlessness, derangements, dishevelment and dislocation that have ravaged the nook and the corner of the country.

In the nutshell, *Ghanachakkar* has embellished the psychological burden of a misfit, who aspires to cure the malaise of different kinds that corrode the creative possibility of society and people with pure lofty aspiration. The misfit intellectual is pressurized by evils and perversions of different kinds to embark on an adventure to uncover hidden ugly truths which bear crucial social implications. And his search is entangled in labyrinthine concentric circle. In this circle, he comes across several imbedded inner circles which continue to unfold eternally till the seeker reaches destiny. No sooner the protagonist crosses one 'chakkar'; he comes across another, which is called as *Ghanachakkar*. These chakkars are unavoidable rather one replaces the other and we are doomed to face these through out our live so does the protagonist. He is surrounded by different psychological problems and he faces them in his own way which the society tagged as insane and abnormal. But he goes on dealing these problems with different approaches and hence celebrates his 'madness.'

Chapter IV

Conclusion

The conception of *Ghanachakkar* is an apostle of reality in the heart ached civil war history of our country. This book features characters trying to bring together their exact wishes with the forces at work in our society. This is the human history of tension, continuous revolt, upheavals, wars and ceaseless challenges finding its way into feudal communities, regimentation, fascism, dictatorship, guided democracy, mutilated democracy and liberal democracy depending upon time, constellation of forces and structural peculiarities of a country or region involved.

“Romanticism of Madness”, in Foucault’s term, tends to see madness as a form of genius which modern medicine represses. Similarly, in this novel too, the protagonist does not contest the reality of psychiatric disorders rather, he explores how “madness” could be constituted as an object of knowledge on the one hand, and, on the other hand, as the target of intervention for a specific type of power: the disciplinary institution of the asylum. He goes on searching the root causes of his misfit celebrating his madness as he is haunted by the word “khoj.” In fact, he recognizes the energy of ‘madness’ which is a level of human emotion that is capable of transformation into higher energy of a very powerful human expression. It is so because the strength of suppressing this energy ebbs away as the mind gets rid of its obsession with an accepted, imposed or evolved social order of exploitation.

How seemingly insignificant incidents induce the human thought, his behavior and habits is clearly illustrated in the novel. The failure of the genius Ranganathan as the result of the uprising in the periphery of TU, incidents like the tower of achievement, transformation of a politician into an onion and people into aquatic creatures, big mirror inside the palace, and people’s revolt against autocracy inside the

asylum turn the story into a political satire. The experience of the protagonist, in parts, reflects not the madness of an individual but that of the society and our way of thinking. The entire description might appear a bit confusing and depressing but the questions like, 'Why one goes psycho?' 'What are the symptoms of psychosis?' 'Who are really mad?' 'How does society behave towards one who tries to come out of their group for some reasons?' and 'When does one get bewildered on preexisting notions?' These are the questions that have been raised by the novel. All this seems to make the protagonist mad while carrying on in a disoriented type of sensibility. The situations of social crisis precipitated by a mutilated democracy harboring greed, corruption and betrayal are the causes of his so called madness and while finding the solace he goes on celebrating his "madness" without concerning what the society thinks of him.

Works Cited

- Camus, Albert. "Absurd Freedom." *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Literature*. Eds. Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr. New York; Oxford, 1965. 844-52.
- "The fact of Absurdity" *The modern Tradition: Background of Modern literature*. Eds. Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr. New York: Oxford, 1965. 823- 27.
- *The Myth of Sisyphus*. Tr. Justin O' Brien.. England, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1975.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Doren, Charles Van. *A History of knowledge: Past, Present, and future*. New York: Ballantine, 1992.
- Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Vintage, 1973.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World*. New York: Berdley, 1994.
- Greene, Majorie. *Martin Heidegger*. London: Bowes and Bowes Publishers Ltd., 1957. Group Ltd., 1970.
- Heidegger, Mrtin. "Dread Reveals Nothing." *The Modern Tradition: Background of Modern Literature*. Eds. Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr. New York: Oxford, 1965. 838-39.
- Heidegger, Martin. "What is metaphysics?" *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams and leary Searle. Tallahassee: Florida Street Up, 1986.1-9.
- Kaufmann, Walter. "Nietzsche, Friedrich." *The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. Vol. V. Paul Edwards. New York: Macmillan and Free Pres, 1961. 504-14.
- Long, William J. *English Literature*. New Delhi, Ludhiana: Kalyani Publishers, 1977.

- Marx, Karl. "Alienation." *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Literature*.
Eds. Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr. New York: Oxford, 1965.
741-44.
- Mc Bride, Joseph. *Albert Camus: Philosopher and Litterateur*. New York: St. Martin
Press, 1992.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "The Masks of Truth." *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of
Modern Literature*. Eds. Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr. New
York: Oxford, 1965. 754-56.
- "The Death of God and the Antichrist." *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds
of Modern Literature*. Eds. Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr. New
York: Oxford, 1965. 905-12.
- Olson, Frederick. "Camus, Albert." *The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. Vol. II. Ed.
Paul Edwards. New York: Macmillan, 1967. 15-18.
- Patrik, Linda E. *Existential Literature: An Introduction*. United States: Wordsworth,
2001.
- Poudyal, Agya. "Much Madness is Divinest Sense." *Wave* 144(December): 2007.
- Safranski, Rudiger. *Nietzsche: A Philosophical Biography*. London: Granta Books,
2002.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology*
Tr. Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Washington Square Press, 1984.
- *Existentialism and Human Emotions*: Tr. Bernard Frenchman and Hazel E.
Barnes. New York: Castle.
- "Existence Precedes Essence." *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of
Modern Literature*. Eds. Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr. New
York: Oxford, 1965. 827-28.

Sapkota, Bishnu. "Fusion of Fact and Fiction." *The Kathmandu Post*. 7 Oct, 2007.

Sharma and Poudel. "Picture of Contemporary Nepali Literature." *The Rising Nepal*.

18 Jan, 2008.

Tarnas, Richard. *The Passion of The Western Mind*. London: Pimlico, 2000.

Upreti, Sanjeev. *Ghanachakkar*. Kathmandu: Jagadamba Press, 2007.

Wellek, Rene. "The Main Trends of 20th Century Criticism." *Twentieth Century*

Criticism. Ed. David Lodge. London: Longman, 1972. 68-84.