I. *Ghanachakkar* and Postmodern Nepalese Society

The present situation of Nepalese society has been greatly affected by the political changes brought by the Mass Movement II of 2062-63 B.S. The movement abolished the centuries old monarchy and transformed the country into a democratic republican state handing over the sovereignty in the hands of people. Along with the abolition of the centralized system of monarchy, the central power has scattered among the various groups like political parties, ethnic groups, regional groups, subaltern, women and previously marginalized groups and other minorities. It has opened the door of unbound opportunities for the people from all classes, sex, ethnic groups and regionally backwarded to involve and participate in the mainstream social, cultural, political, intellectual and economic practices conserving their diverse identities. There are many factors responsible for this great shift of Nepalese politics and changes in the social, cultural, psychological, economic and intellectual practices of Nepalese people. Among them the paradigmatic changes in the western intellectual phenomena during the late twentieth-century, advanced development in the information technology and the gradual process of globalization are some factors that have shaped Nepalese peoples' lives and their desires to restructure the whole socio-political systems.

After the World War II, especially after the 1950s, the whole western intellectual world was shifting from Modernism to postmodernism, structuralism to post structuralism and center to margin. Supported by Jacques Derrida's concept of deconstruction, Jacques Lacan's ideas on psychoanalysis and Michel Foucault's concept of discourse, and power, and the poststructuralist movement, paved the way for multiplicity of truths, meanings and knowledge against the modernist and structuralist claim of singularity, centrality and fixity of truths, meanings and

knowledge. Such shifts in intellectual practices proved experimental validity through the success of Women's Movement, the revolutionary development in the field of science and technology, especially the advanced information technologies made possible the expansion of poststructuralist ideas all over the world instantly and immediately. Similarly, ideas of globalization spread those ideas all over the world. Scholars and intellectuals termed the whole phenomena as a shift from modernism to postmodernism, into the age of multiple truths, indeterminacy of meaning, lack of center, and so on. Nepal also could not keep herself separate and secluded from the global influence of postmodern and post structural ideas. As a result centuries old monarchy was overthrown and the whole nation has entered into the new era of democratic republic, individual rights, politics of minorities and marginalized, awareness of identities, and the rule of law which has been determining the postmodern phenomena of present day's Nepalese history. Although the Mass Movement II opened the door of unbounded opportunities for the rise of socially, politically, culturally, religiously, economically, and regionally backwarded and marginalized people to enter into the mainstream national politics and guarantee their rights, that also has brought about the disorders in the socio-psychology of the nation. Before and after the movement people were and are suffering, and feeling psychologically disturbed. All these major shifts and transformations of the Nepalese history have affected all the social, cultural, intellectual, political, religious and economic phenomena of the nation including arts and literature. It is this very context that Sanjeev Upreti deals with in *Ghanachakkar*.

Sanjeev Upreti, a scholar of literary theories, university teacher, a critic, a creative writer and a leading figure of present day's Nepalese intellectual circle observes the troublesome era of Nepalese history from both theoretical and realistic

points of view. His novel *Ghanachakkar* (2007) reflects and portrays the changing patterns of Nepalese society, especially the society of Kathmandu city, as it is viewed and observed from the eyes of postmodern intellectual. Thus, this research claims that Upreti's *Ghanachakkar* reflects the postmodernity of Nepalese society found in the capital city Kathmandu and its mentally disturbed narrator reflects and represents the postmodern awareness of the whole Nepalese society.

Ghanachakkar begins with the narrator's deteriorating mental condition and one of his students Ranganath Pudasaini's rebelion against the Central Department of Nepali Cultural Studies with the demand of right to recheck his failed exam papers. But the head of the department, B. P. Barma, rejects his demand and says that his demands are out of the system and authority of the department and rather calls Ranganath "Mad" (2-5). Being angry and hopeless towards the future, Ranganath determines to revolt against the system and to find his failed papers by other means (5). Then the "Khoj" or the search of Ranganath begins. Professor Narayan Prasad reminds the narrator about his important duties and responsibilities and warns about the rumors regarding his negligence of the duties, craziness, nonsense idling activities and charges that he is becoming more crazy and anarchic (6-11). The narrator realizes that he starts forgetting some events of the past but he rejects the claim that he is mad. He thinks his wonderings, roaming and forgetfulness are only the results of his mental tiredness and the troublesome contemporary social and political situation (10-11).

Suggested by the friends and colleagues Barun and Bimba the narrator goes to visit Dilbarnath Jogi in Toudaha (14-22) and Franz Ryner in Boudha (25-29) to interview them for the writings in the column "Fact and Fancy" that he and his friend Barun were running in *New Kantipur Post*. In Taudaha he listens to the myth of the origin of Kathmandu valley from his friend Samsar and mysterious prophecies of

Dilbarnath. His mind becomes more restless and tensed but he determines to prove the rumors about his madness false and to show that he is normal (47). Further he goes to visit German tourist and researcher of power, Franz Ryner, in Boudha. Ryner says that the whole city of Kathmandu valley is full of mysterious and unclear powers that he is unable to study and analyze (26). His instruments also are failing to measure and indicate the flows and motions of those incomprehensible powers in Kathmandu (28). Ryner also suggests the places where he experienced the flows of those powers (29). The narrator also remembers that once he had also experienced some sort of power that had entered into his body and soul (29). He feels some type of connection among the fragmented mysterious prophecies of Dilbernath, Ryner's concepts of mysterious powers and his own problem of mental disorder and restlessness (30). All these make the narrator more self-reserved and anarchic in the eyes of others. His family members, friends and colleagues decide to admit him in the asylum of the north. But knowing this plan and determined to find his own remedy the narrator leaves home before they take him to the asylum.

Then in a disguised costume of a Jogi he visits many places told by Ryner and Dilbernath. He lives in a *Pati*, the rest house, at the bank of river Bishnumati and resumes his Khoj, the search of the meaning of the mysterious prophecies of Dilbernath and his own remedy of mental disorder in relation to Ryner's concepts of the flows of incomprehensible powers. He goes to the palace, ministries, restaurant, historical and religious places, major trade centers and politically important places in Kathmandu. In every place he experiences odd, strange and unbelievable events. Finally his friends and colleagues find him laying powerless in Basantapur and take him to the asylum (165-72). In the asylum he analyzes every events putting them together systematically in order to reach into the core of truth and meaning. But

ultimately he realizes the emptiness of truth, meaninglessness of life and existence

that motivates him to commit suicide (199). But the doctors and nurses find him

before he dies and save his life (213). After this he hallucinates his own ego talking to

him and reminding him of his lost identity, memories and various responsibilities of

life (216-23). Suddenly he remembers everything about himself and claims that he is

normal now and then returns home with new vigor of life (227-30).

   The novel ends with an optimistic tone. Although the narrator takes the time of

his adventure to be short, one can find the complete history of Kathmandu from the

Royal massacre of 2058 B.S. to the days after the Mass Movement of 2062/63. Upreti

portrays the changes that took place during those days of Nepalese contemporary

history as it is seen from a mentally disturbed intellectual, a university teacher and a

sharp minded critic. During his search he meets various types of people who represent

various class, group, ethnicity, religions and professions, and he learns a lot from

them. Upreti's portrayal of those seemingly minor characters is important as they

reflect the contemporary life pattern in Nepalese society. Thus, this research

hypothesizes that Upreti's portrayals of the changed patterns of social, political,

economic, socio-psychological, religious and cultural lives of the people provide a

way to analyze how the whole Nepalese society is gradually proceeding towards

postmodernism. Analyzing the novel from the multiple perspectives of postmodernist

reading one can see how the consciousness of the narrator reveals the paradigmatic

changes in the basic principles upon which the whole Nepalese society was founded

in the past. One can also see how the changes that have entirely affected the western

intellectual phenomena have also affected Nepalese social, political, cultural,

economic and intellectual phenomena as well, which have marked the postmodernity

of Nepalese society at present.

Ghanachakkar has received many critical appraisals since its first publication in 2007. Several literary critics and reviewers have interpreted the novel using multiple perspectives and giving multiple meanings. Some have viewed the novel as the deconstruction of the binaries between sanity and insanity, normality and abnormality, reality and fantasy and so on. Agya Poudyal illustrates how the novel deconstructs such binaries in her article "Much Madness is Divinest Sense". She claims:

> The book (*Ghanachakkar*) 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 as a lunatic. But the implicit sanity that his actions
>
> and thoughts carry should appear to most readers as otherwise. (46)

Although the narrator is "explicitly termed as a lunatic", his actions, activities and thoughts surpass the traditional definition of insanity. As the narrator's mysterious quest for vague meanings, truths and reality gives the sense of his abnormality, his observations and findings of Nepalese society give the sense of his normality. Readers can grasp the important meanings and information although the narrator is regarded as a lunatic. Thus, for Poudyal the novel successfully deconstructs the binaries between sanity and insanity which the society and tradition have created.

The novel also has been taken as an attempt to dramatize the situations and emotions of socially or mentally stigmatized people. Sharma and Poudel claim that *Ghanachakkar* puts many questions to the society and its structure for their treatment of the so-called abnormal, insane, mad or lunatic people in the society. They ask, "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

peculiar reasons? When does one get bewildered on pre-existing notions? These are the questions that haunt our mind now and then" (11). The major issue of the novel, according to Sharma and Poudel, is the reflection of a mentally disturbed or abnormal individual's life in the society dominated by so-called normal or sane people. Dramatizing the experiences of the abnormal narrator, his astonishingly sharp mind and human feeling, the novel problematizes the socially and traditionally constructed differences between a sane and an insane person in the society. Moreover, the novel exposes how a person holding peculiar attitudes in the society, is treated, misbehaved and stigmatized. Although it is rightly claimed that the novel presents the issue of insanity, madness and social stigma, there are other more serious issues the novel puts forward. The issue of Nepalese socio-cultural realities in the postmodern age of globalization is often overshadowed by the issue of madness and stigma in the novel.

Ghanachakkar is also interpreted as a historical and realistic representation of Nepalese history. During the time in which Upreti was writing the novel, Nepalese society was (and is still) going through the drastic changes. Social, political, economic, cultural and aesthetic phenomena were (are) changing in the country. During the transitional phase of the history of recent Nepalese society, its various institutions and the People were deeply troubled. Lives of the people in the society were greatly affected by the political changes in the country. *Ghanachakkar* artistically dramatizes the society and its people during those troubled years of the Nepalese history. Bishnu Sapkota interprets the novel as a contemporary history of Nepalese society in his article, "Ghanachakkar Mind". He claims, "*Ghanachakkar* is history, its characters are real, even in the mundane sense of the world real" (4). Definitely, *Ghanachakkar* is the representation of the troublesome past of the Nepalese history. It dramatizes the troubled psychology of the people and society

observed from a mentally disturbed narrator. But still such interpretation cannot rightly judge the novel which embodies many issues of postmodernism and globalization. The political and social changes were (are) not only the consequences of the People's Movement II 062/63. There were (are) other causes as well. The concept of postmodern society and culture and the effects of its globalization are other important causes which have determined the structure of Nepalese society at present. Moreover, the Mass Movement II can also be viewed as the influence of western postmodern concept of state and government which advocates for the democratic republic and pluralism. In other words, the globalization of such postmodern concepts of state, government, society and culture are the other causes which have determined structure of Nepalese society at present that have been implicitly reflected in the novel. Thus, taking a narrow path of socio-cultural realism, this project analyzes the postmodern consciousness which lies hidden in Upreti's novel *Ghanachakkar*.

Basing upon both textual and contextual analysis of the novel the research reveals the issue of postmodern consciousness embedded in *Ghanachakkar* which has been overlooked till now. It claims that *Ghanachakkar* is the expression of the consciousness of various postmodernities brought by the all-encompassing movement of postmodernism in Nepalese socio-cultural practices, especially experienced in Kathmandu city. Other issues like sanity and insanity, historicity, rising of the marginalized and minority groups, globalization, and identity crisis, literary and artistic modernity revolve around the main issue of postmodern conscious. For this purpose, the research analyzes the novel critically from the multiple perspectives of postmodernist reading. Thus, now it will be better to have a general introduction of the postmodernism and its various strands upon which the whole study grounds.

Postmodernism is a complex, broad and confusing term commonly applied to define the general features appeared in the field of philosophical, socio-cultural, political, economic, artistic and literary activities after the World War II. Postmodernism, as a movement, came against the rationalizing project of Enlightenment which flourished during the heyday of modernism (Jameson 267). In other words postmodernism came as a radical break from modernism or Enlightenment's ideals such as reason, progress, order, universality, and objectivity, (Newton 266). "The enumeration of what follows then at once becomes empirical, chaotic, and heterogeneous" (Jameson 267). So, the present era of postmodernism is characterized by chaos, fragmentation, heterogeneity, indeterminacy, and disorder. Clarifying the present era of postmodernism Fredric Jameson argues:

> The last few years have been marked by an inverted millenarianism, in which premonition of the future, catastrophic or redemptive, have been replaced by senses of the end of this or that (the end of ideology, art or social class; the 'crisis' of Leninism, social democracy, or the welfare state, etc. etc.): taken together, all of these perhaps constitute what is increasingly called postmodernism. (267)

Jameson, in the above excerpt, gives the general introduction of the present era which, according to him, lacks any organizing central principle, theory, philosophy and millenarianism modernism used to hold. Postmodernism itself rejects such ideals and inverts them paving the way to plurality, multiplicity, heterogeneity, polyvocality, indeterminacy, and open-endedness. All these changes in the general view and intellectual practices, for Jameson, have brought the chaos, confusion, disorder, indeterminacy in all fields of human knowledge and activities. But instead of

lamenting such situation postmodernism celebrates the situation and regards such changes as great achievement or success.

All these changes have affected the whole condition of present days human intellectual phenomena. The nature or characteristics of the present days realities of postmodernism is more clear in postmodern critics and psychoanalyst Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's perception of the present days realities. They argue:

> We live today in the age of partial objects, bricks that have been shattered to bits, and leftovers. We no longer believe in the myth of the existence of fragments that, like pieces of an antique statue, are merely waiting for the last one to be turned up, so that they may all be glued back together to create a unity that is precisely the same as the original unity. We no longer believe in a primordial totality that once existed, or in a final totality that awaits us at some future date. We no longer believe in the dull gray outlines of a dreary, colorless dialectic of evolution, aimed at forming a harmonious whole out of heterogeneous bits by rounding of their rough edges. (113)

Deleuze and Guattari believe that the days of principle or theory or philosophy that vows to unify all existing fragments and heterogeneity into a harmonious whole or totality are over. According to them, a postmodern citizen does not believe in the myth of primordial totality and final totality waiting in future that combines the bits of all fragments into the whole. The modernists' theories of such unity and totality are only the myths of "colorless dialectic of evolution" and progress directed towards creating "a harmonious whole out of heterogeneous bits" (113). For Deleuze and Guatteri such myth does not carry any sensible meaning and importance at present

days' reality which is colored with the fragments, bits, heterogeneity, plurality and multiplicity.

