

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

2006

- Hari Lal Poudel

Dichotomy of Irrationality and Rationality as a Device in *Catch-22*

Dichotomy of Irrationality and Rationality as a Device in *Catch-22*

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

By

Hari Lal Poudel

University Campus

Kirtipur

December 2006

Tribhuvan University**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

This thesis entitled "Dichotomy of Irrationality and Rationality as a Device in *Catch-22*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Hari Lal Poudel has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head
Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep sense of gratitude to my thesis advisor Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the head of the Central Department of English, for his scholarly guidance and constructive suggestions to prepare this thesis.

I am grateful to Prof. Abhi Subedi and Dr. Sanjeev Upreti who provided materials giving me encouragement and inspiration.

I am equally indebted to my teachers Dr. Birendra Pandey, Dr. Shreedhar Gautam, Mr. Sajag Rana, Mr. Hem Sharma and Mr. Ghanshyam Bhandari.

I am also deeply indebted to all my respected teachers and friends for their valuable information and suggestions.

I owe to my mother Nirmala Poudel and family members who always inspired and encouraged me for the study. Similarly, I am thankful to my brother, Dinesh Poudel. I express my thanks to my mama Rajan Pokharel and brother Dhruba Raj Ghimire.

Words fail to convey the depth of my gratitude to my friends Mr. Moti Lal Phullel, Mr. Ram Lal Aryal, Mr. Tanka Prasad Khanal, Mr. Surendra Ghimire, Mr. Krishna Acharya, Mr. Chakra Pani Pathak and Mr. Krishna Gautam.

I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Deepak and Narayan Basnet of Resunga Computer Service, Kirtipur for their computer service.

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Hari Lal Poudel

December 2006

Abstract

The main focus of this thesis is to expose the risks and dangers constructed by the superiors during the Second World War. In such circumstances, the protagonist, Yossarian is able to establish his rationality even though he pretends of being irrational in front of the military machine. He has to present himself as irrational to survive and live military life under the irrational rules of *Catch-22*. It evokes how rules are applied on the common people. Moreover, it exposes how highly posted people play the game of power through discourses rejecting the lives of common individuals.

Contents

Acknowledgement iii

Abstract iv

I. General Introduction 1

Joseph Heller/His Literary Career and *Catch 22*: An Overview 6

II. Foucauldian Power and Discourse 20

Discourse 20

Discourse as a Form of Representation 22

Literary Text as a Discourse 23

Discourse as a Social Practice 25

Discourse as a Product of Discursive Formation 27

Foucauldian Power 31

Disciplinary Power 34

The Justification of Power: Truth, Knowledge and Subjectivity 36

III. Dichotomy of Irrationality and Rationality as a Device in *Catch-22* 38

Trap of Irrational Rules and Principles 38

Struggle of Individuals Against the Power of Society 44

Institutional Power Circulates Discourse 53

IV. Conclusion 60

Works Cited

I. General Introduction

Joseph Heller/His Literary Career and *Catch 22*: An Overview

American society during the 1960's was directly affected and influenced by the cold war. American government couldn't give the justification of war and other forms of conflicts. At that time people were disillusioned within the reality of American life. The cold war taught people that it was not bad to be selfish. Even it was considered to be right only to think about one's survival and welfare. People were more skeptical about the honour that supposedly comes with sacrifice and selflessness for the sake of country. Because of many bad events people were frustrated, depressed and alienated.

In Heller's work, war is not only the central theme. Except war, his works show non-sensical and animalistic nature of contemporary modern society. He criticizes the hypocritical functions and conventions within the society. His works deal with love affairs, social upheavals of his time, experience of Jews, poverty, unemployment, wealth, political aspect, business, and death. Moreover, he indicates the irrationality of power-holding people towards the common people. He satirizes societal system, institutions and conditions. He shows the economic system of capitalism. He shows the absurdity of war. He evokes the tendency of majority to weekly submit to a bureaucratic rule which is equally and initially crazy.

In Heller's work we see also the expression of futuality and chaos behind war. He manipulates complex situation within the human being and the complex relation of power in any society.

Joseph Heller, a renowned experimental fiction writer was born in Brooklyn, New York in May 1 1923. He was the son of poor Jewish parents. His Russian born father, Issac Heller, who was a bakery truck driver died in 1927 because of the

botched ulcer operation. After graduating from Abraham Lincoln high school in 1945, Heller joined the Twelfth Air Force. He was stationed in Corsica, where he flew 660 missions as a B-24 bombardier. In 1941, Heller received M.A. from Columbia University in 1949-1950. He taught English composition for two years at Pennsylvania state University (1950-1958) and promotion manager for MC calls. He left Mc calls in 1961 to teach fiction and dramatic writing at Yale University and the University of Pennsylvania. Heller had two children by his first marriage. In 89 Heller married Valerie Humphries, a nurse he met while ill. Heller died of heart attack at his home on long Island on December 13, 1999 and his last novel is *Portrait of the Artist as an Old Man*.

In the 1950 he started writing *Catch-22*. He took seven years to complete the book. In 1974 He wrote *Something Happened*: The book is an unrelenting critique of American values. In 1979 his *Good as Gold* Satirizes almost all of the America's respectful institutions. Similarly he wrote other novels *God knows* (1984), *No laughing matter with speed Vogel* (1986), *Picture This* (1988), *Closing Time*, *Portrait of the Artist as an Old Man*. His short stories are (a) *Catch as Catch Can*: the collected short stories and other writing (2003), Three short stories and other writings. His autobiography *Now and Then* is a memory of Heller's childhood. His contribution we Bombed in New Heaven (1967), *Clevinge's Trial* (1973) are his plays.

The fame and reputation of Joseph Heller's is due to the popularity of *Catch-22* among variety of readers. It is taken to be the mouth piece of many readers. *Catch-22* is a modern classic, hilarious, Funny and horrific. This is the novel having morbid satire, the novel of having amusing observation of human nature and uncanny wit. It is a satiric comedy tied up in a relively formal plot. *Catch-22* is microcosm of the 20th century.

The title *Catch-22* is very ironic because of the definition of *Catch-22* is that in order to be removed from duty one must be insane. The *Catch-22* is that if he goes to the doctor because he believes that he is insane and wants to be removed from combat duty he can't. Older man writes about the *Catch-22* "Catch 22 is the principle that informs the military economic machine, giving it power and making war possible in the First place . . . the illogical must be done because the high command (*Catch-22*) says it is logical" (229). His focus is to show the line between rationality and irrationality, logicity and illogicity. The powerful people with the discursive discourse change the truth of right and wrong.

The use of dichotomy of rationality and irrationality as a device is to satirizes the falsity of the institutions and their impression on common individuals during the dangerous situation of war. In this novel there are many institutions which are conducted by the so called superior class of people. The power holding people holding the different institutions do whatever they like to do. They have to right to do anything no one stop for them. Whether anything is right or wrong. The thing which gives benefits are rational and right for them. Heller's satire is directed towards the institutions that make up the society, business psychiatry, law and military.

No common is higher in any type of institution. Institutions are controlled and handled by the people who have power. These people using their false knowledge misuse the power because their main motive is to take a lot of advantage.

In the book *Catch-22* the protagonist captain Joseph Yossarian, lead bombardier of the 25th squadron, who is stationed at an air trip on the fictitious Island off the coast of Italy during World War II. He pretends to be irrational to escape the miseries of war. He is compelled to remain in the *Catch-22* situation which is conducted by the elite class of people. He hates the military parades because they are

irrational and absurd. In fact, military parading is just a form of posturing. The military superiors seek to prolong their power and superiority through *Catch-22* rule. The power-hungry and egotistical military officials are the ones who bring the downfall of the soldiers in *Catch-22*. In this novel, Milo Minderbinder is the mess hall officer at the U.S. Army Air Corps Base in which *Catch-22* takes place before he becomes obsessed with expanding mass operations and trading goods for the profit of a syndicate in which he and everyone else in the air force has a share. Milo, here is the satire of a modern business man. He is the living representation of the capitalist system. He has no allegiance to any country, person or principle unless it pays him. Colonel Cathcart increases the number of missions to fulfill his own desire to be general. He is to get position and power in military institutions. Captain Black conducts *Loyalty Oath Crusade*. In name *Loyalty Oath Crusade* is logical but the behaviour done by Captain Black is not rational. He only wants to fulfill his ambition and he does persecution upon the people. Because of such power-holding people, the Chaplain considers himself as a weakman who wants to fight for his beliefs but he is more afraid of disobeying the superior officers. Milo bombs his own squadron, Arfy rapes and murders an innocent, poor Italian girl. Doc Daneeka can't treat the patient, Captain Black thinks only for his advantage. Are these rationalities?

Unfortunately, *Catch-22* becomes a way of life for the soldiers. They live life according to *Catch-22* rule in order to survive. Common soldiers feign the activities of irrationality to get out of the military. When they don't succeed, they eventually succumb to irrationality in reality, as this is a better alternative than living and witnessing its disappointment. Irrationality is therefore the initial course of action that the soldier intend to take. It is the way to reject the atmosphere of irrationality being irrational in front of the superiors. Only Yossarian is able to hold on to his sanity while trying to

fight his way through the irrational military officials controlling him. He also tries feigning insanity, but later decides to be indifferent about his reality to survive. Yossarian is able to express what he is feeling and thinking during the war despite being imprisoned by military rules and principles. The story centers on the US AF (United States Air Force) regulation which suggests that willingness to fly dangerous combat missions must be considered insane, but if the air men seek to be relieved on grounds of mental reasons the request proves their sanity.

Hence, the use of rationality and irrationality as a device is to satirize the American militarism. American writer whose novel *Catch-22* is one of the protest literature to appear after world war II. Critics say it is darkly humorous commentary on the illogic of war and bureaucracy. The title which refers to an inescapable double bind has entered the language. Joseph Heller manages to bond humour and terror. Comedy and tragedy and reveals in the process of stubbornness of human characters and society gone nuts. Lesley Henderson mentions, "Joseph Heller has a better claim than any other American to having written the definitive novel of modern war – if universal responses to his definition of that war is any measure. People now know as *Catch-22* the circular bureaucratic formula they had learned from experience" (423).

