ABSTRACT

This article attempts to explore how Bhupi Serchan destabilizes the conventionally established official history of Nepal and efforts to rewrite a true history of the margins raising the voice of the voiceless and choice of the choiceless through his poem Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Itihas (I Think My Country's History is a Lie). It also analyzes Serchan’s concerns on the rulers’ hypocrisies, pomposities, immoralities, atrocities, follies, fopperies, tyrannies and corrupt discriminatory attitudes concealed in the history with the false consciousness of patriotism, nationalism and morality in the formally recorded history by the power-holders. This article shows Serchan’s critical analysis and revisiting of history in favour of the margins leading to a moral, just, equal and humane advanced society. It also projects how the poet exposes the falsities of the so-called true history displaying the helplessness, dumbness and deafness of the great people in the form of the statue and even of the god in the steeple of the temples. Serchan's endeavor to prove the Nepalese official history totally false projecting the true picture of the people and society engulfed in hunger, thirst, poverty, corruption, injustice, inequality, helplessness, humiliation and lack everywhere making whole life hellish has been highlighted in the paper. It also depicts the poet's feeling of distrust, disgust, and mockery at the traditional Nepalese history after his total observation of the suffering people, dilapidated buildings, dim and dark streets and dwellings, deteriorated and silenced statues of the great men and shattered dreams and souls of the national heroes. The new-historicist ideas of Michel Foucault, Stephen Greenblatt and Catherine Gallagher have been used to revisit history in order to remake it. This research is historically significant for its attempt to highlight on the need of rewriting history of people and nations including the excluded.

INTRODUCTION

This research paper highlights on Nepalese revolutionary and deconstructionist writer Bhupi Sherchan's appeal and attempt for revisiting history of modern Nepal in order to rewrite history from the perspective of the marginalized and otherized people and thereby dismantling the power-generated official history. History is, all of us believe, a record of the facts and literature the fictional expression. It means history is supposed to be the reflection of the real events that happened in the past while literature is taken as the expression of inner feelings and the product of human imagination. Therefore, history is considered to be objective and literature fictitiously subjective. This is the traditional historicist claim and the belief. But, the new-historicists such as Michel Foucault, Stephen Greenblatt and Catherine Gallagher reverse what the traditional historicists claim and believe. They strongly subvert the hierarchical difference between history and literature putting forward the notion of “historicization of the text and textuality of the history” (Montrose, Redrawing: 410). They claim that ‘history can be fiction and fiction can be history’ as history is written by the victors ignoring the defeated and historicizing the perspective in their own favour, while literature is history for the marginalized people who cannot write their history but fictionalize their realities. It shows how ‘history is not written by pen but by gun’ which blurs the gap between history and fiction.

New historicism rejects any kind of essentialism as it raises the voice of the voiceless. In this regard, Jan R. Veenstra (1995) utters: “The New Historicism is characterized by a unanimous rejection of any form of essentialist humanism which regards man as an autonomous free transcendental essence. The human self is a construct, not an essence” (p. 180). History is not the record of past facts rather it is the products of the interests of the mainstream. John Brannigan in New Historicism and cultural materialism (1998) explains “how New Historicism understands the stories of the past as society's way of constructing a narrative which unconsciously fits its own interests” (as cited in Hickling 2018, p.30). History self-consciously deconstructs as it is context-dependent. In Foucault and the New Historicism, Geoffrey Gait Harpham (1991) mentions, “History works insistently against the specificity of history” (p. 74). New historicism redefines both history and literature. In Poetics Today (2004), Sonja Laden claims, “It redefines both text and history while simultaneously redefining the relationship between a text and history” (1).