From this idea of Deleuze and Guattari one can make little sense, just little sense because understanding of the whole nature of present days' realities is very tiresome if not impossible, of what is generally called postmodernism and postmodern realities of the present. In Jean-Francois Lyotard's word, "This is a period of slackening-I refer to the color of the times" (268). Like modernism itself, postmodernism is an elusive and used to describe a diversity of strands which have emerged in all spheres of present days' human activities ranging from science to the drug-culture and the question of individual's self or identity (Ruland and Bradbury 386). As postmodernism is very broad and complex phenomena, there is neither any single all-encompassing "postmodern world view" nor the possibility of one (Tarnas 143). Although postmodernism is an elusive, broad and complex theoretical concept, there are some ways which lead to the general understanding of what is postmodernism. Postmodernist and postcolonialist critic Kwame Anthony Appiah opines:

> [T]here is now a rough consensus about the structure of the modern/ postmodern dichotomy in the many domains–from architecture to poetry to philosophy to rock music to the movies-in which it has been invoked. In each of these domains there is an antecedent practice that laid claim to a certain exclusivity of insight, and in each of them 'postmodernism' is a name for the rejection of that claim to exclusivity, a rejection that is almost always more playful, though not necessarily less serious, than the practice it aims to replace. (58)

In Appiah's view there is the dichotomy between modernism and postmodernism. One should observe this dichotomy in order to understand what is postmodernism and what it does. According to Appiah, modernism is based on the theory or practice of exclusivity. Modernism excludes certain insight in every and each domain of human knowledge and activities; in architecture, in art and literature, in philosophy, in science, and in politics regarding those insights as chaotic, disordered, bad, irrational, immoral, and secondary. What postmodernism is then the rejection of such exclusivity of insights in each domains and what postmodernism does is the subversion of such practices of exclusivity in each domains. Such subversion or replacement, according to Appiah, postmodernism does always restore insights or practices which were once excluded in modernist practices of exclusivity in "more playful" manner (58). But the new practices, which postmodernists want to bring into practice in each domain, are not less serious as it was once thought to be. Thus, one should observe whether there is such a shift or replacement or subversion in the antecedent practice of exclusivity of certain insights in each domain in order to judge and recognize and understand various practices whether they are modern or postmodern in each domain that people are conducting and confronted in this era of slackening.

Although Appiah's model is essay and more economical to analyze and understand present days changes, it is not a theory and perspective upon which the analysis and understanding of any literary production may ground. There are other critics and theorist like Jameson, Lyotard, Jean Budrillard, and Richard Rorty whose views and perspectives are more essential to understand as their views provide a theoretical base to postmodernism in different domains of human knowledge and activities.

Fredric Jameson approaches postmodernism from the "periodizing hypothesis" of history and sociology. From a Marxist stand point "Jameson finds value in manifestation of the postmodern but nevertheless argues that it has to be understood as a cultural phenomenon emerging out of late capitalism" (Newton 266). To prove this "periodizing hypothesis" (267) Jameson brings forward the notions of economist Ernest Mandel. In his book, *Late Capitalism*, Mandel "anatomizes the historic originality of this new society (postmodern society)" (Jameson 268). According to Mandel this is "the third stage or moment in the evolution of capital" and "a *purer* stage of capitalism than any of the moments that preceded it" (Jameson 268). Grounding upon these concepts of Mandel, Jameson proceeds ahead and claims:

> Namely that every position on postmodernism in culture-whether apologia or stigmatization-is also at one and the same time, and necessarily, an implicitly or explicitly political stance on the nature of multinational capitalism today. (268)

According to Jameson there exists a deep interrelationship between the new culture of postmodernism and multinational capitalism. He argues that the present-system of multinational or global capitalism is the new form of the capitalism supported by "a whole new technology" and "a whole new economic world system" (270-71). Such changed system of capitalism demanded the urgency of producing novel-seeming goods in every field, including art and literature, resulted in commodification of art and literature. But such new economic world system got theoretical, and ideological supports in every domains and institutionalized in the name of postmodernism and arrival of new culture generally termed as "postindustrial society", "consumer society, media society, information society, electronic society or 'high tech', and the like" (Jameson 268).

Finally, the new transformed culture and society exposed in the new constitutive features of postmodernism as mentioned above. Because the new transformed culture owe its credit wholly to the new world system of economic, characterized by multinational business, multinational or global capitalism, postmodernism that functions to provide theoretical, ideological and political back up legitimizing the new culture in every domain or sphere. Thus, Jameson regards postmodernism as the cultural logic of late capitalism and the cultural phenomena emerging out of latest phase of capitalism.

Another Frankfurt Marxist Jurgen Habermas argues that what we generally call postmodernism is the failed or incomplete project of modernism that started along with the Enlightenment project of the eighteenth century. According to Habermas, the project was committed to rationalized development of "objective science, universal morality and law, and autonomous art according to their inner logic" (280). The Enlightenment and modernist philosophers "wanted to utilized this accumulation of specialized culture for the enrichment of everyday life-that is to say, for the rational organization of everyday social life"(Habermas 280). This project flourished till the first half of the twentieth century in the form of industrialized capitalism, objective and inventive science, secularism in metaphysics, experimentalism, expressionism, Dadaism, avant-gardism, etc. in art and literature (Upreti, *Sidantaka Kur*a 63-7). "Each domain of culture could be made to correspond to cultural professions in which problems could be dealt with as the concern of special experts" (Habermas 280).

In the beginning of the second half of the 20th century this project and its optimism began to lose impression and started declining as there appeared a huge gap between the culture of experts and the culture of common people. Habermas argues:

The 20th century has shattered this optimism. The differentiation of

science, morality and art has come to mean the autonomy of the

segments treated by the specialist and their separation from the

hermeneutics of everyday communication. This splitting off is the

problem that has given rise to efforts to 'negate' the culture of

expertise. (281)

As a result of split between expert culture and society some critics and groups of

intellectuals started negating the project of modernism as lost cause and this negation

is more evident and apparent in the domain of art and literature (Habermas 281).

There appeared negation of the project of modernism from anti-modernist movement

of the young conservatives, pre-modernism from the old conservative, and

postmodernism of the neo-conservatives (Habermas 284). But the negation has led to

nowhere and the problem has remained the same. According to Hebermas, it is only in

the field of art and literature that the problem has created crisis but in the domains of

science, religion, politics and economics, the project of modernism is still functioning

and continuing in the various new forms (Uprati, *Sidantaka Kura* 75).

Habermas suggests that the project is not stoppable and negatable and the

efforts of the negation have only made the problem more critical rather than solving

them (283). Hebermas is still optimistic and suggests:

I think that instead of giving up modernity and its project as a lost

cause, we should learn from the mistakes of those extravagant

programs which have tried to negate modernity. Perhaps the types of

reception of art may offer an example which at least indicates the

direction of way out. (283)

Instead of negating the whole project of modernism as a lost cause and splitting movement between culture and society, as it appeared due to the gap between expertise and common, one should learn from the mistakes of the past according to Habermas. The negation and the type of reception in the domain of art and literature is an example of how such negation leads the whole culture towards chaos, anarchy and disorder. Learning from such examples may guide to the direction of a way out to the completion of the project. Thus, Habermas seems to be accepting the failure of the project of modernism that has resulted in what is generally termed as postmodernism and he seems to be suggesting the way out for restoring the lost project. In other words, for Hebermas, postmodernism is the failed project of modernism and there are still possibilities to complete and restore the project.

Unlike Jameson and Habermas, Lyotard regards postmodernism as a rupture or radical break from the ideological construction of modernism (Upreti, *Sidantaka Kura* 74-5). Lyotard argues that although postmodernism "is undoubtedly a part of the modern" there exists a huge gap between modern and postmodern cultures (273). According to Lyotard "[M]odernity is fundamentally about order: about rationality and rationalization, creating order out of chaos" (Ghimire 2). Modernist thought that creating more rationality creates more order in the society for the betterment and progress of the society. Thus, modernists were always on guard against anything and everything labeled as "disorder" as they thought disorder disrupts the order. Then they created a binary opposition between "disorder" and "order" so they could assert the superiority of "order" characterizing "disorder" as non- rational, non-white, non-male, non-heterosexual, non-hygienic, non- western, and so on (Ghimire 2).

Modernist preferred "order" with the effort to achieve "stability". As a result "disorder" became "the other" and avoided in each domains of human life.

Modernism, according to Lyotard, got its ideology of binarism between "order" and "disorder" on its "grand narratives" or "master narratives", which are the stories a culture tells itself about the logic of its practice and belief system. Modernism, in this sense, had the grand narratives of utopian society, rationalism, secularism, objective science, universal law and morality, autonomous art and literature, liberal humanism and democracy, and capitalism. Such grand narratives assigned and made possible to create binarisms in modern practices in all domains. But Lyotard argues that all binarisms practised in modernism are only constructed to achieve their certain future objectives and, thus, do not possess the truth in themselves. Postmodernism, Lyotard argues, rejects all these grand narratives and binarisms it constructed. Analyzing Lyotord's notion of postmodern rejection of such grand narratives, Saroj Sharma Ghimire writes:

> Lyotard argues that all aspects of modern societies, including science as the primary form of knowledge, depend on these grand narratives. Postmodernism then is the critique of grand narratives, the awareness that such narratives serve to mask the contradictions and instabilities that are inherent in any social organization or practice. In other words, every attempt to create "order" always demands the creation of an equal amount of "disorder" but a "grand narrative" masks the contractedness of these categories by explaining the "disorder" REALLY IS chaotic and bad, and that "order" REALLY IS rational and good. Postmodernism, in rejecting grand narrative, favors "mini-narratives", stories that explain small practices, local events, rather than large-scale universal or global concepts. Postmodern "mini-narratives" are always situational, provisional, contingent, and

temporary, making no claim to universality, truth, reason or stability.

(3)

The end of grand narrative has opened the new practices of inclusivity of all contradictions and beliefs which were once rejected in the socio- cultural practices. The small narratives have taken the places of grand narratives. Such small narrative makes no claim of universality and eternal truth. All these have colored the postmodernism with playfulness, plurality, multiplicity, inconsistency, heterogeneity and indeterminacy. According to Lyotard these changes are fundamental to postmodernism which were rejected by modernism. Thus, in Lyotard's notion postmodernism is characteristically different from modernism due to the end of grand narratives and the rising of the small narratives.

From this analysis, now, it appears that postmodernism is very broad area of study. Various critics, philosophers and theorists have analyzed postmodernism from

Another critic Jean Budrillard opines that postmodern societies lack the sense of originality, only one truth and depthness. According to him, there is not any original but only copies which he terms simulacra. In postmodern era there are thousands of copies of various high modernist arts and paintings. Due to the availability of copies everywhere the art works become an inert object, a reified end-product (Jameson 271). Moreover, in the field of music and movie, which are also arts, there is no original. Cds and recordings are produced in thousands of numbers and all are the same. They are all copies and as well as originals. "Another version of Baudrillard's "simulacrum" would be the concept of virtual reality, a reality created by simulation, for which there is no original" (Ghimire 3). Thus, according to Baudrillard, there is no sense of originality in postmodern realities like in modern realities. Copies or simulacrums themselves are the realities and vice versa.

From this analysis, now, it appears that postmodernism is very broad area of study. Various critics, philosophers and theorists have analyzed postmodernism from

different angles and perspectives. Although somewhere and in some points they contradict with each other, in which contradictions there lies the hidden sense of postmodernism, there are some basic and common grounds among their thoughts. From commonalities and contradictions a conclusion can be drawn as: postmodernism is the latest movement appeared in all domains of human life. Although it can be taken as new and continued phase of modernism, there are many fundamental differences between two movements. Unlike modernism, postmodernism is characterized as the present day realities which is contaminated by new world economic system of late capitalism, a cultural logic of late capitalism; failed project of modernism due to the gap between culture and society; rising of meta-narratives, of heterogeneity, and of disorder due to the end of grand narrative, of universality, and of order; and the lack of originality due to the simulacrum. All these indicate that postmodernism is a chaotic, vague, confusing, disordered, indeterminate, slackening and self-criticizing movement or phase which has made contemporary realities vast and incomprehensible.

Grounding on these characteristics or features this study analyzes how Upreti's *Ghanachakkar* reflects the contemporary Nepalese socio-cultural, political, and psychological domains and how they have been more or less affected by postmodernism. Researching and analyzing these issues in the novel this study proves the hypothesis that *Ghanachakkar* embodies the postmodern awareness in its reflection and dramatization of contemporary Nepalese lives and societies.

Apart from the above discussed socio-cultural dimensions of postmodernism there are other dimensions of postmodernism that deal with the various features of a postmodern text or work of art and literature. This aesthetic part of postmodernism analyzes the form of any artistic or literary work and its relation to the content. So, it

is also important to have a glimpse on this aesthetic part of postmodernism before entering into the main part of the analysis of the novel. While doing this, this section limits itself to the analysis of postmodern literature, especially novel, as it concern with literature.

Postmodernism in literary writing can be seen as transgression of the previous limits, set by modernism, in particular art genre (Hutcheon 275). M.H. Abrams puts:

> Postmodernism involves not only a continuation, sometimes carried to an extreme, of the counter traditional experiments of modernism, but also diverse attempts to break away from modernist forms which, inevitably, become in their turn conventional, as well as to overthrow the elitism of modernist "high art" (176)

According to Abrams, postmodern work of art and literature is an attempt to break away from modernist limits of forms. It attempts to overthrow modernist "high arts" or elitist art. For this, sometimes, it uses the experimentalism, first introduced by modernist, to its extreme. Postmodernist also uses various styles and modes of writing.

Linda Hutcheon, in her essay "Theorizing the Postmodern" in the book *Theorizing the Postmodernism: Towards a Poetics* argues that it is very difficult to incorporate postmodernists' writings in her book. According to Hutcheon fluidity of borders between literary genres is one major innovative style of post-modernist writings. Novel and short storiy collections, novel and long poem, novel and autobiography, novel and biography, novel and history are merging and it is very difficult to point out which is the dominant. Such merge of genres are played off against each other. So, there is no simple and unproblematic merging (Hutcheon 276).

Parody is another perfect postmodern form, according to Hutcheon. But unlike the traditional use of parody, as in Eliot's *The Waste Land*, postmodern parody displays and critiques inter textual relation to the traditions and convention of the genres involved. It paradoxically both incorporates and challenges that which it parodies (Hutcheon 277). Similarly, Hutcheon also points outs "postmodern inquiry into the very nature of subjectivity" as another important feature of postmodernist writings. It frequently challenges the traditional notions of perspective (277).

Irony is another most recognizable aspect of postmodernism. Irony has been practiced since long history of literary tradition but postmodernist exploitation and use of irony is different from traditional uses. Postmodernists use irony often in playfulness and as black humor. Postmodernist like Heller, Vonnegut, and Pinchon often use irony to treat serious subject in a playful and humorous way. Unlike the concept and use of stable irony used by modernist to provide the readers "an assertion or position which, whether explicit or implicit, serve as a firm ground for ironically qualifying or subverting the surface meaning", postmodernists use "unstable irony" that "offers no fixed stand point which is not itself undercut by further ironies" (Abrams 143). In other words the use of unstable ironies in postmodern works "there is an endless regress of ironic undercuttings" (Abrams 143). "The literature of absurd typically presents such a regression of ironies" to "suggests a denial that there is any secure evaluative standpoint, or even any determinable rational, in the human situation" (Abrams 143).

Metafiction is another technique or style of the postmodern literature especially applied in novel. It foregrounds the "roles of author in inventing the fiction and of the reader in receiving the fiction" (Abrams 203). It is a self-reflective mode of writing that makes readers aware of the functionality of the fiction and undercuts the

modernist notion of "realism" in presentation. "Historiographic metafiction is a term applied to characterize postmodern fictions that fictionalize actual historical events or figures. This concept of historiographic metafiction undercuts the logic and claim of the objective historical truths of the history texts and literature or realism, according to Hutcheon.