According to him people now are more aware of the irrationality of bureaucrats after having read this novel *Catch-22*. *Catch-22* rules and restrictions are imposed upon the individuals by such bureaucrats. They work to get power among bureaucrats themselves. To satisfy the hunger of power they can snatch the happiness of lower rank people. They are mad to get the upper positions. It is not wrong to say that *Catch-22* is the circular bureaucrats formula to achieve their benefits. Heller tries to develop the theme that in a bureaucracy there is no individuality and that the individuality doesn't matter.

In an interview in 1975 Heller says 'A I've said wasn't really about the world war II. It was really about the American society during the cold war, during the Koran, war, and about the possibility of Vietnam" (*Merill Interview* 68).

The above lines don't only mention about a single war. The similarity of conditions can be found in many wars if it express the same intention. Michel Scoggins describes *Catch-22* relating with the combat experiences of Joseph Heller during the II world war. It is the black comedy about military life during the dehumanizing military bureaucracy. The book's attitude towards war and military resonate protest over U.S. involvement in Vietnam. The book's title also enters lexicon to indicate an unresolvable contradictory situation.

Merriam Webster's dictionary mention: "Though luck warmly received on its publication the book slowly acquired an audience and during the Vietnam war its satire resonated so strongly that becomes ubiquitous on college campuses (192).

As the U.S. involvement grew, Heller's exploration of the both the insanities of both war and military industrial complex gradually caught the public imagination.

Harper Collins Reader Encyclopedia of American Literature illustrates:

The title has entered the language – as phrase defining a circular trap. Yossarian, the anti-hero, is convinced that the officers from General Scheisskopf on down, are insane and trying to kill him. Every time he contemplates a mission as a bombardier, the Squardon loses another man, and the number of missions required for home leave is raised on a ludicrous mission to bomb the incomplete bridge at Avignon, Snowden bleeds to death on Yossarian's Flying Suit, Yossarian stops wearing clothes. Heller's technique is to alternate the ridiculous with the starkly realistic scene of war. (420)

According to the above mentioned lines it is understood that the circular trap situation makes the hero to accept the social restrictions. Yossarian struggle against the rule of military. He pretends to be irrational. Such technique is to depict how the reality is created. It shows the irresponsibility of the superiors. The real events are exposed by the novelist. Such type of technique is to ridicule the weakness and vices of the modern human society where the same *Catch-22* game is exercised.

Reference Guide to American Literature mentions, "*Catch-22* is nominally a world war II novel but with important difference. Set in Italy at the tag-end of war, it focus on a group of American Fliers who discover that double-shuffle can be as deadly as enemy gunfire" (395).

On the basis of the above lines it is clear that military industrial complex is more dangerous than the war itself. It is as dangerous as war because bureaucrats confine the people in a trap like situation. It shows the irrationality of American military machine.

Indicating many critics Laura Hildalgo Downing presents:

Many critics have observed that war is not necessarily the central theme of the novel, but rather an excuse for a satire on different aspects of contemporary society. It can be argued that important questions and theme dealt with the novels are not "what happened", but rather 'what is real and what is not real,' what true and what is false. (1)

Catch-22 doesn't only indicate the miseries of war. It can be seen anywhere in any society. Through this novel *Catch-22* is the game played anywhere. The ruler uses *Catch-22* irrational rules upon the ruled. The rich uses such rule upon the poor. We human beings are chained under the system of society. Therefore, major thing is what is real and what is unreal more than what happened in the past.

Peter Be High put his arguments:

We cannot understand life's *Catch-22* situation because they are absurd. They seem completely foolish and against the reason. We think we are free, but we are controlled by the absurd language of the society. The only character who escape destruction in *Catch-22* are the ones who have mastered the language of absurdity. They succeeded by being more absurd than the world around them. (197)

According to High *Catch-22* represents the absurd situation of human life. He says we are controlled by the absurd language of society although which itself is futile. Peter be High interprets this novel in the absurd trend.

Abhi Subedi writes:

I clearly heard the politician repeating cyclical countdrum and "no win situation" in the country. They were all like the bombardier captain Joseph Yossarian of *Catch-22* who didn't fly for fear. He was caught in the milestorm of circular logic. But Yossarian finally discovers that a copuntdrum rule *Catch-22* was his colleague's invention to escape war. That meant nothing. (4)

For Subedi *Catch-22* not only depicts the condition people of mid 20th century America. He describes the *Catch-22* in the context of Nepal. He indicates Nepali politician's bewilderment due to *Catch-22* situation.

Robert Young writes, "*Catch-22* is a black comedy about death, about what people do when faced with the daily likelihood of annihilation. For the most part what they do is try to survive in any way they can" (1).

Young in the beginning of the essay talks about the question of survival in the world. Other things are secondary in comparison to life. Similarly Yossarian, the

protagonist's approach to life in this novel is that everyone lives for himself/herself. Everyone has his/her own island and live it alone.

The justification of the title the dichotomy of rationality and irrationality as a device is to distinguish the apparent and reality. Heller is one of the influential authors writing about subjects that dealt with serious themes by using the above device.

Fredrick R. Karl analyzes:

Cathcart set production quotes: The Chaplin, until he rebels, offers faith in whatever the boss decides, 'Milo assures the stockholder that profits in the form of pork,' Korn vie's with catchcart , each Jokeying for power and promotion in general. In the middle range just below decision making, are the officers who fly the missions' and well below them . . . are enlisted men, those already left behind by the corporate system. Once again, this is a 1950'ps vision, the manifestation of what James Burnham warned about in the "managerial revolution and what William white described in organizational man." (220)

On the basis of the above line the corporate structure and consumerism ideology defines the individual's life span. They are greed for power and positions. People are categorized. Lower rank people are controlled. The false consciousness and tricks don't allow the lower rank soldier to be free form the paradoxical situation of war. Such paradoxical situation is created by the people who conduct the war in the name of nationality and other popular issues.

Richard Ruland and Brabury says, "In *Catch-22* the enemy seemed less the German or the Japanese than American Military Machine and to its contrivance into the cold war to follow" (374). They view the novel as cult classic and stress, "*Catch-22* described America in a fantastic and widely comic parable" (381). *Catch-22* gives

the irrational ways of conducting the war by America. American talks about prosperity democracy and peace in the world but in behaviour it has imposed its irrational behaviours even upon its own citizen. Yossarian is the real hero it is clear how he is convinced to go to the war. To show such theme, mentioning black humour, this novel moves away from-realism towards the fabulous and extraordinary. It is necessarily Funny, but finds humour in such serious objects as death, the disintegration of social institution suffering and disease. It is clear that *Catch-22* gives the mirror of every aspects of society including war. There even in the critical condition, the institutions are instruments from which power holder people get profit.

John Muste writes:

In a modest proposal, however horrifying swift suggestions may be, however explicit his instructions for braising and roasting a fat infant, author and reader are fully aware that suggestions are unreal that swift writes as he does precisely because he knows that his readers will agree with him that such things are beyond comprehension, and will therefore agree with him that such things are beyond comprehension, and will therefore agree with him that such things are beyond comprehension, and will therefore agree with him that other real attitudes and acts are equally intolerable and must be reformed. No such sense sustain us in *Catch-22*. The scenes Heller describes are real; they are those to our experience to convince as that Fundamental horror is true. (22)

The presentation of social satire in *Catch-22* is different from the Johnthan Swift's modest proposal. The satire of *Catch-22* is persussive, convincing and real even though it is not in a chronological order. The actual horror, dilemma,

contradiction and paradox are presented significantly from the presentation of such details given in the novel give us to distinguish what is real and what is unreal. It makes us know the actual condition the people were facing at that time.

Julian Mitchell puts his views on the structure of the novel:

Epic in form, the book is episodic in structure. Each chapter carries a single character a step nearer madness or death or both, and a step, too legend. The action takes place well above the level of reality. On level or action the characters behave with a fine regard. For the laws of probability. Yet within its own terms the book is wholly consistent, creating legend out of the wildest force and most painful realism, constructing its own system of probability. (301)

The characters face death or madness, this novel *Catch-22* has its own law of probability. Whatever it presents the main focus of the book is to evoke the painful realism no matter it has lot of fun and wildest force.

Norman Podhoretz writes:

But Yossarian mind so powerfully that he himself is carried out what might seem to point of madness, Not however, in Heller's eyes. There is not the slightest doubt that he means us to regard Yossarian's paranoia (even though it extends to a Nurse in the field hospital who dislikes him and to bus driver everywhere, all of whom are trying to do him) not as a disease but as a sensible response to real dangers. For example, we are shown that his diagnosis of colonel cathcart and all the other senior officers he also dismiss as insane – is accurate. The madness lies not in him but in them and system over which they preside. (3)

According to him the madness is not in Yossarian, the madness lies in senior officers. Yossarian's unusual activities are accurate in the real sense. It shows that the Arm Forces during the 60's were ruled by an establishment made up of madmen and criminals. It is the evils of American militarism. It is clear that people's lives in 50's and 60's were preplanned, pre packaged pre-fabricated. At this time many institutions like school, hospital, office, shopping mall, religion, medicine are conducted by the insane people even though they claim themselves as rational. Most of the organization work insanely. The system, organization or institutions are so cruel they are difficult to endure.

Individual is made helpless for the preference of the group. Many institutions in the novel are corrupt, self-centered. This novel criticizes the various institutions like commercial, military and religious organizations. The boorishness autocratic, cruel nature of military does not do anything for the benefit of the people which is prevalent in this novel.

Josephine Hendin views, "By Joseph Heller in comic *Catch-22* (1961). There all power and evils are external. The villain is the army, which tries to close all escape with red tape.' Yossarian, is the man who tries to open them up" (245).

He also sees the negative aspect of the army. Yossarian, the protagonist of the novel, can't go anywhere because his officers use illogical laws and rules. Whatever the power holding officers do against him, at the end of the novel Yossarian rejects the entire system. He refuses to fly anymore missions. He is given the choice to support *Catch-22* rule and gets an honourable discharge or face court-martial. Yossarian doesn't accept such irrational rules; and principles propounded by the such evil people. Instead of support the system Yossarian goes to create his own ethics which is simple and sensible. Through the presentation of such character like

Yossarian it has become clear to find out issues like rationality and irrationality, madness and non-madness. The novelist excellently presents the things which were unexposed. Such unexposed rules and regulations are manipulated by corrupt and evil people.