Similarly, magic realism is another mode of writing postmodern fictions. It is popular among Latin American writers. It is practiced successfully by postmodernist writers like Gabriel Gracia Marquez, Isabella Allande, Gunter Grass, Italo Calvino, John Fowels, Salman Rushdie, and so on. The term is applied to analyze their treatment of realism often with the mixture of fantasy and supernatural elements (Abrams 203). The practioners of magic realism often "weave, in an ever-shifting pattern, a sharply etched realism in representing ordinary events and details together with fantastic and dreamlike element as well as with materials derived from myth and fairy tales"(Abrams 203). Thus magic realism blurs the boundaries between fact and fantasy, natural and supernatural, realism and myth or fantasy drawn and practiced by the modernist writers.

Apart from "parody" , "irony", "black humor", "metafiction or historiographic metafiction", and "magic realism" postmodernist writer also uses "pastiche", "temporal distortion" , "technoculture and hyper reality" , "paranoia", "maximalism" and "multiple perspectives" in order to reflect and dramatize the complex and broad socio-cultural pattern of postmodernism. This study analyzes the various postmodern techniques applied by Upreti in *Ghanachakkar* in order to show how the technical aspect of the novel itself carries the postmodern awareness of writing and how they have been applied to reflect the changing pattern, absurdity, and emptiness of human life and whole society. For this purpose it searches and analyzes the elements like

parody, irony, metafiction or historiographic metafiction, magic realism, pastiche and

hypertextuality and their relation to the theme and content in Upreti's novel

Ghanacakhkar.

Although a postmodernist reading does not remain within any single or limited

boundary as it has heterogeneity, plurality, indeterminacy and inclusive in its heart,

this research limits itself within the fluid boundary of postmodern analysis of the

novel. Confusion may arise between or among postmodernist analysis, deconstructive

analysis, and poststructuralist analysis as they sometimes and somewhere overlap

with each other. Such overlapping is common as they share certain theories and views

regarding the indeterminacy of meaning, spatio-temporality of truth and knowledge,

unpredictability of realities and identities. Postmodernism itself got its theoretical

supports from the various premises of poststructuralism and deconstruction. So, the

confusion aroused by their overlapping is liable one. Still there exist major

fundamental differences among them. Poststructuralist reading rejects the claim of

structuralist notion that the "structure" gives the objective meaning of a text. It denies

the claim of the linguistic structure and generic structures as the source of meaning of

the text. Instead, it claims that due to the same structure, linguistic and generic, the

meaning becomes plural and indeterminate. There is not any single structure or

pattern reliable for the universal meaning rather many structures. The meaning that

comes from the various structures undercuts each other and it creates inaccessibility to

the meaning. It is purely a linguistic phenomenon. What a poststructuralist reading

searches and analyzes is those multiple structures embedded in a text and their

relation to the plurality of meanings which is expressed in the text.

Very close but not same to poststructuralist reading, deconstruction also points

towards the lack of single, and central meaning in the text. It denies the claims of

singular and universal meaning of a text. It argues that there exist various contradictory elements, and views within a text. Such inherent contradictory elements, views and ideas undercut the logic of single, definite meaning imposed from outside. Thus, a deconstructive reading is purely a textual phenomenon that searches and analyzes the inherent contradictions within a text and relates to the indeterminacy of the meaning.

Unlike poststructuraliam and deconstruction, postmodernism is a broad concept that includes every domains of human life. Although it shares the concept of plurality, lack of center, heterogeneity, and indeterminacy. its social cultural, political, historical, economical, psychological concerns have made it fundamentally different from poststructuralist and deconstructive reading. Thus, this research limits itself within the search and analysis of the socio-cultural, political, historical, economic, and psychological issues in Upreti's novel *Ghanachakkar*. Despite some overlapping with the poststructuralism and deconstruction, this study firmly ground on postmodernist reading of the novel.

Finally, talking about the outline of the whole body of the study, this research is divided into five main chapters. The first chapter entitled, "*Ghanachakkar*, Nepalese Society and Postmodernism", is the general introduction of the whole study. It introduces the statement of problem, major issues, hypothesis, claim and methodology of the study in brief. It also provides a brief background of the time during which the novel was written, and the short summary of the novel. It also gives argument regarding why the issues are researchable and why the hypothesis is logical one through the systematic discussion on the various reviews and criticism on the text. It also gives significance, limitation and general outline of the whole study.

Second, third and fourth chapters are the textual analysis of the novel. They

are actual reading of the novel. Second chapter, entitled, "Socio-Cultural Realities in *Ghanachakkar"* explores and analyzes the social, cultural, political and psychological realities which give the sense of various postmodernities of the Nepalese societies. Third, chapter, entitled, *"Ghanachakkar*, Postmodernism and Madness" explores and analyzes the issue like "end of grand narrative" and its consequences like "confusion", "madness", "schizophrenia", "absurdity" and Ghanachakkar. Fourth chapter entitled, "Postmodern Narrative Techniques in *Ghanachakkar"* focuses mainly on the aesthetic part of postmodernism. It explores and analyzes the various techniques like parody, irony, metafiction, magic realism, pastiche, hypertextuality, etc. and their relation to the themes or content of the novel. This chapter demonstrates how the overall techniques of Upreti's writing themselves express the postmodern consciousness in *Ghanchakkar*. These three chapters, their analysis and claims are frequently get supports from the theories and perspectives of various postmodern theorists.

Finally, the fifth chapter, entitled, "Postmodern Consciousness in *Ghanachakkar"*, is the conclusion of the study. It puts together all the findings of the research. It draws a conclusion from the analysis and findings of the preceding chapters and proves the claim and hypothesis.

II. Socio-cultural Postmodernity in *Ghanachakkar*

At present all the social, cultural, political and intellectual phenomena in Nepalese society are going through the incomprehensible changes. The whole society has been turned into a complex and a vast area of study. Some of traditional practices values are disappearing; some new cultural and intellectual practices and values are emerging; and some hybrid cultural practices are appearing in the arena of Nepalese social landscape. Moreover, the changes brought into the political activities by the Mass Movement II, influences of western intellectual phenomenon like poststructuralism, deconstruction, postmodernism and globalization have turned the Nepalese society towards a new direction which is difficult to comprehend and analyze by the old analytical paradigms. Upreti's *Ghanachakkar* attempts to reflect and express that world which is myriad by all these changes in the Nepalese social, cultural, political, intellectual and psychological activities.

Ghanachakkar directly takes the readers into those social realities which have been inflected by chaos, anarchy and indeterminacy in every aspects of an individual's social life. Observed from a mentally disturbed university teacher, the narrator, Upreti invites his readers to journey through every field of social activities. This journey takes the readers from a university class room to various spheres of social life. This journey takes the readers to observe *Jogi*'s life in Taudaha, to visit Franz Rynar, international power research, in Buddha, and in different places like Royal palace, restaurant, ministry, temples, public places and asylum. It invites the readers to observe and analyze the indeterminate changes occurring in various areas of Nepalese social lives. It begins just before few months of the Royal Palace Massacre and lasts after few months of the Mass Movement II. This time setting of the novel is very important to understand many issues in the novel because it was that

period of Nepalese history during which major changes have occurred in the fields of Nepalese politics and socio-cultural phenomena. Moreover, all other fields, peoples' daily activities and psyches were deeply affected by those events of political and socio-cultural changes, which the novel endeavors to reflect and dramatize.

Upreti begins the novel by reflecting the chaotic situations and anarchic activities increasing in Tribhuvan University since the decade of 1990s. Revolt of the students against the monopoly and central power of university administration demanding students' rights and transparent system in all examinations have been rapidly increasing since few decades in the university. Many times departments were burnt and strikes were hold on. These events indicate the rising of the students who have been put aside in the periphery by the closed, centralized, teacher centered and powerful administrative system of the university. *Ghanchakkar* first reflects these changes appearing in the field of academic activities. Ranganath Pudasaini, who demands the right to know how he failed the exam and demands the right to see his failed exam paper, becomes rebellious against the teacher centered system of the university. His rebel and dissatisfaction raises question against the totalitarian power of the university authorities. Upreti writes:

> That previous tall and thin student (Ranganath) climbed upon the low bended branch of the banyan tree. Now becoming more excited as if giving speech, he started shouting, "Upon me a huge unjust has taken place. Professor of this department, who speak hours about postmodernism, are in support of pre-modern feudal culture. They could not understand the effects of globalization. Where is there justice done upon own students?" (my translation 2)

Ranganath blames that the system of university and its professors are guided by the pre-modern and feudal system. Although they teach the concepts of postmodernism and globalization, they failed to understand and practice those concepts and principles in practical life. As a result they failed in judging their students. Ranganath clearly demands the new changes in the system of the university that would judge the students in right, logical and transparent way. He demands the professors to be postmodern in their activities as well. His anger, dissatisfaction and rebellious mentality reflect the postmodern consciousness growing within the circle of intellectuals.

Ranganath appears as a postmodern figure when he condemns the traditional system of education adopted by the university. He appears as a postmodern critic who rejects closed, hierarchical and centralized system in the field of education practiced since the time of Plato. According to Richard Tarnas such systems of centrality and hierarchy are based upon the western philosophical tradition to the grasp and articulate a foundational "reality" at center. Tarnas claims:

> More pointedly, such a project has been condemned as inherently alienating and oppressively hierarchical: an intellectually imperious procedures that has produced as existential and cultural impoverishment, and that has lead ultimately to the technocratic domination of nature and the socio-cultural domination of others. The western mind's overriding compulsion to impose some form of totalizing reason; theological, scientific, and economic, on every aspect of life is accused of being not only self-deceptive but destructive. (142)

Tarnas regards the whole western civilization as morally alienating and spiritually bankrupt due to its traditional base. The project to grasp and articulate a foundational

objective reality and truth has been severely criticized "as inherently alienating and oppressively hierarchical" (142). Such system only produces intellectual bankruptcy, existential and cultural degradation as it imposes the form of totalizing reason on every aspect of individual life including his system of education. In the novel Ranganath regards the university and its professors following the same alienating, oppressive and hierarchical system as he and his friends declare: "The department is presenting itself in more and more irresponsible and totalitarian manner. If it is so, no moment delay to burn this department too" (2). Ranganath and his friends' desire to burn the department reflects their dissatisfaction towards the traditional system of the university and their desire to establish new system that would be better, reliable, transparent, and in the behalf of students.

The burning of the English department and the burning of the books, few years before the novel starts, also suggests the approaching changes in Nepali social, cultural, political and intellectual fields. When Ranganath and his friends threaten to burn the department of Nepalese Cultural Studies, the mentally disturbed and restless narrator becomes aware of what is the significance of such activities of the students. He narrates:

> Taking the grieved soul, I proceeded towards class room. Few years
> before, dissatisfied with the exam result students of the Central
> Department of English, which is near by the Department Nepalese
> Cultural Studies, had sabotaged and burnt the department. At that time
> not only the chairs were broken but also some important books of the
> department library were burnt. Will the Department of Nepalese
> Cultural Studies, like the Central Department of English, also be

sabotaged? What again the books will burn or the flame of fire makes

the roof and walls of the department ugly by smearing the soot? (2)

This excerpt reflects the realistic event that happened in Central Department of

English in 2058 B.S. In that year dissatisfied students with their exam result had

sabotaged and burnt the department. This event from history also symbolizes the

changes and revolutions that took place in the west. Here, the Central Department of

English represents the whole cultural, intellectual, political, philosophical and literary

tradition and phenomena of the west.

After the World War II (1939-45) the whole western social, cultural, political,

philosophical, and literary tradition entered into the new phase which is generally

termed as postmodernism (Abrams 176). The postmodern critics questioned and

rejected the omniscience philosophical, religious, scientific notions as a totalitarian

practice of the white middle class Christian males (Tarnas 143). Instead they preferred

multiple perspectives of the truths and meanings which would not put any grand

theories and universal overviews developed by white middle class Christian males

with the Archimedean point at the center (Tarnas 142-43). This movement was

supported by the notion of indeterminacy of truth and meaning, lack of center and

deconstruction of the whole philosophical tradition of the West. Tarnas claims:

Postmodernism in this sense is an antinomian movement that assumes

a vast unmaking in the western mind… deconstruction, decentering,

disappearance, dissemination, demystification, discontinuity,

difference, dispersion, etc. Such terms … express an epistemological

obsession with fragments or fractures, and a corresponding ideological

commitment to minorities in politics, sex, and language. (143)

This movement helped to make many movements successful. Rejecting the white

domination Blacks Movement began in 1960s, Women's movement got success in the

same decade and other movements of minorities and marginalized started in different

places of the world. Such movements brought the white middle class Christian

domination, their philosophical, political and intellectual traditional practices to the

ground from its previous status of zenith. The revolt of the students in the Central

Department of English reflects the same movements of the West that was backed up

by the concepts of postmodernism. Breaking of chair symbolizes the negation of

omnipotent status of university administrators, burning of the books symbolizes the

negation of the traditional epistemology and grand theories that support the

hierarchical, teacher centered and closed system of the university, and raising of the

students symbolizes the once marginalized and put aside in periphery groups fighting

for their rights and equality. The narrator fears of such movements and changes which

are now knocking at the door of the Central Department of Nepalese Cultural Studies

too. This fictional department represents the whole Nepalese culture and society.

Thus, the beginning part of the novel suggests the arrival of the postmodern

phenomena with the prospect of changes in Nepalese socio-cultural activities.

From this intellectual phenomena taking place in the university,

Ghanachakkar takes the readers to other areas of Nepalese socio-cultural realities

which also give the sense of changes. Ranganath is determined to find his failed

examination paper and begins his search. The narrator, after few days, goes to

Taudaha to visit Dilbarnath Jogi in order to collect some subject and issues for the

next column writing in the *New Kantipur Post* and in the hope of getting some

remedy of his deteriorating mental health, as suggested by his friend, co-columnist

and colleague, Barun (12-15). On the way he observes the changes brought by the

electronic culture, multinational industrialization and capitalism, and globalization.

His observations of the street of King's Way and its life activities give the sense of

how Nepalese society is adopting the new global culture of electronics, advertisement,

multinational industrialization and capitalism, and globalization. He describes:

> Although the darkness was expanding, Kings Way seemed decorated
>
> by the electric lights and tall red, yellow electric boards of
>
> advertisement. Oil, shampoo, calculator, beer, motor-cycle, etc. all
>
> kinds of advertisement were functioning. A Buddhist monk was sitting
>
> on the motor-cycle in trance. In red frock a white young lass was oiling
>
> her hair. Under the advertisement of motor-cycle and oil there was
>
> another board. 'Let's Go to America, Here is helped to fill D.V. visa
>
> form in reasonable price ', was the board's declaration. (14)

This description indicates that Nepalese society is also becoming the part of

multinational business and capitalism. The advertisements of the products of

multinational companies indicate the postmodern consumer culture and the

advertisement of D.V. lottery indicates the Nepalese participation in the postmodern

project of globalization.