Catch-22 underscored with dark, humour, abuses the horrors of war and power of modern society which gives nothing to the people. From this novel, it is significant to understand the horrors produced by the bureaucratic institutions. Heller satirizes organized institutions because which seem manipulating people's live in the name of reason and morality. Yossarian is such character who struggles against the self-serving bureaucracy at the heart of military machine. It is easy to understand that society is nuts. The society is irrational and his (Yossarian) act of being irrational is accurate in this novel. The novel shows a mendacious quality in many of our political leaders and business leaders.

James D. Hart says, "This grotesquely comic tale of mad cap bombardier's resistance to his fantastic commander's ambitious for promotion at the expense of his American squadron on at Mediterranean island satirizes military illogicality and glorification" (336).

After having read this novel and opinions of many critics. It has become easier to search the many themes and devices of the novel. It has made convincing to examine the different kinds of powers. It shows how American military officers exercise their power upon the individual to lead to war in the name of rationality during 1960's.

Though many critics raise many issues on the novel but they haven't analyzed *Catch-22* taking the issues of dichotomy of rationality and irrationality as a device. Therefore, Joseph Heller's *Catch-22* is illustrated through the methodological tools

like Foucault's idea of power and discourse to interpret the dichotomy of irrationality and rationality as a device. Foucault's concept of power and discourse assist this research in its attempt to satirize the falsity of institutions and their irresponsibility towards the civilians. This type of power and discourse helps to analyze individual's position at the heart of military machine. It shows how an individual is subjected and how he resist against the power of society. The methodological tool will be discussed in II chapter.

II. Foucauldian Power and Discourse

Foucault's constant emphasis on discourse and power provides a unifying core on his works. While taking the issue of power and discourse his indebtedness towards the Nietzsche's Genealogy can't be discarded. Genealogy focuses on local, discontinuous, disqualified, illegitimate knowledge against the Unitary body of theory. Therefore Foucault's power and discourse shouldn't be understood in a chronological order.

Discourse

The term "discourse" is applied in various areas of knowledge and it may have different definitions in different fields. If it is viewed through the prism of Foucault, he sees discourse in terms of body of knowledge. The knowledge for him is much more a matter of social, historical, political condition under which any statement true or false, reason and non-reason, rationality and irrationality, madness and non-madness, morality and immorality, good and bad, real and unreal is defined in terms of the power and the discourse of society. They are considered to be true or false within the limits that is constrained by the society. Discourse is used to gain and even subvert power. He rejects the theories of historical change which retain the idea of deeper continuity in terms of conservatism.

Discourse is representation but it is not mere form of representation. To be discourse, the socially productive imagination is limited by the material condition. Any statement should be the part of knowledge to work as discourse. Knowledge is linked to power. It not only assumes the authority of the "truth" but has the power to make itself true. There is not truth of knowledge in the absolute sense but of the discursive formation sustaining a regime of truth.

According to Foucault knowledge is power over others, the power to define others. Knowledge ceases to be liberation and becomes the mode of surveillance, regulation and discipline. His discourse is understood as a form of discipline. He views two senses of discipline one it refers to scholarly discipline such as science, medicine psychiatry, sociology and so on and the second it refers to disciplinary institutions such as prison, school, hospital and so on. Foucault's discourse shows the relationship between scholarly discipline and societal institution of social control.

Sara Mill writes:

Foucault discusses the way that discourse is regulated by institutions in order to ward off some of its dangers. He describes the process of exclusion which operates on discourse to limit what can be said and what can be connected as knowledge. (57)

Therefore, his concept of discourse is different from other theorists who have the concept of discourses. His views on power and discourse are neither linear nor absolute.

Traditionally, discourse was being taken to mean human conversation, but Foucault's interest in social technique is both critical and historical. It not only refers to language or social interaction but to relatively well bounded areas of social knowledge. He differentiates his concept of discourse from speech act theory which demands appropriate conditions on socio-linguistic environment or context. If sometimes, the Foucault's discourse is similar to that of speech act theory it is no more than coincidence.

Alice and McHoul and Wendy Grace write:

Foucault specifically differentiates his conception of discourse from that of the speech act theory and indeed, from logical analysis, which

tend to consider language in terms of propositions. Since he is interested in the conditions of discourse. Foucault doesn't mean, by this term, a formal logical linguistic, or even language like system. (29)

In many fields, discourse has become a popular term. Foucault challenges many of the previous mind set about sexuality, madness, discipline. In any ideological struggle the heart of discourse cannot be discarded. Discourse is something which produces something else rather than something which exists in and of itself in isolation because whole rationalization is myth for him.

Discourse produces specific kinds of power-relation. Literary text is like other non-literary text as discourse. In this also, discourse allows us to analyze similarities across a range of text as the product of particular text of power/knowledge relations.

Discourse as a Form of Representation

Discourse is a form of representation. Nothing which is meaningful exists outside and nothing has any meaning outside of discourse. Discourse Foucault argues constructs the topic. It defines and produces the objects of our knowledge. What interested him were the rules and practices that produced meaningful statements and regulated discourse in different historical period. It includes the statements of madness, sexuality, homosexuality, hysteria. It is circulated and practised within the institution dealing with the subjects e.g. medical treatment to the insane, punishment regimes for guilty.

Discourse prescribes the topic and it excludes others only on the basis of representation. Discourse is taken to be discontinuous with raptures and breaks. The discourse is neither solid nor truth, it is representation but in representation any statement cannot be fixed components all rules aren't like grammatical rules.

Foucault Primer mentions, "if discourses don't merely represent the real and if in fact they are part of its production, then which discourse best can't be decided by comparing it with any real objects' (35).

Being representation, it is difficult to define discourse in simple and straightforward way. It has complex history. According to Foucault all discourses are equally subjected to their own particular set of rules. Literature too feels that it has to extend its power over its readers by claiming truth for itself. It shows discourse as a form of representation. Foucault writes "western literature has for centuries, sought to base itself in nature, in the plausible, upon sincerity and science, in short upon true discourse" (219).

Literary Text as a Discourse

Though the modern institutions define literary and non-literary text, but Foucault doesn't see any difference between non-literary and literary texts. The formation of literary and non-literary text is same. The literary text also circles around the complex matrix of issues concerning knowledge, truth and power. Any text exists how far it exercises its own control. Foucault is not interested in any discourse's system of language but in the rules and criteria. For the transformation of statement- and yet there is no reason to suppose that these rules and criteria are someone's personal thoughts. These rules are circulated within the closed community.

Literary text, Foucault says, also the prime example of 'fellowship of discourse' whose function is to preserve or reproduce discourse but in order that it should circulate within the closed community" (225).

Even though literature isn't is his primary concern but he sees literature as a discourse. According to him discourse changes over time depending on the economic and social conditions within when they are generated. The production of any text is at

once selected, organized and redistributed according to certain numbers of procedures as other text is described Foucault says, "the study of discourse doesn't differentiate between those texts which are designed as literary and those which are designated as non-literary although discourse theorists are keenly aware of the institutionalized differences that exists between the two set of texts (20).

Foucault's view isn't the view that previous theorists defined while defining literature. According to him literary discourses aren't only the set of utterances which is stable over time. He tries to work against the notion of progress and development. While talking about the literary text the discursive formation is being circulated. Moreover, he says that any text is not determined by one discourse along there may be several other discourses at work in the construction of particular text and these discourses. Foucault's importance is due to his works which helped many theorists or academicians to consider that English literature as a discipline work. It gave a way to see is practiced by an institution. Foucault provides the evidence how literature and literary criticism were looked in 18th and 19th century. Foucault says:

Literary criticism and literary history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries constituted the person of author, and the figure of the Oeuvre, using modifying and displacing the procedures of religious, exegesis, biblical criticism, hagiography, historical or legendary "lives" autobiography or memories. (71)

If we look at the history, according to Foucault the definition of literature is self-contained categories rather than ones invented by scholars. The formation of literature is discursive as those previously used for the study of religion, with the construction of canon and focus on morality and values.

Discourse as a Social Practice

Human beings haven't always been the unifying element at the center for the organization of knowledge. The current discursive formation of modernity locates human beings as the foundation and origin of knowledge through their supremacy over the use of language, language has been made an object which man controls. We have invented man as distinct self. Foucault argues this self-turn upon itself and once again return man to the background of knowledge. To some degree, this would undermine the linguistic/rhetorical turn. The man is defined as hysteria, sexuality, homosexuality, reasons and non-reason. Human beings are constrained within the discourse and due to discourse one is excluded or included in certain discursive community.

Modern society is shaped and driven by cooperate institutions which deprive an individual of physical pleasure and smooth outlay of emotions as in authentic existence. Even human being is subjected in various categories by other discourse.

Foucault acclaims "If I tell the truth about myself. . . it is in part that I am constituted as a subject across a number of power-relations (*French Philosopher in the Sixties*, 1990:39). Similarly, Normality and abnormality is the product of discourse which is practised by the society. The society according to him should be analyzed as a "process" in several fields, each of which shares the "fundamental experiences of society: madness, illness, death, crime, sexuality and so forth (329).

Here, number of power-relation operating simultaneously precludes signaling out any particular one as the most fundamental.

In *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault's first book, he looks at the way in which the idea of madness had been developed through history. Foucault presents from the beginning how leapers were locked away in the middle ages. He traces the

history through the idea of Ship of Fools in the 15th century, and sudden interest in imprisonment in 17th century France. In course of history madness become a malady of soul whereas later Sigmund Freud took as mental illness. Sometimes mad men were accepted but the change of social context, the change of power and discourse. They were treated as insane, particularly the cases of Philippe Pinel and Samuel Tuke. He claimed that the treatments offered by these men were in fact no less controlling than previous methods. The treatment amounted to repeated brutality until the pattern of judgement and punishment was internalized by the patients.

An exclusion on what can be said center around the discourse of those who considered insane and therefore not rational. The same mad men have been taken differently according to the time and context.

"Foucault argues that in different historical periods the speech of the mad person was considered either to be on the on the level of divine insight or totally meaningless" (58).

If anything is fixed why the same person is considered to be mad who was taken as divine in the past? Therefore, it is only the construction of society. The following line gives the clearance:

For mad man threatens modern man only with the return to the bleak world of beast and things, to their fettered freedom. It is not on this horizon of nature that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries recognized madness, but against a background of unreason', madness didn't disclose a mechanism, but revealed a liberty ranging in the monstrous forms of quality. (83)

Now, if mad people speak, they are given attention, if they make request for an authority they are generally ignored where the "rational" people like doctors and

social workers carry more weight. In *The History of Sexuality*, sexuality also can not be detached from the discourse which is practised by the society even the sex is politicized by discourse. It is understood as in the sense of constraints can be seen as productive as well as limiting. It is only through this process of constraints that knowledge is produced. All these things show discourse as a social practice.

Discourse as a Product of Discursive Formation

The emergence of new discourse and decline of old discourse is due to the practices of discursive formation within the society. The structure governing knowledge in any field is established by particular discursive formation but Foucault's concern isn't to produce a general theory of discourse. His use of term discourse is thought of an attempt to avoid treating knowledge in terms of ideas. Rules which govern discursive formation, rules that control the fact can be talked about.

Discourse (is) a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation it doesn't form a rhetorical or formal unity endlessly repeatable whose appearance or use in history might be indicated (and if necessary explained, it is made up of limited number.

For which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. (106-117)

The discursive practice co-existent with this group of statements called discourse is a body of anonymous, historical rules, determined in the time and space of a given period, and for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic area, the condition of operation of the enuciative functions. This body of rules limits the conditions of discursive existence in different ways in different times and places; it is context, and yet something more than context. It determines what can and cannot be said within particular discursive formation.

For the appearance of object of discourse. There are the prohibitions about speaking of certain things and the rules which establish institutional bodies as the proper authority and spokes people for the creation of an object of discourse. Foucault says "Anyone who speaks, "but what he says is not said from anywhere. It is necessarily caught up in the play of exteriority (122). Due to rules one is allowed to speak and write, what is considered to be necessary we listen and rejects others e.g. children and old man who are abused. Another important factor is credibility is given based on having accomplished certain conditions. The certain ways of producing discourse enable ways of listening and writing (academic and scientific discourses). The rules of proper forms, concepts or theories we must assume to be accepted as knowledge e.g. the scientists always report hypothesis before finding, with the arrangement of statements. Only the certain people may participate in generating types of rules i.e. lay people can't make laws for the catholic church.

Foucault takes statements as components of discursive formation which are primarily functional. He doesn't accept one to one relation of forms and function of linguistic units as argued by the speech act theory. Therefore the facility conditions of prepositions, sentences and speech acts may not work in Foucauldian discourse. Foucault also being the philosopher of discontinuity, he doesn't accept the different discourses in the linear 'episteme' running past upto the present.

In *The History of Sexuality*, The following critic talks about the sex and sexuality. According to him sex is the discourse of sexuality.

Arun Gupto writes, sex has always been in the discourse of sexuality that can be studied in general historical framework. That is when sex comes under Foucauldian archeological and genealogical research it is the study of sexuality. (118)

In this Foucault attacks the 'repressive hypothesis', the very widespread belief that we have particularly since the 19th century "repressed" our natural sexual desires.

In *Archeology of Knowledge*: Foucault states that all discourses are equally subjected to their own particular confining set of rules. Each discursive formation claims for itself the status of true discourse canceling behind its will to constitute the truth of things its desire for power. Instead of finding truth is long established shared varieties his focus is on non-totalized and pluralistic. He says that the discourse exercise its control. "The statements is either an utterance nor a proposition neither a psychological nor a logical entity, neither an event nor an ideal form" (45).

Statements in this understanding are network of rules for what meaningful, rules which are precondition for proposition, Utterance, or speech acts having meaning. A sentence may be grammatically correct, but without meaning and inversely, a incorrect may be meaningful depending on whether it compiles with the rules of meaning. Statements depend on the conditions in which they emerge and exist within the field of discourse. They are not proposition, utterances, or speech acts, but their conditions are of being meaningful. There are huge entities of statements, called discursive formations. He doesn't see a deeper meaning underneath discourse. He doesn't see the source of meaning in some transcendental subject. Foucault analysis the conditions of the existence of meaning. He describes in detail how truth claims emerge during Renaissance, Enlightenment and modern epoch. He wants to avoid all interpretation and depart from the goals of hermeneutics. The posture allows Foucault to move away from an anthropological stand point and focus on the role of discursive practices. Structuralism search for homogeneity in a discursive entity, Foucault focus on differences.

Foucault refuses to examine statements outside of their role in the discursive formations. He says the whole of the system and its discursive rules determine the identity of the statements. On *Archeology of Knowledge* Sara mill writes:

was that discourses not simply grouping of utterances, grouped around a theme or an issue, nor are they simply set of utterance which emanate from a particular institutional setting, but at discourses are highly regulated grouping of utterance or statements with internal rules which are specific to discourse itself. Discourses must also be seen to be regulated by their relation with other discourses. (43)

Discursive rules and structures are shaped by the internal mechanism of discourse and relation between the discourses. Foucault doesn't see these system as being abstract or enclosed. What we think and act within the limits of discursive constraints. Therefore our perception of objects is formed within the limits of discursive formation. Sara Mill writes on Foucault:

Foucault doesn't consider these structures to be simply the invention of institutions or powerful group of people as some Marxist thinkers have suggested in their formulating of the notion of ideology, nor does he purpose that they are simply abstract and arbitrary. Rather he considers that there is a combined force of institutional and cultural pressure, together with the intrinsic structure of discourse, which leads us to interpret the real through preconceived discursive structures. (49)

Unlike Marx, Foucault had no underlying belief in a deep underlying truth or structure. He doesn't see discourse from the objective analysis.

Foucault says whole of the system and its discursive rules determine the identity of the statements but a discursive formation continually generates new

statements. To describe discursive formation he focuses on expelled and forgotten discourses that never happen to change the discursive formation. In this way one can describe specific system that determine which types of statement emerge. We see that discourse as a product of discursive formation. Foucault represents an attempt to control and contain the "barley imaginable power and dangers," the 'ponderous materiality of language (211).

In any discourse, Foucault suggests that the will to truth 'tends to exercise a sort of pressure, of power of constrain upon other forms of discourse. In this way discourse is practised.

Foucauldian Power

Power is immanent which is not outside but within the subject of human discourses like sex, family, politics, society and other institutions. Truth is constructed under the power of various aspects. Therefore, Foucault is taken to be socio-political philosopher due to his concern with the politics of the society. He does not only care power in general and its manifestation but also in techniques which produces truth so as to lead an individual to subjection.

Power circulates, it is never monopolized by one center. It is deployed and exercised through a net like organizations. Power is not negative, it is productive. Power traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms of knowledge and produces discourse. Foucault's major concern is power relationship to the discursive formation, is society that makes knowledge possible. Power here is not the conventional power of mere institution of leader, but the "capillary" modes of power that controls individual and their knowledge. Therefore his concept of power is different from the thinkers of his time.

Power is not used vertically to dominate 'other' and power is not only imposition. In *The History of Sexuality*, he mentions:

Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere . . . power comes below; that is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power- relations, and serving as a general matrix- no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body. One must suppose rather that the manifold relations of force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production in families, limited groups and institutions, are the basis of wide-ranging effects of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole. (93-94)

Power is not vertical extending from linear order. Foucault. says power is horizontal. In course of exercising power there is the possibility of resistance but resistance doesn't exist outside of the system of power-relation.

He tries to show the development of knowledge was intertwined with the mechanism of (political) power. He says knowledge which is used to exercise power. Using such knowledge. Discourse is created and perpetuated by those who have the power and means of communication. Complex differential power relationship extend to every aspects of our social, cultural and political lives. It involves all manners (often contradictory) "Subject positions" and secure our assent not so much by threat of punitive sanctions as by persuading us to internalize the norms and values that prevail within the social order. In the following line Foucault shows the interrelationship of power and knowledge.

We should admit that power produces knowledge (not simply encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is not power relation without the correlation constituent of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that doesn't presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (1990-89).

Modern power operates through the construction of new capacities and modes of activity rather than through the limitations of pre-existing ones. The relations of power don't emanate from sovereign or state: nor should power be conceptualized as the property of an individual class. The practiced of power itself creates and causes to emerge new objects of knowledge. No matter the institutions play the vital role to circulate knowledge because of the discourse power relations are rooted in the whole net works of society. The following line illustrates.

There are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse.

There can no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourse of truth which operates through and on the basis of association. (93)

On the basis of above lines Foucault's writing on power cannot be discussed outside his investigation of production of truth. It is that type of power which doesn't act directly or immediately on others. It acts upon their actions on action. The analysis, elaboration and bringing into question of power relations and intransitivity of permanent political task is inherent in all social existence.

Disciplinary Power

According to Foucault knowledge is power one to another, the power to put others in limitation whereas knowledge ceases to be liberation and becomes a mode of surveillance, regulation, discipline. Disciplinary punishment as a form of punishment which is practised today. Disciplinary punishment gives professional like psychologist, program facilitators. Parole officers etc. to take power over the prisoner. In *Discipline and Punish*. Foucault sees two terms of technologies of punishment first one is "Monarchical " technology of punishment involves the repression of the populace through brutal public execution and second "disciplinary punishment" power over the prisoners, the prisoner's length of stay depend on the professional's opinion.

In a system of discipline, the child is more individualized than the adult, the patient more than the healthy man the mad man and delinquent more than the normal and non-delinquent".

Discipline and Punish shows how the elite in society dominate and control the rest of society. The basic idea of discipline is that one will be rewarded on the basis of achievement and punished for lack of achievement or non-conformity.

Foucault mentions. "Panopticon" In this chapter a single guard can watch over many prisoner while the guard remain unseen. There "Visibility is trap. Here Foucault describes the history of prisons.

"At the beginning of the 19th century then the great spectacle of physical punishment disappeared" (14).

When the physical punishment disappeared. As the emergence of prisons become more than just places where liberty was deprived. Forcing the prisoners to live and work under strict guidelines instilled discipline Foucault said constant suspension

and Forced discipline broke the will of criminal and made him into "docile body" The whole body was easy to control by people in authority.