The major features of postmodern culture are consumerism, media society,

information society, electronic society or 'high tech' and the like (Jameson 268). In

his periodizing hypothesis Fredric Jameson regards postmodern culture as "late

capitalism" phenomena and the postmodernism as cultural logic of "late capitalism"

(268). For Jameson it is the phase of multinational capitalism which gives primacy to

consumerism instead of industrial production (Jameson 268). In this phase of

postmodernism enhanced by late capitalism there is no national boundary of

capitalism, no single center of capitalism rather it is marked by flexible production or

accumulation, disorganized capitalism and global capitalism (Dirlik 309). On the street of King's Way those advertisements of the products of multinational companies reflect the growing effect of late capitalism that endeavors to design a consumer culture. It indicates that Nepalese society is not out of the effects and changes brought by the cultural phenomena of postmodernism and late capitalism. Nowadays, technologies and products produced by multinational companies in foreign lands, electronic devices, information technologies, media culture and consumerism are becoming the integral parts of Nepalese socio-cultural lives. The electronic hoarding boards of advertisements of the products from foreign lands, advertisements of abroad study foreign employment and immigration, rapidly developing media culture in the society all are the evidences of the rapidly developing postmodern culture in Nepalese society that Upreti focuses the description of the King's Way.

The narrator meets Dilbarnath as organized by his friend Samsar. It was already evening so he goes with Dilbarnath talking and questioning while he is performing Pheri (a traditional cultural practice in Hinduism, especially in Nepal, in which a Jogi protects the corners of the houses from evil, spirit and demons by reciting the magical incantation and blowing the horn of spotted deer at night) (16-17). In the conversation Dilbernath complains that this year he is not successful in conducting good Pheri, so unable to protect the houses of Toudaha from evils, sprits, demons and diseases properly because his bag, with five openings in which he used to put the material needed for the Pheri performance, was taken away by the security personal in Lahan (16-17). Now he is working with the bag made by a local tailor of Taudaha which has unmanaged five opening and leakage (18). Dilbarnath complains that salt and turmeric powder, materials needed for conducting Pheri, are leaking, so

he is unable to conduct good Pheri and protect the direction and corners of the houses of Toudaha (18).

What surprises the narrator in his talk to Dilbernath is the awareness of growing chaos and anarchy in Nepalese socio-cultural realities which Dilbernath expresses. He narrates:

> "No, no! Chand, Nepal, Thapa, Koirala and Deuwa, no one could tie the corners of the nation", Dilbernath said, "spirit, evils and ghosts sufferin' from unsatisfied desires are wanderin' within the whole nation. Directions of the country have muddl'd. Diseases are enterin' the borders of country from all sides." (19)

It proves that Dilbernath is not an ordinary Jogi. He possesses a strong sense of political awareness and analytical power. He senses the changes occurring in the whole nation. According to him, some forces within the nation and from outside, are causing the changes which are marked by the chaos, anarchy, confusion and disorder. The political leaders and ministers, in his views, failed in their responsibility to protect the nation from evil forces and to establish order in the nation. Dilbernath does not name the forces directly but indirectly points towards the forces of postmodernism. His characterizations of the forces as evil and disease are similar to many critics who do not like postmodernism and its various theories. Habermas does not like postmodernism and condemns the postmodern theories. He argues that postmodernism tries to undermine the project of modernity, beliefs of the Enlightenment and ideas such as reason and progress (Newton 266). Similarly, Jameson also attacks postmodernism from a Marxist standpoint. Although Jameson finds values in many manifestations of the postmodern and like postmodern art and literature, he condemns social, cultural and political aspects of postmodernism as "the

cultural logic of late capitalism" (268). Dilbernath's view towards the forces that has

brought the changes in Nepalese society is also similar to Habermas and Jameson's

views. It indicates that Dilbernath possesses the awareness of postmodernism which

he implicitly expresses in his observation of Nepalese social, cultural and political

phenomena.

Basing upon the comprehension of the forces of postmodernism Dilbernath

foresees the major changes coming in the future of Nepalese societies. In the state of a

trance he utters some fragmented sentences. "Massacre in Royal Palace, collapse of

famous towers! Hare Shiva-Shiva! Restaurant and ministry. A mobile, a sack.

O'Gorakhnath, O' Shiva! Other more events… A mirror, a peak!" (20). The narrator

does not understand the utterances of Dilbernath. He only senses them as mysterious

prophecies of the events to come in his own life and in the future of Nepalese society.

Dilbernath's prophecies of the events of future indicates the changes which are about

to come in Nepalese society. Those changes, which later come true in the novel, mark

the shift of Nepalese societies to postmodern culture. The next chapter analyzes how

the changes and events foretold by Dilbernath characterize the postmodern condition

of Nepalese society in detail.

Dilbernath's mysterious prophecies make the narrator more impatient and

restless. He feels himself growing more crazy and mentally disturbed (Upreti 21).

After three days his friend and colleague, Bimba, comes in his house and reminds him

of the disappointment of the editor for his previous writing. Bimba suggests him to

visit Franz Ryner in Boudha. According to Bimba, Franz Ryner and his research of

the centers and flow of powers might be an appropriate subject for his next writing

(23-4). He suggests that Ryner measures the scattered centers and flows of powers in

valley and suggests people who are mentally disturbed and restless (24). The narrator

feels as if Bimba, too, is indicating towards his growing madness. He becomes eager to visit Ryner, and goes to Boudha (25).

German tourist and a researcher of the lines of power, Ryner, suggests the narrator that Kathmandu valley is full of metaphysical powers. He also suggests that horrible and incomprehensible powers are also flowing in the valley. According to Ryner, Kathmandu is in crisis due to those dreadful powers flowings (26). But Ryner complains that his instrument has failed to measure the currents of powers in Kathmandu Valley. In Europe and in America he was successful but now in Kathmandu he accepts his failure as his suggestions to common people had brought the opposite consequences (28). He suggests that the Kathmandu valley has turned into the maze and messy place where the powers, unable to be studied yet, are flowing incomprehensibly (29). Ryner warns that various lines of power are mixing with the boiling lava underground and there is possibility of dreadful explosion in the form of horrible earthquake (26). Ratna Park, Sundhara, Basantpur, Bagbazar and Kings Way are the centers of such incomprehensible powers that Ryner suggests (29).

Like Dilbernath, Ryner also points towards some invisible power and future consequences. Ryner also implicitly talks about effect of postmodernism and the future changes it is about to bring in Nepalese society. His suggestion of the centers of those chaotic forces gives a clue that indirectly he is talking about the chaotic forces of postmodernism. Those places, which Ryner takes as the centers of the unknown powers, are the major centers for politics, education, multinational business, and tourism. Here, the global flow of ideas, goods, images and people takes place. Ryner feels that those places are developing new culture which in turn going to change of the whole culture of Kathmandu. Although working in different fields Dilbernath and

Ryner reach in same conclusion that Nepalese society is going through

incomprehensible complexity and ambiguity, and heading towards new changes.

Pluralism, complexity and ambiguity are the characteristics of postmodernism.

They are the essentials for the new postmodern cultures. In this regard Tarnas argues:

> But if the postmodern mind has sometimes been prove to a dogmatic
>
> relativism and a compulsively fragmenting skepticism, and if the
>
> cultural ethos that has accompanied it has sometimes deteriorated into
>
> cynical detachment and spiritless pastiche, it is evident that the most
>
> significant characteristics of the larger postmodern intellectual
>
> situation its pluralism, complexity, and ambiguity are precisely the
>
> characteristics necessary for the potential emergence of a
>
> fundamentally new form of intellectual vision, one that might both
>
> preserve and transcend the current state of extraordinary
>
> differentiation. (144)

According to Tarnas pluralism, complexity and ambiguity are preliminaries of the

emergence of new postmodern culture. They are the most significant features of

postmodern intellectual situation out of which the fundamentally new postmodern

culture emerges. This new culture may be sometimes deteriorated into chaos and

anarchy. So, some people shun the new culture and its preliminary situations.

Dilbernath and Ryner sense the same complexity, ambiguity, and plurality rising in

Nepalese society and predict the future changes that would be marked by chaos,

anarchy and disorder. Here, it is to be remembered that the events analyzed above

takes place just before the Royal Palace Massacre and Mass Movement II in the time

setting of the novel. In the histories of the Nepalese society this period was

undergoing through the great confusion, complexity and ambiguities. Increasing

violence and bloodshed, Maoist war, failure of the government to conduct rule and law, failure of the political leaders in establishing order and stability in the notion, all had turned the whole nation into complexities and ambiguities. That myriad situation was indicating the arrival of some new changes in the whole nation, and some future events that would inaugurate the new epoch. Upreti reflects the consciousness of the historic past from the perspectives of Dilbernath and Ryner. So, Upreti dramatizes both historical situation and growing postmodern conscious of the Nepalese recent past in the episode of the narrator's visit to Dilbernath and Franz Ryner.

The narrator's mental health deteriorates. His forgetfulness, mental restlessness and impatience increase. His wife and friends become worried about his growing madness. He also becomes aware that the rumor of his madness is spreading everywhere rapidly (44). But the narrator realizes that he is not mad, he is only restless and impatient due to the growing violence, bloodshed and effects of the unknown flows of power as suggested by Dilbernath and Ryner. He confesses that he had felt the power directly many times while visiting Ghat (river bank where the cremation of the dead body of Hindu is performed), hills and jungles (44). Moreover, the word "Khoj" (search) written everywhere on the streets, walls, temples, houses, public places, etc. in Kathmandu ever striking his psychic and encourages him to search something. The narrator realizes that his growing restlessness, impatience and forgetfulness are the effects of those unknown flows of power and his friends, wife and others are failing to know the causes (44). Thus, he determines to set forth in the search of solution and medium that would solve all his problems at last (Upreti 44). He decides to run away from the house as his wife and friends plan to send him to Northern Asylum (46). Finally, he leaves the houses in a disguise of Jogi in order to search his own solution (54).

The journey and the search of the mentally disturbed narrator end along with his return from the mental hospital of the North. This time setting of the novel, as it is already explained, incorporates the time space between before the Royal Massacre and after few month of Mass Movement II. It is that period of Nepalese history during which major changes occurred in all domains of Nepalese life. The narrator observes all the changes and events of that period and explains them in the mode magic realism. As he is mentally disturbed and suffering from madness, he envisions different odd, strange and magical and images. Although his perceptions mix with the supernatural elements, they symbolically and logically represent the realistic events of Nepalese history of the recent past. The events like Royal Massacre and the political crisis aroused after the Massacre and before the Mass Movement II are symbolically expressed from the perspective of psychotic narrator.

The narrator reflects the people's growing dissatisfaction and disbelief against the old traditional hierarchical system of ruling when he comes to Kings Way. He envisions a strange and unbelievable tower in front of the Royal Palace and some people trying to destroy and some trying to defend. He explains:

> The uppermost part of the tower was seeming light blue on the background of sky whereas the lower part was seeming yellow, bathed in the light emitted from the lampposts. As if put in one above another the round and round rooms, that tower was raised and reached the zenith of sky with various floors. All rooms of that very tall tower were surrounded by wooden veranda. Tugs and competitions among the people standing in the veranda were visible from the street. They were trying to throw down each other on the street. (59)

This tower is the imagery of the hierarchical ruling system under the provision of the powerful Monarchy. It was in practice in Nepal in the recent past. The image of the tower reflects how the rulers were most powerful and common representatives of the people were less powerful. The people in the lower part represent the people's representatives and the people in the top represent the King and his favorite persons. The top is powerful and lower part is less powerful which have been indicated by the blue and yellow light respectively. Due to the hierarchical system its participants were involved in the tug and unhealthy competition to rise into the power. They even throw each other down on the street in order to climb themselves up. It was the system of Nepalese rule which the Nepalese society underwent in the past.

The narrator not only reflects the hierarchical system of the past but also reflects people's dissatisfactions, disbeliefs, and resistance against the oppressive system of the hierarchical tower. The leader of United Democratic Forum claims that it is the tower of oppression, treachery, conspiracy and corruption, so this tower should be destroyed (59-60). Some others, enjoying the power of the tower, were trying to protect the tower and they were persuading people that the tower is the symbol of the achievement of human civilization (60). This conflicting idea of the people regarding the protection and destruction of the tower reflect the socio-psychology of the peoples and their leaders of that phase of history. Some people were against the hierarchical ruling system and some were in support of it. Some regarded it as the source of all social injustice, inequality, oppression and exploitation of the common people. Some regarded it as the best system of the governance achieved by human civilization. Such conflicting ideas were in the psyche of peoples and their leaders regarding the Monarchy and its hierarchical system of ruling. Upreti artistically dramatizes that socio-psychology of the people from the perspectives of

the mentally disturbed narrator. Thus, even though the descriptions seems unreal, they reflect the realities of the Nepalese past and who possesses little sense of Nepalese recent past events and history, can understand the implication without any difficulty.

It is not only in the field of politics, the changes were emerging, but also in the whole socio-cultural domains. Nepalese society was slowly entering into the global culture and adopting the new dimensions of the cultural changes that were once strange for the traditional society. The narrator describes the street of King's Way which was decorated with the advertisements of Hero Honda, Mayalu Soap, Shikhar Cigerate and Tuborg Beer. He also describes the advertisement of going abroad in many countries (59). This motif of the colors of Kings Way persuades readers to consider the changes occurring in Nepalese society due to the concept of globalization, multinational capitalism, consumerism, electronic and media societies. It is already discussed in the beginning section of this chapter. Repetition of this motif suggests that along with the political changes Nepalese societies were going through also the social and cultural changes during the troublesome past of Nepalese recent history. And all these were leading the whole society towards new era. The magical destruction of the tower by an earthquake, in the novel, indicates the future changes that the narrator envisions.

Then the narrator enters the Royal Palace, finds the Massacre already taken place, and also finds the traces of various massacres taken place in the history of Royal Palace (69). He takes retreat in an old Pati (public rest house) on the bank of River Bishnumati (77). There he meets Mohandas and Maharaj who possesses different ideas of the God despite their same lives of the sagehood. He visits the places suggested by Ryner and finds Dilbernath's mysterious prophecies coming true in some unbelievable ways. Everywhere he goes, he finds the power functioning and

leading peoples and the whole society towards chaos and anarchy. From ministry to restaurant, street to Palace, daily life to myth he finds the power and its current flowing transforming everything into complexity, ambiguity, chaos, anarchy, confusion and madness. Found laying in Basantpur, his friend takes him to the mental hospital (172). In hospital he meets Ranganath and other mad peoples. He critically analyzes all the finding of his heroic quest and reaches in the conclusion that he is totally emptied with human emotions and feelings due to the powers and existential crisis (199). He tries to commit suicide but the doctors save him (213). He hallucinates his ego and finally comes to the normal condition and returns back home with his wife (247).

The ending of the novel takes place after few months of the success of Mass Movement II. In one way or in other the novel takes us to the troublesome past of Nepalese history which was marked by violence, bloodshed, chaos, anarchy, complexity, ambiguity, vagueness, confusion, disorder etc. Not only the narrator but the whole socio-psychology of the era was deeply disturbed by the events of that time. *Ghanachakkar* takes us to that myriad world of the past and invites to observe and analyzes each events of Nepalese society critically. In other word the novel reflects the socio-cultural realities of the recent past from the perspective of a mentally disturbed university teacher. This chapter ends here because the main objective of the chapter is only to illustrate that *Ghanachakkar* dramatizes the socio-cultural realities of the troublesome past of Nepalese history. It is unnecessary to analyze each and every event in order to show how they represents the realities, as it takes long time and more pages, even though the conclusion will be the same: *Ghanachakkar* reflects the socio-cultural realities of the contemporary Nepalese social, cultural, political, psychological, intellectual, etc. histories. This chapter works as the background upon

which the other two chapters are based. So, in the next chapter this study searches the issue of postmodernism and its various manifestations in Nepalese societies and for this purpose this chapter provide a solid base.

III. *Ghanachakkar*, Postmodernism and Madness

Ghanachakkar is the narrative of madness, great confusion that the narrator happens to entangle with. Previous chapter explained it and also gave little information that the narrator's growing madness had some relation with the chaotic power, as Ryner suggests and the paradigmatic changes that the power has brought in the whole Nepalese societies. In the chapter it is also discussed, although in less amount, that the power which Ryner and Dilbernath comprehend symbolizes the postmodernism and its various manifestation in all domains of Nepalese societies. Now this chapter analyzes what are the essential of postmodernism, how they turn the human societies towards the new era of indeterminacy, plurality, complexity, ambiguity, chaos and anarchy undermining the existing paradigms in the societies. It analyzes how postmodernism is functioning in Nepalese societies and how the novel *Ghanachakkar* dramatizes them. Finally, it also analyzes how the socio-psychology and individual's psychology are affected by the new paradigms brought by postmodernism.

As a rejection of the modern intellectual and philosophical practices based on the concepts such as objective truth, reality, knowledge, meaning and history postmodernism, as a "radical perspectivism" on those practices began especially in the Post War era (Tarnas 140). Tarnas argues that postmodernism regards knowledge and "all human understanding is interpretation, and no interpretation is final" (139). Such new concepts aroused disbelief in the existing culture that was based upon the modernist concept that human beings are rational and the whole world can be understood by the reason. Instead intellectual and philosophical practices turned towards the beliefs such as truth, reality, knowledge and individuals' identity are local, "situational, provisional, contingent and temporary, making no claim to

universality or stability" (Ghimire 3). Supported by the new concepts of the analysis of language by poststructuralist critics, Michel Foucault's genealogical investigation Derrida's deconstruction, into the social construction of knowledge, Nietzsche's analysis of the problematic relation of language to reality, Lacanian concept of self or subjectivity, and Cartesian critical intellect the whole western intellectual, philosophical and socio-cultural phenomena entered into the new era which is generally called postmodernism (Tarnas 141-42). Analyzing the above mentioned strands of postmodernism Tarnas defines:

> Postmodernism in this sense is "an antinomian movement that assumes a vast unmaking in the western mind… deconstruction, decentering, disappearance, dissemination, demystification, discontinuity, difference, dispersion, etc. Such terms … expresse an epistemological obsession with fragments or fractures, and a corresponding ideological commitment to minorities in politics, sex and language. To think well, to feel well, to act well, to read well, according to the episteme of unmaking, is to refuse the tyranny of wholes; tantalization in any human endeavor is potentially totalitarian." (143)

According to Tarnas postmodernism is the movement that releases people from any boundaries of earlier epistemological practices. The modern principles and theories of epistemology are totalizing and thus, tyrannical practices which postmodernism deconstructs and demystifies. In this sense postmodernism is a movement that rejects and unmakes the earlier intellectual and philosophical practices which were totalizing, tyrannical and center seeking.

Critics like Lyotard, Rorty, Baudrillard,and Danial Bell have theorized the concept of postmodernism in different domains of epistemological practices.

Postmodernism institutionalized in Western academia as a spirit of new era characterized by new culture of advance scientific technologies, multinational capitalism, raising of minorities, pluralism, complexity, ambiguity and indeterminacy. Both, as academic and as cultural phenomena, postmodernism has spread and flourished in different nations and cultures in different forms and in different practices. Universities become first place where the practice of postmodernism first appeared in various non-western nations like Nepal. It is the academic field where postmodernism is first introduced.

In Nepal postmodernism is first introduced in Universities courses like cultural studies, art and literature, philosophy, economics, history, etc. Upreti's novel *Ghanachakkar* also begins with the description of academic activities taking place in Tribhuwan University. In the beginning chapter it shows how postmodern principles are affecting the academic activities of the nation. Ranganath's dissatisfaction with failed result, warning to burn the department and demands to recheck the exam papers are purely guided by the postmodern spirits. His rejection of the failed result indicates the claim of subjective nature of truth and knowledge as he thinks his understandings about the issues are also valid as of the teachers. His threaten to burn the department indicates the desire to subvert and deconstruct the totalizing and tyrannical structure of University principles. It also indicates the rising of marginalized peoples against the dominating powers. His demand for the rechecking of the exam papers and his blames for the professors of being postmodern indicates the desire for new era which is open and all including. Thus, Ranganath appears to be a herald of postmodernism in the field of academia in *Ghanchakkar*.

Another event in the university happened between the narrator and his teacher-colleague Narayan Prasad, often called as Prasad Sir too indicates the growing

consciousness of the changes in the field of academia, art and literature. Prasad Sir, informs the narrator about the hearsay and rumors of his developing madness and crazy activities (10). Prasad Sir suggests him to abandon writing for the newspapers, wandering aimlessly in the forest, river banks and Ghats (9). Instead he suggests the narrator to write long and profound treaties, good work of literature, criticisms, that would heal his mental degradation (9-10). He suggests, "Do some profound work and within that search the center of life. Now you are wandering here and there due to the the lack of that center" (9). But the narrator rejects the blames of Prasad Sir although he cannot express and protect himself. He rejects the ideas of Prasad Sir. He narrates his feelings:

> I wanted to resist that the huge blame casted upon me in strong voice. I wanted to shout and make hear that these all are fake rumors, some people simply attempting to defame me. But constantly gazing eyes of my teacher suppressed me. As if those eyes are announcing some bitter but unalterable truths. How much I am fired within but words of resistance did not come upon my lips. Rather I remained dumb, looking constantly at Sir's face. (10)

Similar to the rebel of Ranganath, the postmodern awareness can be detected in the narrator's resistance too. His rejection of the blame, although it is unexpressed in front of Prasad Sir, rejects the notion of general truth expressed by the mass and god like figure, Prasad Sir. The narrator plainly states that Prasad Sir is the symbol of some unalterable truth. His face is always glown and covered by the strong and celestial light that had made his personality most impressible in the whole department (9). He is old, around sixty and loaded with the profound knowledge of truth.

There are some fundamental differences between the narrator and Prasad Sir. The narrator likes small and fragmented writings; he is liberal to the differences of ideas and the ways of living. Thus, he prefers writing in newspapers as a co-columnist of "Fact and Fiction" in the *New Kantipur Post*, sympathizes Ranganath misfortune, and wants to wander in forests, river banks and Ghats. But Prasad Sir demands rationality, centrality, order and harmony. He is totalitarian and suppressing differing ideas of the others. He always talks about the universality, centrality and objectivity of the truth and knowledge. Thus, he suggests the narrator to be rational and do work of profound meanings. He suggests improving the growing madness, writing long and profound treaties, conducting seminars, etc.

These differences between the ideas of the narrator and Prasad Sir directly link with the differences between world view of modernism and postmodernism. Modernism is, Hebermas claims, "formulated in the 18th century by the philosopher of the Enlightenment consistence in their efforts to develop objective science, universal morality and law, and autonomous art according to their inner logic" (280). The search foe objective and universal truth, meaning and knowledge, search for order and rationality are the defining feature of modernism. Prasad Sir's demands for the rational activities, order and harmony from the mentally disturbed narrator is the expression of the modernist world view that is still dominating in the mind of aged teacher. Thus, Prasad Sir symbolically stands for the trend of modernism and its world view which the majority of Nepalese scholars still hold.

Unlike Prasad Sir, the narrator is in the ambivalence of modernism and postmodernism. Neither he resists Prasad Sir, and his modern world views openly nor accepts them. Unlike Ranganath the narrator is still suffering from the legacy of modernism. There are many traits in the part of his life that indicates his postmodern

awareness and his adaption of the new world views. He morally accepts the demands of Ranganath as valid. He prefers to write small narratives of the unknown common people, he accepts that there might be mistakes in judging Ranganath's understandings. All these prove the narrator is silently adopting the postmodern world view which is open to all differences, pluralism, multiplicity and self-revising. This break in the perspective and choice of the narrator from his influential teacher indicates the break from modernism to postmodernism within the circle of intellectual and academicians. It indicates the raising awareness of postmodernism in the consciousness of the narrator.

However, this raising consciousness of postmodern world view is not without problems as it rejects the concept of "Archimedean point from which to judge whether a given perspective validly represents the 'Truth'" (Tarnas 142). It leads to the concept of centerlessness or to the concept of multiple centers rejecting the modernist view of "center" with capital "C". Such philosophical practices arises sometimes great confusion, chaos and anarchy in an individual's life and in the whole society. Tarnas claims:

> The other side of postmodern mind's openness and indeterminacy is thus the lack of any firm ground for a world view. Both inner and outer realities have become unfathomably ramified, multidimensional, malleable and unbounded-bringing a spur to courage and creativity, yet also a potentially debiliting anxiety in the face of unending relativism and existential finitude. (140)

The concept of centerlessness or multiple centers instantly opens the measureless opportunities in new creations of ideas. It also arises the disorder, confusion, chaos, anarchy and anxiety as it brings the indefinite and unending relativism of truth, and

limitedness in existential activities. In this regard Prasad Sir and Dilbernath are correct in diagnoisizing the narrator's mental state and the whole society's problems. Prasad Sir rightly claims that the narrator is lacking the center of life, and Dilbernath claims that the nation is lacking the perfect "Pheriman" of the nation who would bring order, harmony and stability protecting the whole nation from the "power" of chaos and anarchy. Ryner also suggests that the whole valley is occupied with multiple centers of powers which have been causing problems in the social lives of people. Although Prasad Sir, Dilbernath and Ryner acknowledge the changing pattern of Nepalese society and its various aspects, they do not support the new era of postmodernism. Prasad Sir demands the old principle of modernism; order, center, profoundness, long writings rationality from the narrator and dislikes his liberal ideas, madness, newspaper writing, and monopoly activities. Dilbernath desires for strong, powerful and perfect leader and minister. He dislikes the approaching events and changes from within and outside the nation as anarchic and chaotic. Ryner tries to apply the theory and methods to improve individuals' life and social condition, which he developed in another part of the world. He believes that his theories and methods were universally valid but fails in Nepal. He, likes Dilbernath, foretells the approaching events and changes and claims them to be disordered, chaotic, anarchic and ugly. All these characters represent the legacy of modern world views. They all possesses he negative views towards postmodernism, and regrets the lack of center.

Unlike them Ranganath and the narrator appear postmodernist. Ranganath accepts the centerlessness of his life and determines to change this in to his strength. He declares, "I have not fear of anyone because I have no any future…." (5). "Future" is the center of the students around which all his academic activities revolve. Ranganath plainly states that he has no future and no center. So, he feels himself free

to resist against the oppressions of the teachers. The narrator also rejects the principle of Prasad Sir and sympathizes Ranganath. He feels that "power", the power of postmodernism entering within his body and leading him towards new direction. He accepts the functioning of the power and his madness. He claims:

> No, probably the time is mad. Whatever happening, I am not the main character of that plot. There are others in the center of this unending plot. Probably the chronicles of history are themselves becoming uncontrolled. Probably the centers are themselves decaying and structures are breaking and the whole society autonomously heading towards madness. (6)

The narrator observes the centerlessness of the events and history. He conceives the madness engulfing the whole human history and society. His madness is only a part of this vast plot of madness. So, he accepts his madness and centerlessness of the whole social activities. It leads him towards postmodern consciousness. Thus, the narrator and Ranganath represent the postmodern consciousness with their resistance against the totalitarian and tyrannical system of the university, and Prasad Sir, and acceptance of the plurality of differences and ideas.

Another important feature of postmodernism *Ghanachakkar* reflects is the idea of small narratives and rejection of "grand narrative." Various events and characters in the novel reject the grand narrative and prefer the small narratives instead. Some characters who represent the modernist world views tries to protect the grand narratives against the sever attacks of postmodern views of small narratives and plurality. As a theoretical and intellectual break postmodernism rejects and undermines the rational, objective, universal and eternal nature of truth. It also rejects the binarism that modernist created between two different ideas, belief, race, culture

and civilization, etc. Such binarism, postmodernist claim, is the constructed principles practiced to suppress certain ideas, beliefs, culture, race and civilization in order to empower certain groups, nations, race and civilization. As the binarism is created one it does not contain any factual, objective and universal truth. Modernism practiced the binarity in order to rationalize and progress the society suppressing the ideas which appear against the project. To create the binarity modernism created many grand narratives. Lyotard argues that "grand narratives" or "master narratives" are the stories a culture tells itself about its practices and beliefs (Ghimire 2). According to Lyotard grand narrative does not contain any factual truth and they are created only to suppress certain ideas, beliefs, race and culture in the name of establishing order and harmony. It masks its createdness, fakeness and the contradictions inherited within itself. Postmodernism rejects such grand narratives and prefers for "mini narratives" which are situational, provisional, contingent and temporary. Postmodernists claim that truth and knowledge are created with the constant interaction between and among different situations and ideas. They are temporal, spatial and relative. Postmodern mini-narratives indicate and reflect such nature of truth and knowledge. Thus, the rejection of grand narrative and preference for small narratives are the defining feature of postmodern intellectual, cultural and political practices. In other words rejection of the grand narrative carries the postmodern consciousness.

Ghanachakkar dramatizes the transitional phase of Nepalese society from modernism to postmodernism. So, it contains both the legacy of modernist grand narratives and postmodernist rejection of the grand narrative. Prasad Sir's demands for the writing which is profound, meaningful and center creating treaties are the part of modernist grand narrative that advocates the rationality, order and harmony. He creates a binary between newspaper column writing and profound treaties. He dislikes

the former and favors the later. In this sense Prasad Sir favors the grand narratives and practices the binarism. Unlike Prasad Sir the narrator prefers short writings that would bring many excluded life experiences of the common peoples. He expresses:

> While writing column in newspaper, usually, I like to write about unknown common peoples. I like to dig out their individual history and life experiences. Watch shopkeeper of Purano Baneswor, Raju and Arjun lama, maker of the medicine 'Himali Malam' that can treat all diseases, Ramman Dai, Nepali magician, Kamal, who lives in Shankhamul , woodcutter of Jhapa, Sanishchar, Natwar Tharu, and postman Kale (Jitendra) Dhakal, and likes are some of my live and real characters. (12)

This excerpt reveals the narrator's desires of the writings that bring the minor people, their individual histories and life experiences into the light. It undermines the demand of profound writing of high modernist art and culture made by Prasad Sir. The narrator is more interested in the lives of those who are unknown, marginalized and outside of mainstream culture. He wants to know their life experiences and perspectives on life which are more subjective, individualistic and incompatible in the rationalistic writing of modernism. This preference for the writing about common people and on common issues in the newspaper column reflects the narrator's preferences to mini-narratives. He rejects the demand to follow and create the grand narrative. At the same time he subverts the binary existing between profound writing and minor writings choosing the common people and their experiences as his subject matter.