"Prisons don't diminish the crime rate; they can be extended, multiplied or transformed, the quantity of crime and criminal remain stable, or worse increase (1975-265). The prison's Major goal was to reduce crime by punishing the criminals prison should also deter others from committing crimes.

"The prison can not fail to produce delinquents. It does so by the very type of existence that it imposes on its inmates, whether they are isolated in cells or whether they are given useless work, for which they will find no employment, it is in any case, not to think of man society: it is to create an unnatural useless and dangerous existence" (266).

The prisoner never knew at any given moment if he was being supervised or not, therefore he constantly obeyed rules. Foucault recognized these flows in the prison system. The lasting of prison system remains so long it benefits the ruling class. The ruling class used criminality as a way of preventing confrontations that could lead to revolutions. The lower social class commit crime. By committing crime they were calling for change in the social system and rebelling against the social elite. The ruling class used the laws as a means to demise the power of these uprising.

It would be hypocritical or naïve to believe that the law was made for all in the name of all; that it would be prudent to recognize that it was made for the few and that it was brought to bear upon others that in principle it applies to all citizens, but that it is addressed in principle to the numerous and least enlightened class" (276)

Foucault viewed the elite class used the delinquent class as a means of profiting themselves. For Foucault's losing of one's own identity to the discipline of

the state is the real crime. In discipline, a punishment is only one element of double system.

"He has also described the process where by those disciplinary structures have informed the way that other power-relations are lined out in the wider contexts of school, churches and military institutions. So the individual learns to discipline themselves on learn self-discipline through notion they are potentially under surveillance" (35).

The above lines shows the institutions are the instruments through which power is exercised under the term discipline.

The Justification of Power: Truth, Knowledge and Subjectivity

The power exists only as exercised by some on others. Knowledge is linked to power, not it only assumes the authority of "truth" but the power to make itself true as already said. The truth of knowledge is not in the absolute sense, but of discursive. Formation sustaining a regime of truth. Discourse themselves are the bearers of various subject positions. The subject produced within the discourse, is subjected to discourse. We must locate ourselves in the positions from which the discourse makes most sense, and then becomes its "subject" by subjecting ourselves to its meaning, power and regulation Foucault's stress on the operation of power through discursive regime-opens up the possibility of analyzing the power-relation which function at the construction of images.

"Truth is linked in the circular relation with system of power which produces and sustain it and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it, a regime of truth (1145).

Truth is the product of relation of power and of the system in which it flows, and it changes as system changes. The same subject is constituted historically itself

and cannot be presumed as truth in genealogical account while talking Foucault says Truth is to be understood as a system of ordered procedure for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements.

The form of power categories the individual marks him his own individuality attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him that he must recognize and others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power that makes individual subject. There are two meanings of the subject one is control and another is dependence,. The subject is constituted out of the power-relation,. "Knowledge is often the product of the subjection of objects or perhaps it can be seen as the process through which subjects are constituted" (18).

In today's world the struggle against the Forms of subjection is against the submission of society. The mechanism of subjection cannot be studied outside their relations to the mechanism of exploitation and domination.

"Power and knowledge is not the detection of false or spurious knowledge at work in human affairs but, rather, the role of knowledge that are value and effective because of their reliable instrument efficacy (26).

In this way the power is linked with truth, knowledge and subjectivity.

III. Dichotomy of Irrationality and Rationality as a Device in *Catch-22*

Trap of Irrational Rules and Principles

The term catch-22 in this novel *Catch-22* refers to a catch in the military regulation that prevents the bombardier from being grounded and sent home. Catch-22 is a practice of power by some handful elite people by using their instrumental power of false rationality. It is a trap of power in which the bombardiers find themselves in a chained condition. The hero of the novel, Yossarian is chained under such the power structure of society. His position before the deadly inhuman bureaucracy of military establishment is meaningless which threatens human life more insidiously than the battle itself. The clause Catch-22 has no consideration for the rational mind or concern for own safety. Catch 22 is the logical infallibility that makes one fellow in endless circle of nonsense. Any one who is sensible is lost on the swamp of incomprehensibility. Many individuals knowledge depends upon just a few people. "You mean there's a catch." Doc Daneeka replied. "*Catch-22* Anyone who wants to get out of combat duty isn't really crazy" (62).

In the world of chaos if one is concerned for Own's safety s/he is not taken to be irrational. *Catch-22* is introduced as a military rule, no matter it is self-contradictory. It is a rule to send the people in to war where sacrifice is made essential into the name of many persuasive issues like patriotism and honour. It prevents anyone from avoiding combat mission. This types of *Catch-22* is double binding. The following lines show:

There was only one catch, and that was catch-22, which specified that concern for own safety in the face of danger that were real and immediate was the process of a rational mind. Orr was crazy and could be grounded. All he had to do was ask; and as soon as he did, he would

no longer be crazy and would have the fly more mission. Orr would be crazy to fly more mission and sane if he didn't, but if he was sane he had to fly them. If he flew them he was crazy and didn't have to; but if he didn't want to he was sane and had to. Yossarian was moved very deeply by the absolute simplicity of this clause catch 22 and let out a respectful whistle. "There is some catch that is Catch-22," he observed. 'It's best there is, 'Daneeka agreed.'" (62-63)

The above extracts shows much of the Heller's prose in *Catch-22* in circular and repetitive, exemplifying in its form the structure of *Catch-22*. Heller reveals in the use of paradox. *Catch-22* stands as a symbol of relation of power, relation that exists even if they are nowhere put down in writing, and it is these relations that are responsible for the misery and senseless death of million and millions of people. In essence, Heller is pointing to the fundamental nature of modern politics, in spite of all talk of democracy and freedom.

Catch-22 rule is used to help the soldiers' superior propel them to power and authority. Heller wants to portray that it is only through feign rationality – that the Generals, Colonels, and Majors of the military will get more power and control over the soldiers and citizenry. Without catch-22 rule, they will not have the invincibility of ordering the soldiers to undergo flying mission. Without catch-22 the war will not be fought even though all the soldiers realize that they are fighting a senseless and baseless war. The following lines show.

Yossarian says 'Then I can go home right? I've forty-eight.'

'No, you can't go home,' ex P. F.C. Wintergreen corrected him. 'Are you crazy or something?'

'Why not?'

'Catch-22'

Catch-22? 'Yossarian was stunned," what the hell has catch-22 got to do with it? (78)

Reason no longer exists and it is not respected, reason tells the soldiers the war is senseless but the irrational rules and principles of the military institution keep them following such rules and regulations. Even though the targeted mission is finished the another numberless missions have to be finished by the juniors. This is the predicament of soldiers. The highly posted military officers teach them to be brave, selfless and patriotic. Confining within a very narrow limits of knowledge the military officials try to control the junior soldiers.

To take personal benefits how the way of power is exercised that is given, such as Milo says,' We're at war, he said, 'And there's no use complaining about the number of missions we have to fly. If the Colonel says we have to fly fifty missions we have to fly them" (86).

For the purpose of continuing his business Milo says that the superior's order should be followed. He says Yossarian to follow the rules of Catch-22. Although within the superiors there is struggle of power. That type of struggle is possible when the common people are used or exploited as far as possible. That the following lines show:

'National defense is everybody's job,' Captain Black replied to Milo's objection, "And this whole programme is voluntary, Milo-don't forget that. The men don't have to sign Piltchard and wren's Loyalty Oath if they don't want to. But we need you to starve them to death if they don't. It is just like catch 22. Don't you get it? You're not against catch-22, are you?' (22-149)

The person who doesn't have love to the people talks about the nationality. The catch-22 rule is common everywhere. Due to the jealousy of position Captain Black applies the irrational rules. Apparently "The Loyalty Oath Crusade" is beautiful, rational and sensible but its behaviours are targeted to satisfy the hunger of power. Therefore it is irrational. The following lines clarify:

"Sure, I can ground you by filling out a slip saying you're unfit to fly.

But there is catch."

'Catch-22'?

"Sure. If I take you off combat duty, Group has to approve my action, and group isn't going to. They'll put you right back on combat status, and then where will I be? On my way to the Pacific Ocean, probably,

No thank you, I am not going to take any chances for you. (223)'

Yossarian's request for medical slip from the doctor is to prove that he is not fit to go to the war that is possible by the doctor's slip. But the circle of Catch-22 rule never gives such chances. This shows how power is circulated by the military system and how bad the social structure is ! This Catch-22 creates the man's relates the mains role in a horrific society. The common individual's hope to survive is made difficult by such rules.

There is no love, no humanity, no reason even the Soldier In White is fed his own urine (217). The individual has no value like other animals. It is a system covered by veil feigning control, order and mastery but which reveals beyond smoke and mirrors a wrapped, distorted, self-sustaining and myopic existence.

'Catch-22 the old women repeated, rocking her head up and down.

Catch-22 says they have a right to do anything we can't stop them from doing. 'What the hell are you talking about?' Yossarian shouted at her

in bewildered furious protest. "How did you know it was catch-22?
Who the hell told you it was catch-22?" (514)

The old woman tells Yossarian that everyone has been driven away because of the catch-22. In the eternal beautiful city in which the officers enjoyed themselves the apartment with lots of beautiful women has now come a hell overrun by military police. The war done by catch-22 theory has taken away most of the men, and many of the women have turned to prostitution are how being driven away. Yossarian comes to realize that catch 22 doesn't really exist, but that because the powers that be claim it does and world believes that it does, it nevertheless has potent effects. Indeed, because it doesn't really exist no way it can be repeated, undone, overthrown or denounced. The combination of brute force with specious legalistic justification is one of the books primary motifs.

This novel is about bureaucracy and it closes with a absolute triumph of organizational values, leaving the individual with only a single option. To conform or to flee.

The nonsensical craziness of bureaucrats trap individual into a situation of shocking horror. It reflect the ultimate evil of bureaucracy and a world that embraces such a system.

The novel has disjointed plot line because of the Heller's purpose is to disgust the irrational rules and principles made by bureaucracy,. A true catch-22 is a locked loop, where we can't be in one of the two states for instance. If we are in A we are allowed to be in B, but by moving to state B, we disqualify ourselves form remaining in that state. It is a constrain where escape is impossible. Heller makes his statement through people who are dominated by the world. An individuals identity is not beyond the discursive formation communicated by them.

The novel is divided into 42 chapters., This is not in a linear order. The large numbers of characters are significant to justify the novel. Many characters are indulged within power structure of the society.

Wake man writes, " Heller argues that he was concerned to attack not only the absurdity of war, but in general the humbug, hypocrisy, cruelty and sheer stupidity of mass society' (630)

Above critics target of satire is not only war. He criticizes the irrationality of mass' society. Such society always uses the system of double binding in which victims are indulged. In this way, colonel and military doctors artfully employ vicious mechanism of Catch-22 rules on its victim.

Merill mentions, "Each (repetition) is structured as a kind of trap, for the reader is encouraged to laugh at characters and events which seem quite serious" (145).

According to Merill readers are encouraged to laugh at the characters and events. The role of characters are funny. The readers get a lot of humour. The presentation of such characters and events evokes the painful situation that the people are facing under military industrial complex:

Divid Crystal: The Anti-war plot centered on the view that U.S air men on dangerous combat mission must be considered insane, but if they seek to be relived on grounds of mental derangement, they find themselves ineligible, since such a request proves their sanity. Hence catch-22 has come to signify and logical trap of double bind. (513)

The absurd quality and mendacious qualities in many of our political leaders and business leaders are also satirized thorough the characterization of the novel *Catch-22*, therefore, the dichotomy of rationality and irrationality as a device to mock

the various weakness of the power holding people whose main goal in life is to only self-service ignoring the many lives of the people. The discursive entanglement of the individual shows how power in society is extended.

Struggle of Individuals Against the Power of Society

The reason and non reason, logicity and illogicality. Sanity and insanity are the terms defined by the society. The society goes on to exercise such complex power relation in every aspects of social, cultural and political lives. Such discursive practice is still in existence which tries to define the individual. In Catch-22 many individuals struggle against the constraints that is exercised by the power of society. To illustrate all these issues the following characters are inevitable to describe.

Yossarian:

For Yossarian life is more important than his country. His approach to life is that everyone lives for himself/herself alone. Yossarian, like all of us, is chained by rationality that has been stripped of reasons, engineered thus for the purpose of control. Yossarian knows that these people are out to kill him simply by being indifferent to the fact that he risks his life. Colonel Cathcart, his mission controller, continuous to raise the number of missions that his pilot must fly in order to back home. He tries to hide in the hospital, complaining of a pain in his liver an illness in his jaw and a number of other illness but in the end it doesn't change anything, he is still under their control and is dancing at the end of string no more than the part of their machine. In the beginning he says:

'They are trying to kill me,' Yossarian told him calmly. 'No one is trying to kill you,' Clevinger cried then why are they shooting at me?'
'Yossarian asked.'

'They are shooting at everyone, Clevinger answered.' They're trying to kill everyone'.

'And what difference does that make?' (26)

Yossarian's main concern is the idea that people are trying to kill him. His suspicion becomes full-blown paranoia when he finds out, because of Air Force Red Tape, he can't leave. By taking issues like patriotism and honor, many people are led to accept catch-22. They are being lied by abusive bureaucratic society which Yossarian never accepts as legitimate./rational answer to his complaints. Further the following lines evoke, "Do you really mean that it's not my business how or why I get killed and that it is Colonel Cathcart? Do you really mean that" (161).

Yossarian for the first time takes direct action against the military to stop flying more missions. This step shows his coming rejection to not to fly more missions. Yossarian's conversation reveals his refusal to conform power structure of the society, whose main interest is to survive. The misery is that individual is less important than the society. The power structure of society even does unjust work.

"All right," Colonel Cathcart decided, 'We'll give him a medal for being borne enough to go around over the targeted twice, we'll make him a captain" Whether any military effective action is taken does not matter as long as Colonel Catchcart earns the honor" (277).

Colonel Cathcart is in trouble for failing to destroy the bridge at Ferrara for an entire week. He blames Yossarian, who took evasive action on the first round, although the other missed the target on the first round and it was Yossarian who hit the bridge on the second try. Yossarian suggests that Colonel Cathcart cover up this humiliation by giving Yossarian medal for going around twice and promoting him to

Captain Colonel Cathcart which Korn agree as is a good cover up and promise to do it. The clearance is found in these lines:

'That I have flown enough missions and can go home,'

'How many have you flown?'

'Fifty one"

'You have only got four more to fly

'He'll raise them. Every time I get close he raises them". (135)

The above conversation between Major and Yossarian shows the unjust order of colonel cathart who continuously raises the number of missions.

Yossarian tells the Major that he will not fly more mission. The confused Major does not know what to tell Yossarian and apologies but insists him just to follow Colonel Cathcart's order. It disregards the choice of individual. Heller shows the gap between exploiter or exploited. Such theme of struggle is a thread which holds the novel together. To the military system soldiers are not people, they are just uniforms. Therefore Yossarian in the following line shows unusual actions to react such irrational systems:

'Why aren't you wearing clothes, Yossarians I don't want to

I don't want to:

'What do you mean you don't want to? Why the hell don't you want to?

I just want to sir (277)

He pretends to be irrational because it is the best rational way to get out of the combat duty. It means he doesn't accept such type of system created by the superior people. He also hates General Peckem. When he awards Yossarian the *Distinguished Flying Cross*, he demands to know why Yossarian is naked, Colonel Cathcart becomes upset, but General Dreedle declares that he approves of it simply because General Peckem

wants everyone to wear their uniform, so they look good when they are killed. This notion of misuse of power lessens an individual's hope to survive in the world. The individual is considered to be meaningless here. Each man is locked into a system that compels him to suffer no matter how, when, where there the death takes place,. To fake of being irrational is a kind of rationality against the fake rational world where no value of sensibility is practiced, recognized and maintained.

Yossarian is naked and show unusual behaviours. This line Yossarian tells to Milo. "It is the tree of life' Yossarian answered Wagglng his toe, and of knowledge of good and evil too" (333).

Being naked, Yossarian is able to hold on to his rationality while trying to fight his way through the irrational military officers trying to kill him. It is against the, so called society' morality, rationality and rule. Therefore, Yossarian refuses to conform the institutional patterns. He wants to establish his individual identity. For instance, Nurse Duckett says:

'Are you crazy? She scolded virtuously, shaking an indignant finger in front of his eyes'. 'I suppose you just don't care if you kill yourself, do you?'

'It's my leg.'

It certainly isn't your leg! Nurse crammer retorted. This leg belongs to the U.S government It's no different than a gear or bedpan. The Army has invested a lot of people to make you an airplane pilot, and you've no right to disobey the doctors' order's. (370)

Catch-22. The governing rule in this novel, is an illogical and irrational power that doesn't assume his existence. Group plays the vital role to determine the fortune of individual. This shows the condition of juniors. Society takes individual just for the

sake of society. Society manipulates individuals within the Frame of it's own structure. The catch is used as justification for violation of human rights,. The catch means whatever they (the system) want, they can grasp. Characters are persuaded to believe in the system rather than to oppose it.

The story is told through the voice of Captain Joseph Yossarian. He is one of the sane men in the novel, who sees all of the impossible situation his squadron is placed in. Catch-22 is unwritten loophole is every written law which empowers the authority to do anything whether it is right or wrong. There is the absolute evil in a malevolent, mechanical and incompetent world. Such Catch-22 justice is mocked when the innocent Yossarian is victimized.

Yossarian's reminiscence of Snowden shows the physical identity of soldiers:

'I am cold', Snowden said again in a frail, childlike voice. 'I am cold.

'There, there,' Yossarian said, because he didn't know 'what else to say
'there, 'there,'

'I am cold, Snowden whimpered, 'I'm cold,

'There, there, there, there. (551)

The presentation of Snowden's death can be seen several places in this novel. Yossarian treats Snowden with compassion and empathy. He tries to comfort Snowden who is cold. Yossarian has become Snowden while his life is not as endangered as Snowden is. Snowden comes to represent the soldier whose physical identity has been destroyed. The existing life of an individual is made sufferable by so called rational people. The individual vs. the system and loss of individuality is the recurring theme in Catch-22. These recurring of ideas are knitted in this novel. The presentation of character like Yossarian is to show the role of an individual in the society.

At the end of the novel, the individual has triumphed against the institution because he is no longer afraid of the punishment that the institution uses as a deterrent against such behaviour:

'How do you Feel, Yossarian?'

'Fine', No I am very Frightened:

'That's good, said Major Danby. It proves you're still alive. It want be fun.

'Yossarian started out. Yes it will,'

'I mean Yossarian, You'll have to keep on your toes very minute of every day. They'll bend heaven and earth to catch you.'

'I'll keep on my toes every minute.'

'You'll have to jump.'

'I'll jump'

'Jump ! Major Danby cried. (570)

When Yossarian realizes that he has no other choices and decides to actively face the consequences of becoming a deserter, he is rejecting the status of being vegetable and establishes his identity of an individual. Although he may indeed be caught or punished by the military bureaucracy, that the above conversation indicates. What does it indicate?

Yossarian is faking of being irrational to get out of the military and when he doesn't succeed, he eventually succumbs to irrational in reality, as this is the best alternative than living and witnessing its disappointments. Only Yossarian is able to hold his irrationality while trying to fight his way through the irrational military officials. Yossarian is irrational. the power holding officers are rational because of the legalized power. But this novel cuts the line between rational and irrational. For

evidence the Robert Brustein says, "It is the triumph of Mr. Heller's skill that he is so quickly able to persuade that the most lunatic are most logical" (2).

Yossarian can be taken as the hero who has acted upon the corruption that he saw in military system. In fact Hero becomes someone who can preserve his sanity despite the constraints created by the power of society, there the flux of irrationality and rationality as a device is to expose the unexposed.

Yossarian's Faking illness in the hospital, His censuring letter's signing them *Washington Irving*, His memories of Snowden, his relation with psychotic Hungry Joe, the amateur war profiteer Milo minder binder, and the spoiled, idealistic Nately his relationship with his best friend, Danber, Chaplin Mc Watt, Orr and others. His struggle with Colonel Cathcart Captain Black. To relieve his tension the behaviour like sleeping, drinking, the relation with the prostitute, Nately abusing towards him. All these events show that Yossarian is not satisfied in such lunatic and irrational world.