Rejection of the modernist grand narratives and the failure of such grand narratives to establish order in the society are also expressed in the narrator's following expression. He doubts:

> Political leaders were failing to protect all by blowing the long-horn of the nation. What was the cause of all these? What our political, administrative, economic and social system have turned into mean and useless object like Dilbernath's cumin-powder and salt leaking five-opening bag? Is that the cause of failure in conducting good Pheri of the nation? (22)

Regarding the failures of all political leaders and ministers to lead the nation in the path of progress and integrity, the narrator casts doubts upon the whole system themselves. He questions the grand narratives of national political, administrative, economic and social systems. According to him the fault or error lies in the grand narratives of the national systems themselves. Those systems have turned into mean and useless object. The grand narratives of the whole system, he compares with the leaking bag of Dilbernath. It indicates that the narrators doubts the whole systems based on the grand narratives such as constitutional monarchy, powerful hierarchical administration, liberal economic system, concept of welfare nation and societies, capitalism, etc. The narrator feels the need to reject such grand narratives and think of alternatives.

The motif of the rejection of grand narratives is also evident in the episode of Kings Way event where the narrator envisions the tall tower and its destruction. The people from the top of the tower requests people to save the tower from destruction. He says that the tower is the symbol of the human achievement of the creative power and hard labor (60). It is already discussed that the tower is the symbol of modernist

hierarchical system of ruling and administration. It is also the symbol of grand

narrative of the modernist hierarchical system and principle of ruling. But those who

are aware of the suppression, exploitation and corruption of the tower or the grand

narratives reject the existence of the tower and attempt to destroy it. They say, ". . .

now, we all together, let us develop the new culture of small houses and apartments.

A new system which will replace the decrepit culture of tall expensive towers" (61).

This expression of ideas clearly marks the break from grand narrative to mini-

narrative. Postmodernist think the grand narrative is the source of all oppression,

exploitation, inequality, social injustices and corruption existing in the society. As it is

discussed earlier, a grand narrative is constructed to impose order in the society. For

this purpose it demands the creation of equal amount of disorder. Then first function

of the grand narrative is to create binary oppositions. It gives power to the order and

represses disorder. In such practices repression, suppression, exploitation, corruption

and social injustice find their first base in the society. Postmodernism unveils these

hidden aspects of the grand narrative and rejects them. Instead they prefer mini-

narratives which are evident in the peoples' desire to start new culture of "small

houses and apartments."

Another motif of the end of grand narrative is found in the episode of magic

mirror. The mirror which would reflect the person's hidden images was put outside

the gate of Royal Palace in order to select the new priminister who possesses clean

image. Historically it reflects the Palace invitation for the vacant priminister post from

those candidates who possessed clean images. Everyone would have to prove his

clean image for the post of priministership. The Palace had created certain grand

narrative that would judge the image of candidates. This grand narrative is

symbolized by the magic mirror in the novel (93). Everyone fails to prove his clean

images in front of the mirror as it reflected all their hidden images in the form of different animals (95). But when a candidate with clean image goes in front of the mirror it breaks in to pieces (96). People start debating about the event of mirror breaking. Some opine that it is all happening according to the "grand design" which is functioning both inside and outside the Palace. Some claim that the mirror broke because it could not bear the clean image their perfect leader (96). Whatever the peoples' opinions but the event indicates the end of the practices of judging people's image by the creation of certain principles and theories. It indicates that any principle or theory cannot judge all aspect of an individual's life. Such touch-stone of the principle and theory are made to serve the motive of its creators. The mirror is thus known as "The Mirror of Treachery" which tricks common people in order to fulfill the desire of its creators. Thus, the breaking of the mirror into small pieces indicates the end of grand narrative and the beginning of mini-narratives.

From the analysis till now it is evident that *Ghanachakkar* reflects and dramatizes the rejection of grand narrative in various fields of socio-cultural, political, administrative, economic, intellectual and philosophical activities. The novel also dramatizes how the whole Nepalese culture is shifting from grand narrative to mini-narratives; from modernism to postmodernism. This shift has brought many changes in Nepalese socio-cultural activities. People, now days, are raising their voices for the safe guarantee of their rights and places in the new constitution. Marginalized, woman, disable, indigenous, ethnic and subaltern are forming their organizations and demanding their right in the constitution; the success of the Mass Movement II which put an end of the centuries old centralized King's rule and ended the grand narrative of monarchy has opened the way for new decentralized federal system. All these prove that the whole nation is proceeding towards new era of mini-narratives and

multiple centers. *Ghanachakkar* artistically dramatizes these issues as observed from a mentally disturbed intellectual, a universality teacher of cultural studies.

Apart from the above mentioned issues the novel also dramatizes the negative effects such as chaos, anarchy, disorder, madness, confusion, etc. of resulted from the shift of modernism to postmodernism. For modernism always functions according to the principles of reason, order, harmony, powerful center to govern, and universality of truth and knowledge which are strongly backed up by grand narratives. And when the rejection of the grand narratives arises, generally, there also arises great confusion, chaos, anarchy, disorder and madness as the center looses power to govern and established order among the part in peripheries. *Ghanachakkar* reflects and dramatizes such consequences appearing in the contemporary Nepalese socio-cultural, political and psychologies of the individuals.

Rejecting the concept of objective reality as advocated by the modernist, postmodernists endeavor to demonstrate the subjectivity, temporality, plurality and provisionality of the reality. Tarnas claims, "The postmodern paradigm is by its nature fundamentally subversive of all paradigms, for at its core is the awareness of reality as being at once multiple, local and temporal and without demonstrable foundation" (143). According to Tarnas postmodernism is the awareness about the subjectivity, plurality, spatio-temporal nature of the reality and the truth. The truth and reality cannot be demonstrated as an objective fact due to their multiple manifestations in different time and space. The narrator also reaches in this conclusion. Once he writes an article in the *Shantipur* which deals with the issue of fact and fantasy as the complementary two parts of a same coin (122). The article also points towards the plurality and heterogeneity of truths and realities. It reads:

....Soon it was cleared fact or truth were multiple instead of one.

Conflict were continuing amount those various truths. Poor and rich,

living in bungalow and living in cottage, studied and unstudied

individuals were assimilating different-different truths. Different kinds

of peoples were worshipping the god of fact in different ways. (121)

This postmodern concept of multiple truths and realities are spreading in the Nepalese societies. Nowadays people are creating and living their own realities and truth which are different from others. The narrator is living a life of great social critic and historian of the transitional phase of himself. All he perceives and internalizes the events or societies are realities and facts for himself. The same narrator is living the life of madness who fails to distinguish between fact and fantasy, reality and imagination in the eyes of others. It indicates the validity of postmodern concept of plural, heterogeneous and multiple truths and reality.

Another important concept of postmodernism regarding the center and ultimate truth is that there does not exist such extra historical center or truth (Tarnas). There is not any center rather centers everywhere and in those centers there does not exist 'truth', rather emptiness and hollowness. The metamorphosis of the new leader into a big round onion indicates this postmodern concept of emptiness of truth and meaning. The new leader whom the peoples have expected to be the truth and solution of all existing crisis turns into an onion (159). The leaders of the political parties opine that within the layers of onion there might be the truth, meaning which would solve all crisis and problems (161). But everyone knows within the layers of an onion there exists nothing but only emptiness and void. By this imagery of onion Upreti satires the political leaders who always seek solution meaning from their political theories, principles and philosophies which are no more than the onion-emptiness at

the center. Thus, the imagery of the onion symbolizes the postmodern concept of the lack of center, 'Truth' and also satirizes the practices of searching them.

Such the pradigmatic changes which reject the concept of grand narrative, singularity and universality of "Truth", objectivity of reality, existence of "Center", fixity of meaning, distinction between fact and fantasy, etc. lead the whole society not only to the positive changes but also to the negative impact in the whole societies. *Ghanachakkar* present the picture of that transitional phase of Nepalese history which is myriad by mixture of both modern and postmodern consciousness. On the one hand it dramatizes the modernism as still functioning in the mind of some characters on the other hand it also dramatizes the crisis brought in the whole societies by the postmodernism. The novel reflects the problem and crises of leadership, central governing power, chaos, anarchy, disorder and the disturbed mentality of the individuals. The narrator's madness or disturbed psychology itself is the best example of how the postmodernism may lead the whole society towards madness if not properly assimilated its various principles. As it is already stated that the narrator suffers the ambivalence between modernism and postmodernism taking this route the novel can be understood as how it provides a critique on postmodernism and its various manifestations.

The narrator's madness is the reflection of how the chaotic principles of postmodernism leads individual towards mental disorder. Split between rational and irrational movements of modernism and postmodernism he fails to distinguish between what is fact and what is fantasy. On the one hand he rejects modernist principles and demands as suggested by Prasad Sir, and on the other hand he sets forth in the journey to fond certain truth and understanding. It seems that he is adopting postmodern paradigms letting himself to be drifted by the power that leads him

towards more and more confusion and madness. It is natural for him to be mad because he surrenders himself to the power which denies rationality, grand narrative, center, truth and objective reality. In the lack of such essentials an individual fails to distinguish between fact and fantasy, reality and imagination. The power, power of postmodernism as it is discussed earlier, does not see any difference between reality and imagination. So, it is common for the narrator to fail in judging and distinguishing the differences between reality and imagination.

As postmodernism ends the tyranny of grand narrative, powerful center, universal truth and fixity of meaning, various personal small narratives, centers, truths and meanings get chance to arouse. People are freed to create their own perception of the reality and to incorporate themselves in that perceptions. Tarnas argues:

> In growing numbers, individuals have felt not only compelled but free to work out of themselves, their relationship to the ultimate conditions of human existence, drawing on a far wider range of spiritual resources to do so. The postmodern collapse of meaning has thus been countered by an emerging awareness of the individual's self-responsibility and capacity for creative innovation and self-transformation in his or her existential and spiritual response to life. (145)

Individuals are not only compelled to abandon the concepts of eternal truth, objective reality and fixed center but also freed to create their own instead. For this postmodernism provides them with the vast spiritual resources which are primarily subjective and bounded by spatio-temporal limitations. Now they can create their own self-responsibility towards life and they can transform themselves to the existential and spiritual response created by themselves.

The narrator also creates his own perspective on human life, on the nature of fact and fantasy, on reality and imagination, on the nature of truth in his various articles he writes for the newspaper. He transforms himself into the self-created by those perspectives in return. In the articles, read to him by Bimba and others in the restaurant which was written by himself, he finds himself and his self. He narrates:

> 'Perhaps, caught within the world of my own writings, I am growing
> more and more mad' I thought frighteningly, 'probably, the writings
> which I had written with fantasy are creating own types reality.
> Probably, I am growing more and more mad as claimed by others,
> falling in the labyrinth of that mixture of imagination and reality. (123)

It proves that the main cause of the narrator's madness is the collapse of center where lies dominating power of rationality. He accepts that the world which he had created with the mixture of fact and fantasy is now creating another type of reality and his own subjectivity. It is not only the psychology of the narrator but, as Tarnas claims, also of the all individuals who accepts the postmodern concept of the end of the practices of central truth and meaning. Nepalese society, which has been institutionalizing the postmodern paradigms, is also producing the individuals like the narrator in huge scale. Nowadays people are bargaining for their own types of truth, reality, knowledge and center in different domains of socio-cultural activities. From rationalistic perspective it all seems to be the madness of the transitional phase itself. Thus, the madness of the narrator reflects and represents the madness of the time itself which is contaminated by the postmodern paradigms. In other words the madness of the narrator represents the growing chaos, anarchy, illusion and disorder of the transitional era itself.

The narrator's madness reflects the irrational activities of the people since long history. He remembers the irrational activities of the famous historical figures and finds the collection of the narratives of madness in the library of new ministry in Sundhara (138). That ministry which was established to solve all the crisis of the nation was keeping the huge collection of the writings on madness. It surprises the narrator. He asks:

> But what this part, filled with the works on madness, does not raise question upon the legitimacy of this ministry? If the goal was to search the complete knowledge then what was the relevance of collecting all the novels, plays, stories, poems and narratives written on madness and putting them in a single section of the cupboard? What isn't madness that mental state which deconstructs all the strong and united centers of knowledge and meanings? Separates into pieces all the organized rules, sub-rules and drafts, and scatters everywhere? (139)

Madness is found everywhere by the narrator. Even in the new ministry established for finding that knowledge which would solve all the existing crisis and problems, he finds the huge corpus of writing on the madness. He realizes that the ministry itself is under the power of madness. What is important here is that the narrator's characterization of madness is similar to the characteristic of postmodernism. He regards madness as the mental state which deconstructs and subverts all the centers and organizations of the knowledge and meaning and scatters them everywhere in fragments. He regards madness itself as a power which undermines the corpus of knowledge and meaning based on reason.

In the ministry he finds a page with the title "Ghanachakkar". He takes the writing and reads at night in the Pati of Bishnumati River Bank (139-48). In the page

he finds the definition and description of the various dimension of "Ghanachakkar." It defines "Ghanachakkar" as the construction of various small unsolvable mysterious in the human life (144). Due to the power struggle, psychology of lackness, existential pangs and search for materialistic comfort and their inner interrelationship "Ghanachakkar" is formed in an individual's life (144-8). The description of the political dimension of "Ghanachakkar" reflects Foucauldian concepts of power and discourse. It regards that human life is not out of the network of power struggle (144). The description of psychological dimension reflects the Lacanian psychoanalysis of lack and gaps. It regards that at the center of human psychology there exist a huge, unfillable hole of lack and people always tries to fill that whole doing and gaining different things but the hole remains always unfilled (145). Similarly, the description of its existential dimension reflects the Camus and Beckett's notion of absurdity. It regards the human existence is absurd due to the awareness of final death and decay that leads towards nothing, non-existence. People try to avoid the sense and fear of death applying different means and methods. But all the attempts fails in front of death and the people's attempts becomes absurd (146). Finally, the description of material aspect reflects the late capitalists' notion of work and rest. As the capitalism defined the labor in relation to the units of time people are compelled to work more in order to gain more. They also need rest. So, peoples are caught in the search of work and rest that finally becomes the defining features of their all activities (146-48). There is the constant interaction and interrelationship among these four dimensions of the "Ghanachakkar" in an individual's life. They all together determine the whole activities of the individuals (148).

It is clear that the concept of "Ghanachakkar" itself is the concept of postmodernism, and the concept of madness is the concept of "Ghanachakkar" and

postmodernism. They are all the same phenomena. The narrator finally finds the knowledge in the ministry which symbolizes the knowledge of postmodernism. Although he regards the knowledge in the page useless and throws it after reading, it is the final gain of his search, his great heroic journey. The importance of the knowledge in that page is also indicated by the words of the watchman of the new ministry. He blames the narrator of stealing most important document from the ministry (165). It symbolizes that the knowledge of postmodernism is most important gain and possession of the ministry. With the knowledge of "Ghanachakkar" and discourses on madness the new ministry appears to be institutionalizing postmodernism in Nepalese societies. Thus, the novel reflects and dramatizes the postmodern consciousness by its theme of madness and "Ghanachakkar."