Yossarian is convinced to follow the order of superiors. The medal that his superior want to give him. For the purpose of continuing war.

B.B.C. on lines quotes the short summary said by Joseph Heller "Everyone in my book accuses everyone else of being crazy, Frankly I think the whole society is nuts; the question is what does a sane man do in an insane society". (2)

In the world of irrationality no human being is taken sensibly. This shows how society imposes order, how society confirm, accepts and procures the insanity, a mortality and irrationality. To illustrate, Yossarian is exemplary character in this novel.

Chaplin

Chaplin is one of the symbolical characters of repression. He is an innocent individual who is constrained by the authority of the cruel world. He is kind, weak willed but firmly believes in trying to save human life, particularly Yossarian's. He longs for his wife and doesn't sleep with the various prostitutes to satiate his physical desire. He is displaced from this insane world of war. Chaplin feels safe when he is in the officers club with Yossarian and Danber. Colonel Cathcart tries to give plum tomato to trap Chaplin. Colonel Catchcart persuades Chaplin.

Colonel Cathcart says, "That's another one of things that's wrong with you. That long face of yours get everybody depressed, let me a belly laugh, now I will give you a whole bushel of plum tomato" (280).

The saying is nice but by creating such falsity Colonel Cathcart wants to take advantage. The discourse of persuasion is created. The discourse is related to trap the individual like chaplain. Apparently it is pleasant but ultimately it is nothing more than the deception from irrational Colonel Catchcart,

"Why'd you steal it from Colonel Cathcart if you didn't want it?"

"Then why are you so guilty, if you didn't steal it?"

"I am not guilty!" (485)

The irrational motives and attitudes is clear in this novel where the plot of tomato episode destroys the humanity and human desire to be free from the power of society which weakens the rationality. It is abuse of power because Chaplin gets punishment. even though he didn't steal plum tomato.

He is accused that the following lines evokes:

'We charge you formally with being Washington Irving and taking capricious and unlicensed liberties in censoring the letters of officers and enlisted men, "Are you guilty or innocent?

'Innocent sir 'The Chaplain licked dry lips with a dry tongue and leaned forward in suspense on the edge of his chair.'

Guilty; said the colonel

Guilty" said the Major

Guilty it is, then 'Remarked the officers without insignia, and wrote on a page in the folder, 'Chaplain', 'he continued looking up,' we accuse you also of the commission of crimes and infractions we don't even know about yet, Guilty or innocent." (487)

He is accused of faking his handwriting Since it doesn't match the signature written by Yossarian. The Chaplain protest against such stupidity but the Colonel shoves him back down and tells him to shut up. If he is within the discourse of the upholding officers during the time of victimization, as an individual he only understand himself in the term of discourse allows. The innocent individual believes and confirm to the authority that the discourse draws upon him. The truth is created by them through the exercise of power with the circulation of discourse.

The inquiring Major presents various documents containing statements made against him mostly by Colonel Cathcart. They declare that he doesn't believe in God against the law and his opposition against the insincere condolence letters. Despite his declaration of innocence they say he is guilty and order him to leave while they decide on his punishment. The Chaplain flees and meets Colonel Cathcart. He protest against the mission which killed many who already finished their required number of missions.

Institutional Power Circulates Discourse

The communal opinions or collective representation imposes the role of individual in *Catch-22*. There are many institutions which are irrational even though they have positions or status in the society.

Medical Institution

The men are seeking to avoid actual injury of death by pretending to be ill. The doctors are fail to realize that men are faking their illness. It is seen medicine as a science that is almost barbaric and not exact. Heller writes of how the men of the squadron used the hospital as a way out of the battle. The novel *Catch-22* itself begins in the hospital where Yossarian is faking jaundice of the liver in order to avoid battle. Heller address the barbarism of medicine with Doc Daneeka's aids. He writes them painting people gums and feet violet in order to ward off illness. The following line shows the irrationality of Doc Daneeka's "It is terrible thing. When even the word of licensed physican is suspected by the country he loves" (56).

The incompetent doctor says himself as responsible fellow. More over, his talks with patriotism is humorous. He supports the system by not grounding any of the aircrews, but then system turns him and basically destroys him despite his loyalty.

Doc Daneeka was making lot of money by taking patients of other drafted doctors; he feels that his problem are infinitely worse than anyone else. He is basically the tool of army. The following lines illustrates the doctor's work.

"That's just what I'm trying to tell you, goodammit. I am asking you to save my life. "It's not my business to save lives.

Doc Daneeka retorted sullenly.

What is your business?

'I don't know what my business is. (224)

The profession of a doctor shows that he is nothing more than the tool of army. He prefers him dead alive,. The doctor's fate appears to illustrate the capricious impersonal attitude of bureaucratic system.

Loyalty Oath Crusade

It is an institution in which the Captian Black is the leader. He takes advantage of ongoing war to drive his glorious Loyalty Oath Compagain. Each time someone wants intelligence information from him, he has to sign a loyalty oath. His main intention is that other should not compete with him. If anyone complains, he points out those are moral and loyal to their country will want to sign the oath and sign the star spangled banner. Though he refuses to let Major Major sign the oath and then accuses him of being communist. Captian Black uses patriotism as an excuse to coerce his will upon the men. According to Captain Black, one can persecute people about anything. People have to swear and disclaim communism to get knife, fork, spoon but the main point wasn't to allow Major Major to sign so he could be ostracized. Black's bile was because Major had been made squadron commander Black says "From now in I'm going to make every son of bitch who comes to my intelligence tent sign a Loyalty Oath. And I am not going let that bastard Major, Major Sing on even if he wants to" (147).

The end of Glorious Loyalty Oath is particularly ironic. The basic denials of the food unless they sign the oath makes no sense to Major de coverley. Captain Black bring upon his own destruction when he invites Major de coverley. His conduct of such intuition is one of the example of irrationality. Such person says, "National defuse is everybody's job" (149).

M. M. Enterprises

Another institution which is led by Milo Minderblinder. Milo is the spirit of capitalism as well embodiment of its False consciousness. He is exemplar of the logic of capitalism and its irrationality. Milo runs a black-market syndicate in which he claims everyone gets the profits. Milo minder binder decides to act out on the principles that US was supposedly defending in the war to stand his own business of buying or selling. To conduct the black market he paraphrase Henry Ford's famous statements" What is good for M. M. Enterprise is good for the country's as he has not allegiance to any country, person or principles unless it pays him. His most interesting attributes are his complete, mercenary a morality and irrational logic in the operation of his enterprises. Milo travels across the world mainly in Mediterranean, in process of buying and selling through black market channels. Milo says:

The syndicate benefits when I benefit, 'Milo explained, 'because everybody has a share. And the syndicate gets Colonel Cathcart's and Colonel Korn's support so they'll let me go out on trips like this one. You'll see how much profit that can mean in about Fifteen minute when we land in Palermo. (295)

Milo's claim that all the actions of the syndicate are beneficial for everyone. By circulating such discourse who develops a trading "syndicate" out of which he make huge profits. Such man talks about democracy which is ironical. "In a democracy, the government is the people" Milo explained we're people aren't we? (329).

Troubles have arisen at the same time. Milo's purchase of Egyptian Cotton is causing M.M. Enterprise to go bankrupt because there is no market for it. Milo resolves this issues by having his plane bomb his own outfit and destroy the cotton.

This creates fury among the women, children and decent people. Milo calms down, them, by pointing out with that he can reimburse the government for the damage.

Milo in many ways resembles Colonel Cathcart, especially in his attitude towards men's lives. This truth is underscored, when at the end of the book, Milo and Colonel unite together to run the syndicate. "And the government does have the responsibility of buying all the Egyptian cotton 'I've got that no one else wants so that I can make a profit doesn't it?" (327).

Whatever he says his main intention is to get incredibly profitable income. It portrays how the capitalist society marginalize the other peoples goodness. Here power is only for himself not for the country. The person who does not have any sense of patriotism says democracy, which is irrational. If he is responsible why many men are being killed in own squadron? In the name of business he wants to falsify the people and to get profit as far as possible.

Military

In this institution The higher rank of military people are irrational and highly illogical. One of them is Colonel Catchcart who is rude and very obsessed with becoming general. He does what ever to please his superiors, particularly by raising the number of missions the men have to fly to complete a tour of duty, beyond that normally ordered by other outfits. He doesn't trust anyone but sees Colonel Korn as his closet ally. He decides to utilize religious practices to fulfill his goal, Colonel Cathcart is an industrious, intense, dedicated military tactician who calculates day and night in the service of himself.

He elaborates the prying, "look how much good they've done for these people in England. Here is a picture of a Colonel in "The Saturday Evening post whose Chaplin conducts prayers before each missions. If the prayers work form him, they

should work for us. May be if we say prayers, they'll put my pictures in The Saturday Evening Post" (243). He tries to create morality, truth and meaning through discourse as if he is religious leader. The pretension of being religious leader is the one of the elements of false leaders. He is one of the false military leaders. The following lines shows his religiosity.

"We were speaking about conducting religious services in the briefing room before each mission. Is there any reason why can't?" (245).

The Colonel Cathcart performs very irrational acts. He offers a plum tomato to Chaplain persuasively later the accusation towards him shows how power is practised by elite man. The dangerous circulation of power through false discourse of rationality of catch-22 prevails over a simple reason. The officers wants to victimize the Chaplain. 'Hello, Colonel, Colonel (the Chaplain) claims you gave him that plum tomato. Did you?

"Why should I gave him a plum tomato? Answered Colonel Cathcart" (484). The unknown force of military bureaucracy slowly crushes the will to live and love of life. The catch 22 situation employed by the higher rank military officer make the every individual like Chaplain. The Chaplain consider himself as a weak man who wants to fight for his beliefs, but he is afraid of disobeying a superior officer.

Cathcart rightly make list of "feathers in his cap", and "black eyes(270). The power of catch 22 is also represented in the character of Colonel Catchcart, as he consists entirely of irresonsible opposition and maintain an illogical thought process that echoes the catch. Colonel Cathcart is political doublespeak often contradictory what he says which is right. Usually when a superior officers disagree with him when Yossarian is caught Awol in Rome, Cathcart is eager to have Yossarian court martial and imprisoned. The following critic talks about the military weakness. James D. Hart

examines, "American Squadron on Mediterranean island satirizes military illogicality and glorification" (326).