The novel does not end here. Although the narrator finds the great knowledge in his search, his madness increases to the climax. In the mental hospital he analyzes all events of his life that leads his to the conception of meaninglessness, absurdity and worthlessness of human life which undermine the eternal, central and objective definitions of human life and demonstrates the temporality of human emotions, feelings and passions of life. He tries to commit suicide (199). This final section of the novel illustrates the negative aspect of postmodernism is its climax. When there is no center of life, no truth and no meaning existence becomes absurd. In such condition people drives to end the empty existence. By putting the narrator in front of suicide, Upreti critiques on the concept of postmodernism. He shows how the surrendering completely to the anarchic and chaotic forces of postmodernism leads individual towards madness, loss of identity, existential pangs, senselessness, emotionlessness, feelinglessness, and finally to the tragic end. The narrator recovers as he regains the sense of his lost identity which symbolizes Upreti's critical position

on postmodern debates. Upreti's critical position is clear in the following expression of the narrator:

> Although the wheel of Ghsnachakkar runs with however speed, although the wheels of tyranny, suppression, scarcity, agitation reemerge time and again, although the madness increase, the rulers can never suppress the voice of people forever', I thought , 'How much big the tower of tyranny, the rebellion raised from villagers, cities, woods, bazaars, and everywhere can hew down one day. That's why whatever there is, whatever traps peoples are caught in, people should at least struggle. Should try to distinguish which is fantasy, which is truth, which is plot, which is fact, which is illusion, which is reality, which is fiction, which is self-expression, etc. If not the roots of Ghanachakkar increase and spread more and more. Sorrow and madness continue to grow more. (233)

This expression of the narrator after his recovery to normalcy presents his critical position about the postmodernism. He regards postmodernism as the expression of the changes brought by the great wheel of time which has both good and bad aspects. As a good aspect it destroys the tyranny of rulers, brings awareness of rights in people, ends the suppression, exploitation and social injustices, etc. But if completely surrendered to this power of "Ghanachakkar", one fails to distinguish between reality and imagination, truth and fantasy, etc. that increases sorrows, madness, worries, restless, etc. Thus, he advises to keep struggling against the situation and crisis distinguishing fact and fantasy, reality and imagination, truth and illusion, etc.

With this understanding the narrator returns back home with his wife in a car. Along with the acquisition of the knowledge of "Ghanachakkar", his perspective on

human life and world gets changed. Although he determines to be rational in order to struggle the chaos, anarchy, disorder and confusion, he does not completely rejects the postmodern concepts of the unreality of the reality. Tarnas claims, "Imagination is no longer conceived as simplistically opposed to perception and reason are recognized as being always informed by the imagination" (147). The narrator also sees the reality and the perception of reality as guided by imagination. His final perception of the reality, thus, he expresses as:

> I saw the image of house in the side mirror of the car. In the mirror flower basing painted red appeared. Bushes were curtailed. Garret of the house came entering in the mirror. I remembered the scattered puppets, boat, marble, etc. on the floor of the garret. The world of fiction seemed in the mirror. (247)

The narrator perceives the reality as "the world of fiction" which is dominated and characterized by imagination, fantasy and illusion. This new perspective on reality reflects the narrator's awareness and understanding of the reality as another part of imagination. It proves his postmodern awareness which he gained during his heroic journey in the *Khoj* of great knowledge.

From the analysis till now it is evident that the novel endeavors to reflect and dramatize the postmodern awareness dealing with the various issues of contemporary Nepalese society. The novel deals with the concept of the end of grand narrative in relation with the major political changes brought by Mass Movement II and postmodern intellectual and philosophical practices in the circle of Nepalese intellectuals. The novel also dramatizes the chaos, anarchy, illusion and disorder appearing in the whole Nepalese society from the radical perspectivism of postmodernism with the issues of narrator's madness and disturbed socio-psychology

of the transitional phase. The novel artistically and logically proves the similarly among postmodern paradigms, madness and "Ghanachakkar" which provide Upreti's critical position in the debate of whether postmodernism is right or wrong. Thus, the novel can be logically taken as the expression of postmodern consciousness in the context of Nepalese social, cultural, political and socio-psychological phenomena of the transitional era.

IV. Postmodern Narrative Techniques in *Ghanachakkar*

After the World War II (1939-45) the "Western morale of the first war were extremely exacerbated by the experience of Nazi totalitarianism and mass extermination, threat of total destruction by the atomic bomb, the progressive devastation of the natural environment, and the ominous fact of overpopulation" (Abrams 176). It brought the new theme of writing art and literature which overthrew the modernist theme and concept of "high art". Postmodern art and literature endeavor to demonstrate the underlying "abyss" or " void" or "nothingness" to reveal the meaninglessness of existence, play of conflicting indeterminacies to subvert the foundation of language, and undertake to show that all forms of cultural discourse are manifestation of the reigning ideologies or of the relations and constructions of power, in contemporary society (Abrams 176-7). For this postmodernist use the new style in writings, reuse the old literary techniques with new motives, and sometimes carried the counter traditional experimentalism of modernism to an extreme. As a result absurdity, chaos, anarchy, disorder, meaningless, lackness of the truth and center, etc. became the main theme of writing and the genre breaking, genre mixing, parody, metafiction, multiple perspectives, magic realism, irony, playfulness, black humor, pastiche, temporal distortion, techno-cultural and hyper reality, hyper-textuality, paronia, open-endedness, etc. became the dominating techniques in writings.

As a postmodern literary work *Ghanachakkar* deals with the theme of chaos, anarchy, absurdity, meaninglessness, end of grand narrative, mass culture characterized by electronic culture and media culture, etc. which is analyzed in the previous chapters. The novel also embodies the postmodern narrative techniques like, historiography metafiction, parody, irony, magic realism and hyper textuality whose

discussion is the main focus of this chapter. It proves that even the narrative techniques themselves carry the postmodern awareness of Upreti's text on its aesthetic level.

"Historiographic metafiction" is the term coined by Linda Huntchen in *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction* to refer to works that fictionalizes actual historical events or figures. *Ghanachakkar* speculates the troublesome history of the recent Nepalese past from the perspective of a university teacher. It begins with memory of the narrator of the events before few months of the Royal Palace Massacre and lasts after few months of the Mass Movement II. The narrator restages the events of this phase from his own personal perspectives and experiences as he himself was being caught up in the various events of this particular phase of history. Unlike the historical texts, the narrator's account of the events and figures of that particular phase of history are colored with the personal taste and experiences of the mentally disturbed narrator.

In the novel the narrator re-accounts the historical events, such as peoples' dissatisfaction and raising against the monarchy, and the whole socio-political systems, Royal Massacre, the changes appearing in the intellectual and socio-cultural phenomena, and the Mass Movement II as they were experienced by himself. His accounts of the events of Royal Palace and peoples' different perspectives of the event, for example, reflects the general views of the peoples which is different from the accounts of history texts. The narrator narrates:

> "Being mad after failing to marry the girl whom he wanted, the prince
> shoot all the family members at once", a voiced echoed. "That beloved
> of the Prince was no more than a small means of the huge conspiracy",
> others were saying. "Hiding rebellions who blasts the bombs, chief of

armies, new King, and rich and big nations of the world jointly have

started the grand conspiracy. The Narayanhiti Royal Massacre is only a

small part of it." (71)

This account of the peoples' personal perspectives of the event contradicts and

somewhere undermines the account recorded in official history texts. The history text

does not include the peoples' personal experiences and perspectives on the events of

history. *Ghanachakkar* reflects and accounts such experiences and perspectives which

have been ignored in many history texts of the period. The novel does not only thus

represent the history but also sets an enigma as to show how exactly we know history.

The novel re-accounts the events from history, but with significant variations.

Anirudra Thapa argues that history "cannot be recalled without the

consequence of being caught up in it" (15). Historiography provides with an

opportunity to the writers to relive the history again in order to know the past and its

meaning at present which are deprived by the "historical truth" of the history texts. In

this regards Thapa argues:

> The narrative's refusal to engage with the "historical truth" strips
>
> history off its teleology, rendering it into something to be performed,
>
> improvised, and passed on. It is the narrative performance that makes
>
> the past relevant to the present as it destabilizes the constitutive
>
> function of language. The "human intension in history", to quote
>
> Miller's telling phrase, manifests itself not so much in our
>
> understanding the past but in reliving the past and its meaning and
>
> consequences through an endless sequence of narrative performance.
>
> (17)

According to Thapa narratives of the historical events in fiction undermines the claims of objective historical truths of the history texts. Such historical texts employ the constitutive function of language as claimed by J.L. Austin whereas the historiography or narrative employs the performative function of language which Miller terms "Fiction's Performative." Peoples are interested in history not because of the intensity to know the truth but to relieve the past at present and this is made possible only by the performative function of the language and in return by the historiography. Analyzing the concepts of "constitutive function" of language as forwarded by J.L. Austin and the definition of "performance" by Richard Schechner as "restored behavior" or the "twice behaved behavior" in relation to history and historiography respectively, Thapa claims, "[H]istory as a cultural product becomes a "twice behaved behavior" and historiography, through performative narrative, further produces meta commentaries on history and in turn becomes the history itself" (19).

Ghanachakkar is the "twice behaved behavior" of the transitional past of the history by the narrator. His reliving of the past has reflected the history as he had once experienced them. In such account of the history there he provides many meta-countries on the history as he provides different perspectives on the event and of different peoples including his own. In this regard the novel can be taken as historiography of the Nepalese recent past.

Parody is another important feature of Upreti's writing. Ghanachakkar parodizes the motif of heroic adventure expressed in various myths and heroic adventure fictions. Following the structure of monomyth; departure, initiation and return of the hero, it makes parody of the great heroic myth like the heroic journey of Aeneas in Virgil's Aenied, of the Odeyssey in Homer's Oddessy, of Robinson Crusoe in Denial Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, of Kim in Rudyard Kipling's Kim, etc. As in the

myth of heroic journey and quest, the narrator follows the pattern of monomyth. He goes in adventure with great motive, crosses the road of trails and gets atonement with the father, the universal soul, and first refuses to return, as he tries to kill himself, then finally returns becoming the master of two worlds and obtaining the freedom to life.

The novel parodies such heroic journey putting the mentally disturbed narrator in the role of great heroes. The novel also challenges the notion of heroic myth and heroic journey which turn the parody it makes into postmodern parody. Hutcheon claims, "parody is a perfect postmodern form, in some senses, for it paradoxically both incorporates and challenges that which it parodise" (11). *Ghanachakkar* also paradoxically incorporate the myth of heroic journey and also challenges its many concepts. The novel challenges the mythic concept of "atonement with the father" and "ultimate boon" that hero finally gets in his journey. Joseph Campbell in his book *A Hero with the Thousand Faces* formulates that the hero crossing the adventures and road of the trails finally reach the universal father image, the universal soul and get atonement with that image or soul. Then the hero gets apotheosis and the life giving boon. But the narrator ultimately reaches in front of the great emptiness and void instead of any divinity as expected in the heroic myth. He confronts the great existential crisis instead of getting apotheosis and ultimate boon of life. It certainly parodiese the myth of heroic journey expressed in various myth of the world. Thus, the novel incorporates and challenges the heroic myth paradoxically.

Use of the magic realism is another postmodern technique Upreti uses in *Ghanachakkar*. It is the shifting pattern to represent realism in postmodern writings. In this technique "a sharply etched realism in presenting ordinary events and details together with fantastic and dreamlike elements, as well as with materials derived from myth and fairy tales" (Abrams 203). Sanjeev Upreti in his *Siddantaka Kura* writes,

"According this form (magic realism) unbelievable magical event surprisingly mixes with the "factual" events of "reality" (198). In *Ghanachakkar* various events seem unbelievable. For example the narrator envisions or hallucinates the tall tower in front of Royal Palace. He observes many people involved in the tug of power and trying to rise above in the powerful position in the tower (57-60). Latter the tower falls and turns into the small pieces of papers (62). This event seems extremely strange and unbelievable. Similarly, he observes the new leaders metamorphosing into a big onion in Basantpur which is also magical or supernatural. Although such events abundant in the novel strange and unbelievable they give the sense of real events of the reality. The changes in the political system and overthrow of the monarchy logically resemble with the destruction of the tower. The failure of the leaders to serve the nation and its people, transforming themselves into senseless corrupted and selfish person, resemble with the leader changing into an onion.

Such presentation of the reality in mixture with unreal elements undermines the high modernist concept of naive realism. The logic behind magic realism is that reality is not objective and made up of the elements which can be comprehended objectively. Rather reality consist many unknowable elements and individual's imaginations. In order to present such notion of the reality in painting and fictions the concept of magic realism is successfully applied by postmodernist writers like Jorge Borger, Garbial Gracia marquez, John Fowles, Italo Calvino, and Salman Rushdie in their works. Upreti in *Ghanachakkar* also successfully experiments with the technique to reflect the mired reality of transitional past.

Another most important postmodern technique Upreti uses in *Ghanachakkar* is the hypertext. The term was coined in 1960s, but latter was applied specifically to texts on a computer, in which browsers and hyperlinks enable the reader to move

instantly from one document to another. Later postmodernist writers use the technique in order to make their writings non-sequential and open ended. Abrams defines:

> Hypertext designates a non-sequential kind of text, achieved by embedding within it a number of links and references to other texts; the result is to make the experience of reading the hypertext nonlinear, open and variable. That is, the reader of the hypertext, instead of reading along a single verbal line, is free to branch off into other text at will. (128)

According to Abrams a hypertext is characterized by non-sequential kind of writing within which number of references and links to other texts are abundant. Such texts are always open-ended, nonlinear and variable in themes. Readers may go outside the text following the links and references in the hypertext. All these make a hypertext different from the traditional text which dwells upon the concept of text as a verbal artifact and autonomous entity. A hypertext demands to know other texts and references at the same time in order to know the text. Sometimes, such references may come undercutting the meaning and logic of the main text and create the playfulness of the meaning.

When Jameson called postmodernism the "cultural logic of late capitalism" it also signifies towards the latest phase of capitalism. By 'late capitalism' it should be understood that the society has moved past the industrial age and entered into the information age. In this regard the reality is determined and shaped by the information network which is shaping the mode of perception in postmodern era. The postmodern text thus tries to reflect such mired reality of information age with the help of hypertext. Similarly, Baudrillard claimed postmodernity as defined by a shift into hypereality in which simulations have replaced the real. In postmodernity people are

inundated with information, technology has become a central focus in many lives, and our understanding of the real is mediated by simulations of the real. The concept of hypertext is the result of all these changes appeared in the present day reality by the effects of advanced information technologies and digital technologies.

In the above perspective *Ghanachakkar* is a hypertext. The novel embodies many links and references to other texts which demand the reader to develop understanding of the themes of the novel in relation to other texts. For example when the novels deals with the postmodern concept of subjectivity or of the human self, the novel gives reference of the concept of postmodernist writer Indra Bahadur Rai and his text *Kathputaliko Maan*. Upreti gives the title "Kathputaliko Maan" to his one of the sub-chapter in the novel which deals with the unstable and in determinant nature of human self. In *Kathputaliko Maan* Rai reflects the unstable, indeterminate and plurality of the human self and demonstrates that it is like the self of the puppet controlled by some other outer forces. Rai's text itself is the rewriting of the realist story writer Guru Prasad Mainali's story *Paralko Aago*. In Rai's text there are various "traces" of the other stories which deals with the theme of misunderstanding and conflict between wife and husband (*Sidantaka Kura* 114). With the technique of "Leela Lekhan" Rai demonstrate the lack of singular human self, singular truth and singular meaning. With these concepts Upreti supports his theme that deals with the lackness of central self-governing "self" in the individuals lives.

Another example is the reference of Shanker Lamichhane's *Abstract Chintan Pyaz*. Lamichhane in his text deals with the lack of center and universal truth. With the image of an onion he indicates towards indeterminacy and endless search of the "truth". Upreti also deals with the concept of the lack of universal truth in his six chapters entitled "Pyazko Mahan Dharahara" (149-72). In this chapter he

demonstrates the individual's endless search of "truth" and "meaning" which seems absurd like the searching the "center" in an onion. He also deals with the multiple and heterogeneous identities of individuals in reference of Lamichhane's *Abstract Chintan Pyaz*.

Simarly, we also find the reference of Jonathan Suifts's *Gulliver's Travels* which satirises on foolishness of the people fighting wars for the power. In the story, "Ghlliver's voyage to Lillput (where the people are six inches high) and Brobdingnag (where they are immense). The Lilliputians fights wars (as the English do) which seems foolish" (Thornley and Gwyneth 82). Swift's novel is a bitter satire on human struggle for power. With the reference of Gulliver's journey Swift criticizes on the whole English nation involved in the war. In Upreti's novel when the narrators takes all medicines at once in order to kill himself, he reach in a state of a trans and hallucinates the valley as being turning to the lake, as it is prophesized by Manjushree, all its inhabitants turning to amphibians and fishes (200-07). Then a group of peoples, who escape the valley, go far away in different parts of the world like Gulliver. There they see the strange peoples and their practices. The narrator describes:

> Disciples, followers, rebellions and common people reached the renowned and big cities of the world. There they saw strange rebel, conflict, treaty and elections taking place. They understood-how the struggles for the achievements of money, rank and power had turned the human brain ugly. How some people had grown taller than the house and the trees and how some people had grown, instead, shorter and smaller than the ant. How the people were forgetting the massage of love and compassion. How some people living in the dark streets in

the big cities of the world were slowly-slowly metamorphosing into

tailed donkey and horse like citizens transformed into fish and tortoise

in the valley. (207)

This excerpt clarifies the reference of Swift's *Gulliver's Travel* in *Ghanachakkar*.

What is important, here, to understand the reference is that like Swift, Upreti also

perceives the degrading state of humanity due to the meaningless struggles for power

and honor and satires upon those practices of the human beings.

In the above excerpt the reference of Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*

also appears. When Upreti writes about the people's metamorphosis into donkey and

horse in the far cities it gives the reference of the Rusdie's famous character Saladin

Chamcha in *The Satanic Verses*. In Rushdie's novel Chamcha becomes "translated" in

to a he-goat by the defining power which the white possess. Rushdie poses a bitter

satire towards the white treatments of the non-white peoples and on the suppression

and exploitation that whites do upon the non-whites. In the *Ghanachakkar* the

narrator with his divine sight views such cruelties existing in the far cities of the

world which are famous and renowned for the civilizations. From this reference it is

evident that Upreti also satires on the inhuman cruelties existing in different parts of

the world.

Apart from these the whole novel can be analyzed as the reference of Miguel

de Cervantes' *The Adventure of Don Quixote*. Cervantes' novel dramatizes how the

old gentleman Alonso Quijano becomes mad and turns in to knight-errant Don

Quixote de la Mancha due to his over-reading of the books of chivalry. The rest of the

novel dramatizes the mad knight's strange behaviors and adventures. Impressed by

the stories of chivalry, full of magic, strange places, animals, giant enemies and

wilderness through which a knight successfully and bravely encounters, Don Quixote

fails to distinguish between fact and fantasy, reality and imagination. He becomes the victim of the strange stories of chivalry and firmly caught by their impressions. Finally, the mad knight recovers and dies a pathetic death. With the story of Don Quixote, Carventes satires on the chivalry writings that dramatize the unreality as reality. For Carventes such writings leave the negative impression in the psychology of people which may bring misfortunes in their lives.

Similarly, the narrator in *Ghanachakkar* becomes mad due to his own writings in the newspaper column "Fact and Fantasy". He fails to distinguish between fact and fantasy, reality and imagination, history and myths, etc. due to his own position regarding fact and fantasy. As a postmodern thinker he rejects the differences between the two categories which are evident in his articles retoled by Bimba, Barun and his readings from the old newspapers. Like Don Quixote he envisions and hallucinates strange events and creatures, transform to Deliberant from his different real name and fight the strangeness (6-23). What difference lies between Don Quixote and the narrator is that the former becomes mad due to the chivalry stories written by others and the later due to the writings of his own. Even in this difference similarity exists as both writings deals with the fact and fantasy in equal amount and with equal significance. Similar to Carventes, Upreti also suggests that one should distinguish what is fact and what is fantasy (233). Thus, Upreti also appears to be critiquing the nature of the fact and fantasy in specific and critiquing the postmodernism in general.

Ghanachakkar also contains the references of the myths. Hindu myth of divine Shivalingham and Buddhist myth of metamorphosis are dominant in the novel. These references of the myth Upreti uses to dramatize his theme of the incomprehensibility of the truth and recurrent pattern of the wheel of time.

The novel also contains the link with various other texts and writings. To highlight the theme of madness Upreti provides the links to many others text and writings which have been written on the theme of madness. With the italicized titles of the texts-such as Jaya Dhamala's *Pagal*, Bijaya Malla's *Anuradha*, Dhurbachandra Gautam's *Sworgiya Heeradeviko Khoj*, Bijaya Malla's play *Boulaha Kajiko Sapana*, Bindhya Subbah's *Aathah*, Shrawan Mukarung's poem "Beese Nagarchiko Bayan", SaruVakta's *Pagal Basti*, and Laxmi Prasad Devkota's poem "Pagal", Uprati provides the readers with the links to know and understand what is madness. In all these books the madness is presented as a general condition of the people but not recognized and institutionalized in the society. With the link to those text Upreti's implicitly claims that madness is the condition in which people possesses the extraordinary power of comprehending reality.

From these short analyses of the various references and the links in the novel it can be logically claimed that *Ghanachakkar* is a hypertext. With its hypertextuality the meaning of the texts slides to the meaning of the other various texts in indeterminacy. With its hypertextuality Upreti proves that the meanings and truths are already there in the societies scattered in different forms and disguise. All these features of hypertextuality have made Upreti's novel a non-sequential kind of writing, open ended and variable in its nature which is purely the characteristic of postmodern writing. It also reflects the functionality of the *Ghanachakkar*, as it borrows many ideas from the other fictional writings, which have made the novel historiographical metafiction at the same time.

From all these analysis of the narrative techniques it is evident that *Ghanachakkar* is more than what a general reader perceives of it. The techniques like parody, historiography metafiction, magic realism and hypertext have made the novel

one of the best examples of Nepalese postmodern text. Upreti uses such techniques to dramatize the absurd and mired contexts of Nepalese realities of the transitional phase of the recent past. Both content and form successfully present the changing socio-cultural, socio-psychological, socio-political, intellectual, philosophical, and religious phenomena of the contemporary Nepalese societies. Thus, along with contents, the various postmodern techniques or the aesthetic sides themselves carry the postmodern awareness in Upreti's novel *Ghanachakkar*.

V. Postmodern Consciousness in *Ghanachakkar*

Sanjeev Upreti's *Ghanachakkar* is a historiographic metafiction which reflects and dramatizes social, cultural, political and psychological aspect of the transitional phase of recent past of Nepalese history. The novel presents the mired realities of Nepalese society which is passing through the significant paradigmatic changes in all domains. Observed from a mentally disturbed narrator, the novel takes the readers in a journey to various domains of Nepalese realities where the changes are appearing in incomprehensible ways. Framed within few months before and few months after the Mass Movement II (2062-63), the novel presents many historical events in fictionalized form. Within this time setting the novel takes the reader to observe changing pattern of realities in the field of intellectual, philosophical, social, cultural, political, religious and psychological phenomena. Wherever the narrative takes the readers can be seen with growing consciousness of postmodernism and its various manifestations.

As the novel begins Upreti reflects the growing consciousness of the students, represented by Ranganath Pudasaini, about their rights and marginalized position in the university. Aroused by the concept of postmodernism such as plurality, heterogeneity and multiplicity of meaning the students demands the validity of their understanding of the subject which undermine the concept that teacher's understanding is only valid and authentic. The students threaten to destroy such totalitarian and tyrannical concept of knowledge and meaning. Thus, even in the beginning the novel reflects the growing postmodern consciousness in the field of academic practices.

The narrator gains knowledge from Dilbernath Jogi and Franz Ryner that the whole society is being affected by the chaotic and anarchy power of postmodernism

which is bringing the changes in the societies and in individuals' psychologies.

Through the perspective of the narrator the novel reflects peoples' disbelief against

the old paradigms and grand narratives and the desires to replace them with meta-

narratives. The rising of the peoples' political conscious, their rights and marginalized

position in the main-stream socio-political activities inspire them to overthrow the

tower of old hierarchical system and grand narratives which support them. The novel

thus present the historical changes in the field of Nepalese political system brought by

the Mass Movement II in relation to the postmodern awareness growing in the

Nepalese citizens.

Upreti's dramatization of the Nepalese society and lives in the novel is also

colored by the concept of late capitalism and the new culture it has brought in the

societies. The effects of multinational capitalism, business, industries and products

have been shaping peoples' lives at present. Moreover, the advanced development in

communication, transportation and entertainment technologies have brought the new

era of consumerism in the whole societies. Consumer culture, media culture and

electronic culture are determining the new definition of present day's Nepalese

society and its culture. *Ghanachakkar* reflects and dramatizes all these mired and

shifting pattern of Nepalese socio-cultural realities. As Jameson calls postmodernism

the cultural logic of late capitalism, Upreti demonstrates how the late capitalism is

functioning to bring the new culture in Nepalese societies. For this he presents the

vivid pictures of city's streets like King's Way, Ratna Park, Sundhara, and Boudha,

where the growing consumer culture, and media culture become evident.

In the novel Upreti also reflects the theoretical and philosophical trends which

are expressed in postmodern theories and philosophies. With the reference of

postmodern writers and their writings like Indra Bahadur Rai and Shankar

Lamichhane, Upreti suggests how postmodern theoretical and philosophical trend that denies the centrality of meaning, truth, knowledge, and subjectivity are developing in the Nepalese intellectual phenomena. Upreti's narrative of madness itself rejects the rational dichotomy between normalcy and abnormality, fact and fantasy, reality and imagination, history and myth, fact and fiction. These reflections on the new philosophical trends and their new approach towards the nature of truth, knowledge, meaning, self, identity, fact, reality, and imagination are another important postmodern themes that the novel embodies.

　　Ghanachakkar not only reflects various manifestations of the postmodernism but also presents its effects on socio-psychology. The postmodern awareness results in the expression of dissatisfaction, disbelief and resistance to the old totalitarian, tyrannical system of hierarchy and ideologies of grand narratives. Upreti regards them as good aspects of postmodernism. But Upreti also criticizes the negative effects it brings in the individuals and socio-psychology. Presenting the narrator as submissive in the beginning, to the postmodern chaotic and anarchic power, Upreti demonstrates how total submission to the postmodernism may lead the individual and the whole societies towards madness, chaos, anarchy, disorder and the sense of absurdity. The narrator's madness, which results from his total submission, itself, is the example he presents. In this regard the narrator's madness represents and reflects the socio-psychology of the whole societies. Thus, Upreti also provides critique of postmodernism reflecting its negative effects in the lives of people and in societies. Together with the dramatization of the postmodern themes and with the critique on postmodernism Upreti successfully reflects postmodern awareness in *Ghanachakkar*.

　　Postmodern awareness in the novel is also embodied in the various techniques which Upreti uses in his narrative. The novel appears to be a parody of the great

myths of heroic adventure and quest. Following the pattern of monomyth it both incorporates and challenges the concepts of great mythical journey of the heroes which make the novel postmodern parody. It also appears to be historiographic metafiction as it presents the historical events and figures in the fictionalized form. The use of postmodern technique of magic realism has further added the postmodern color in the novel. The hypertextuality of the novel with various references and links have made the novel non-sequential, open ended and variable which are the defining characteristics of a postmodern text. The hypertextuality in the novel has also strengthened the theme of indeterminacy of the meaning and truth which the novel embodies.

To conclude, Upreti's *Ghanachakkar* reflects the various events, socio-cultural, political, and socio-psychological dimensions of the recent past which was going through the major paradigmatic changes. The novel dramatizes how postmodern awareness is manifesting in all those events and changes of the history of the Nepalese transitional phase. Observed from a mentally disturbed university teacher, the novel presents the complexity, ambiguity and confusions rising in the Nepalese socio-cultural realities due to the paradigmatic changes brought by theoretical and philosophical practices of postmodernism. The novel also reflects the social reality which is entering into the new era of late capitalism. The dramatization of the disturbed socio-psychology, people's dissatisfaction towards the failed grand narratives, totalitarian, tyrannical hierarchical system all together reflect the postmodern awareness in the novel. Moreover, the various postmodern narrative techniques like parody, historiography metafiction, magic realism and hypertext have successfully carried the postmodern conscious in Upreti's *Ghanachakkar.*

Works Cited

Abrams, M.H. *Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8th ed. Boston: Thomson Wordsworth, 2005.

Poudyal, Agya. "Much Madness is Divinest Sense." *Wave*. (December 2007). 28.

Appaiah, Kwame Anthony. "Is the Post-in Postmodernism the Post-in Post-colonial?" *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007. 55-71.

Baudrillard, Jean. *The Mirror of Production*. St. Louis: Telos Press, 1975.

Deleuze, Gilles and Flex Gauttari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Helen R. Lane, Robert Hurley and Mark Seem. New York: Viking Penguin, 1977.

Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007. 294-320.

Ghimire, Saroj Sharma. "Postmodernism: Paradoxes and Prospects." MPhil Term Paper. Tribhuvan University, 2007. 1-7.

Habermas, Jurgen. "Modernity: An Unfinished Projet." *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Eds. Hazard Adams and Leory Searle. Florida: University Press of Florida, nd. 276-85.

Hornby, A.S. *The Adventure of Don Quixoe by Miguel de Cervantes*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Hutchen, Linda. *Theorizing the Postmodern: Toward a Poetics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism."

    Twentieth- Century Literary Theory: A Reader. Ed. K.M. Newton. 2nd ed.

    London: Macmilan: 1997, 267-75.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. "Answering the Question: What is Postmodernism." *Critical*

    Theory Since 1965. Eds. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle. Florida: University

    Press of Florida, nd. 268-75.

Newton, K.M. "Postmodernism: Introduction." *Twentieth Century Literary Theory: A*

    Reader. E.d. K.M. Newton. 2nd ed. London: Macmilan Press, 1997. 265-67.

Ruland, Richard and Malcom Bradhury. *From Puritanism to Postmodernism: A*

    History of American Literature. New York: Penguin Books, 1992.

Sapkota, Bishnu. "Fusion of Fact and Fiction." *Kathmandu Post*. Oct. 7, 2007:8.

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

    18, 2008: 11.

Tarnas, Richard. *The Passion of the Western Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books,

    1991.

Thornley,G.C. and Robert Gwyneth. *An Outline of English Literature*. 3rd ed.

    Callcutta: Longman, 1994.

Thapa, Anirudra. " What has Memory Got to do with History? The Novel, the Yarn,

    and the Performative Historiography in William Faulkner's *Absalom,*

    Absalom!" Cross-Currents A Journal of Language, Literature and Literary

    Theory 1.1 (2011): 15-30.

Upreti, Sanjeev. *Ghanachakkar*. Kathmandu: Nepalaya, 2007.

- - -. *Sidantaka Kura*. Kathmandu: Akshar Creation Nepal, 2011.