Using tableau of characters with varying roles Heller shows the handful military officers who hold the callous institutions. He presents the military whose way to succeed is to humiliate and put down others. Therefore military's saying and doing is absolutely different.

Special Service

General Peckem is the head of special services. He cares only for bureaucratic power in the organization. For him combat operation could be more special. He says general schieskopf. "Don't be such as scheisskopf. People have a right to do anything that isn't forbidden by law and there is no against the law against lying to you. Now, don't even waste my time with such sentimental platitude again Don't you hear? (407)

The name special service is to serve the need of the people but it is not for the people. His special service is to expand the combat activities.

As long as they don't interfere with main assignment of recommending that the authority of special services be expanded to include combat activities"(410). It determines what can and what can't be said within a particular discursive formation. General Pekem is one of such officers who seek to glorify at the expense of other lives. He begins to discuss with Colonel Scheisskopf the issues of bomb patterns. 'A bomb pattern is a term. I dreamed up just several weeks ago. It means nothing, but you'd be surprised at how readily its caught on why I've got all sorts of people convinced I think it is important for he bomb to explode close together and make a neat aerial photograph" (411).

From such activities it is clear that those institutions are against the many people and irrationality is pervasive throughout the book. For instance critic says

"Heller's mordent intelligence penetrates the surface of the merely funny to expose a world of ruthless self advancement, gruesome cruelty and flagerant disregard for human life. A world very much like our own as seen through magnifying glass, distorted for perfect accuracy (30).

Here Brustein interprets the nature of modern society's irrational institutions. Who to constrain the individual to fulfill only for self-satisfaction. The superior officer believes in the complex logic, mind games and hilarious "leg pulls".

Robert Young writes, "persecution is rampant, the pointless the better, as are blackmail, intimidation, caprice and malice. The best persecution of all is, of course to endanger people to the point of death by raising the member of missions.

Here, all the activities are not in the favour of people. Those institutions are the instruments which evoke the irrationality of officers. This shows how power is exercised. Therefore dichotomy of rationality and irrationality as device to justify it.

IV. Conclusion

Catch-22 depicts the modern bureaucratic world where rational is irrational and irrational is rational. As it has been discussed in previous chapters, Joseph Heller condemns many social institutions which are conducted by superior officers. They try to perpetuate the trap on individual using their illogical and irrational laws called *Catch-22*. The book denounces the military officers who conduct war in the name of military glorification, patriotism and social system. But military officers are only aware of their self-service. Their insincere, inhuman and corrupted behaviours disregard the value of human justice.

Heller centers on the theme of rationality and irrationality on the primary factors that reinforce the implementation of the concept *Catch-22*. In highlighting the existence and prevalence of these two qualities he highlights the prevalence of these two characteristics by demonstrating an awareness of how military, business, medical and religion sector encourage these two qualities. In this text, he uses the character of American man who lives in modern society who remain unhappy, dissatisfied and is continually skeptical despite the comfortable life that he can lead living in American dream.

Heller creates the hero, is taken as one of the first characters in modern American literature to fight against powerful system. *Catch-22* is about war but it is not confined taking the issues only of war. It is more than just a war novel. It is also a novel about moral choices that every person must make when faced with a system of authority whose rules are both immoral and illogical. *Catch-22* talks about the freedom and we have the freedom to say 'no' to authority. Therefore the principle of resistance exists in the real world too. In the beginning Yossarian tries to reason with the officers to let him stop flying missions. He cannot go anywhere because they are

using irrational rules and laws. In the middle he begins to use Catch-22 and other irrational reasoning to work for him. It doesn't work because the officers just come with more. This shows the bureaucracy of the military and how little sense it makes. In the end of the novel Yossarian rejects the entire system, by refusing to fly any more missions and is given the choice to support Catch-22 and get an honourable discharge or face court martial. Yossarian decides he needs to make up his own morals and laws and he goes to Sweden. Joseph Heller does this to illustrate the loss of faith in military views of what is right. Bucking the system, Yossarian goes to create his own ethics which is simple.

The appropriateness of the title irrationality and irrationality is inevitable to brush out the world of corruption, anarchism and chaos. Society imposes such rules on individuals which control the freedom to survive with the personal choices. When Yossarian, the protagonist of the novel, is made victimized by the society it shows society is irrational. Yossarian pretends to be irrational against the irrational society. It is his rationality to struggle against the unjust system of society. Because the rule of Catch-22 is used for suppression, corruption and inhumanity. Catch-22 rules control the whole world of protagonist and other characters. Like Yossarian, many soldiers during the war have been confined by the discursive power of society. Such Catch-22 situations are not created only in war, it is created anywhere. The role of individuals is nothing in front of the society. As a result of injustice individuals take the stand of resistance. To give such a message Heller uses sarcasm and humour. Milo Minderbinder's insatiable monolithic behaviour 'what is good for M.M. Enterprises and public(s) hypocrisy' are some of the *Catch-22* most harshly ridiculed topics.

Conducting war is not sensible and rational. The novelist doesn't accept the ways of conducting war by the some handful people. He shows the situation of war in its

true form but he doesn't glorify the war. According to him or through the message of the novel it is understood that war is always death, chaos, fear and anger. War is only destruction. When people read this novel during the Vietnam war, they regarded the novel. *Catch-22* became a sort of text for the consciousness of that time. Many critics say that the fiction can't change anything but can certainly organize a generation's consciousness.

Through the dichotomy of irrationality and rationality as a device this novel can be understood the modern leaders who sit safely in secure whereas the common soldiers take all the risks, offers up their bodies for battering, endure indescribable torments in battle and often give the ultimate sacrifice of life. Joseph Heller does a wonderful job exposing the world, the world of treachery and corruptions. In such cruel world military system and social structure is in the hands of bureaucrats therefore such system is covered by veil Feigning control. The system of Chaos not created by other creature, it is created by the man who have power, positions and politics.

This novel moves from humour to horror is in fact an epiphany that reveals it how society confirms, accepts and procures the irrationality and lunacy. The socio-political system, strict rules, positions, power and politics mean nothing if the withholder has lost all sense of humanness. These things are easily graspable through the technique of the dichotomy of the irrationality and rationality as a device.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Banglore: Prism, 1999.
- Booth, Own. *What is Catch 22? And Why does the Book Matter?* 28 February, 2002.
news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/UK/1868619.stm-38K.
- Brustein, Robert, "The Logic of Survival in a Lunatic World" *Critique*. 13 November, 1961-1321.
- Collins, Harper. *Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature*. 2nd Ed. U.S.A.: Harper Collins Publishers, 2002.
- Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 513. 1992.
- D. Hart James. *The Oxford Companion to American Literature*. 5th ed. New York: Oxford, 1983, 336.
- Downing, Laura Hidalgo. *Negation as a Stylistic Feature in Joseph Heller's Catch 22*.
<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=602951&sid=38fmt=48cilentId=19371&RQt=309&vName=PQD>.
- Dreyfus, H. and Rabinow, P. *Michael Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, London: Brighton. 1982.
- Ferry, L and Renut. *French Philosophy in the Sixties*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990.
- Foucault, Michael "Truth and Power", *Critical Theory since Plato*. ed. Hazard Adams. Florida: 1982, 1145.
- - - . *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Hormondsworth: Penguin, 1987.
- - - . *History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol. 1, New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- - - . *Madness and Civilization*. New York: Vantage Books, 1988.

- - - . *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972.
- - - . *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sherdian Smith. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- - - . "The Order of Discourse." *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1990. 72.
- - - . "Subject and Power." *Essential Works of Foucault*. Trans. Robert Hurley, et al. ed. James D. Fabian New York: The New York Press, 2000. 326-348.
- - - . *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A, Sberidan Smith. London: Tavistock Publication Ltd, 1972
- Gupto, Arun. "Foucault and His analysis of History" *Healing Thoughts on Tender Theory*. Kathmandu: New Hira Books Enterprises, 2004. 113-120.
- Heller, Joseph, *Catch-22*. Great Britain: Vintage, 1994.
- Henderson, Lesley. *Contemporary Novelists*. 5th ed. Chicago and London: St. James Press, 1991.
- Hendin, Josephine. "Experimental fiction" *Harvard Guide to Contemporary American Writing*. Ed. Daniel Hoffman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970. 245.
- High, Peter. *An Outline of American Literature*. 5th ed. New York: Longman Group, Limited, 1986:197.
- Karl, Fredrick R. *American Fiction (1940-1980)*. New York: Harper and Row Publisher, 1983.
- McHoul, Alice and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. New York: New York University Press, 1897.
- Merill, Robert, *Joseph Heller*. Boston : GK Hall, 1987.
- Mill, Sara. *Discourse*. II ed. London: Routledge Taylors & Francis Group, 2004.
- Mitchell, Jullian. "Catch-22 and the Illiad". *Spectator*. 15 June, 1962. 309.

- Mr. Young Robert. *Deadly Unconscious Logic in Catch-22*. London: Amazon Books, 1993.
- Muste, John H. "A Modest Proposal and Catch-22." *Critique*. New York: OUP. 1962. 22.
- Olderman, Raymond M. "Heller Joseph." *Contemporary Literary Criticism*. Ed. Carolyn Riley Vol.3, Deteroit Gale 1975, 229-230.
- Podoretz, Norman : Looking back at catch-22<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=48445277&sid=3&Fmt=38clientId=193718RQT=3098vname=P&D>
- Rigs, Thomas. *Reference Guide to American Literature*. 4th ed. Boston: St James Press, 2001
- Ruland, Richard and Malcolom Bradbury. *From Puritinism to Postmodernism*. New York: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Scoggins, Michael. *Combat Experience of Joseph Heller*. London: Amazen Books, 1992.
- Subedi, Abhi. "Catch-22 Second Edition." *Kathmandu Post*. June 28, 2006.
- Wakeman, John. *World Author 1950-1970*. New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1975
- Webster, Marriam. *Marriam Webster's Dictionary of American Writers*. U.S.A.: Springfiled, 2001. 192.