It is needless to say that the powerful and the conquerors write history in their own favour. History is textual and text is historical. New Historicists locate the context of the text to recover repressed and mute histories of the text and investigate the bond between historical and cultural connotations of the text to trigger the reader’s cultural recurrently refurbishing the “marvelous at the

---

1 Faculty of Tribhuvan University, Department of English, Nepal
* Corresponding author’s email: dhungel.nabaraj60@gmail.com
heart of the resonant” (Greenblatt, 1990 as cited in Raj 2015, p 214). Chung-Hsiung Lai (2006) in “Limits and Beyond: Greenblatt, New Historicism and a Feminist Genealogy” mentions: “In Louis Montrose’s most famous dictum, the new orientation to history in literary studies may be characterized as a dynamic dialogue between literature and history and it has a reciprocal concern with the historicity of texts and the textuality of history” (p. 2). Likewise, in The New Historicism (1989), Harold Aram Veeseer projects: History, in the post-modern era, has been regarded as a discourse constructed by a “literary imagination” and “power relations,” and in this sense it is ideological and subjective, always open to multiple inquiries and re-interpretation. Flourishing in the 80’s, New Historicism, mainly based on Foucault’s theories, and offered just such a critique of history. (p. 37) History is an ideology as it is produced by imagination and power relations. In “Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture,” Montrose (1989) defends new historicism as a practice that recognizes the “the historicity of texts and the textuality of history” (p. 23). For him, history is a text and text is a history. For Foucault history is the complex inter-relationship of a variety of discourses, the various ways, artistic, social, political and so on that people think and talk about their world. History, as Greenblatt notes, is one of the West’s dominant modes of representation. It is itself an exercise of power and cannot be appealed to some pure outside or “context” which could adjudicate a conflicting field of representation. The narratives of history are just further ways of creating borders, boundaries and exclusions. Gallagher and Greenblatt in Practicing New Historicism (2000) assert: “Indeed, it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain a clear, unambiguous boundary between what is representation and what is event. At the very least, the drawing or maintaining of that boundary is itself an event” (p. 15). Representation and the real event are confusingly integrated by power. Gabrielle Spiegel (1990) acclaims: “New Historicists point to the culturally specific nature of texts as products of particular periods and discursive formations, while viewing reality—history—as itself mediated by linguistic codes which it is impossible for the critic/historian to bypass in the recuperation of past cultures” (as cited in Raj 2015, p.213). New historicists combine text and the context. History and literature are opposite as traditionally claimed. As both history and literature can be interpreted and reinterpreted according to the context and necessity, they are similar. Moreover, both are the products of the society reflected through the minds of the writers. In both disciplines, the writers attempt to create and spread certain discourses aesthetically or informatively.

‘Modern Nepal’s history is the history of the royal monarchs’ beginning from King Prithvi Narayan Shah. It is recorded in history that Shah unified different estates and made one Nepal with great trouble, sacrifice, effort and struggle. ‘Mera sana dukhale arjyako muluk haina sabailai chetana vaya’ (This state is formed with great diligence; everyone should be aware of it), says Prithvi Narayan Shah. Therefore, he is worshipped as the father of the Nation even today by some of the regressive forces. The kings of Nepal were considered as the incarnation of Lord Vishnu who is the savior of humankind. During the monarchy, they were beyond the law, court and the parliament glorifying them as more than god. And, anyone speaking against their autocracy, oppression and unnecessary deification and for democracy, freedom, equality and human rights in true sense, was declared to be the terrorist and brutally murdered. Bhupi Sherchan (1936-1989) in his poem Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Itihas (I Think My Country’s History is a Lie) challenges the conventionally written history factualizing the fictional aspects imposing power. The history glorifying the rulers and the discourse and truth created by them is not the truth but a lie for Sherchan. Questioning the history of the mainstream, Sherchan revolutionizes the history of the people in the margin through his poem.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study is a library-based literary research and therefore, textual analysis (qualitative) method has been used here. Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Itihas (I Think My Country’s History is a Lie) by the Nepalese poet Bhupi Sherchan is the basic text for analysis. The poem dismantles the traditional history of the kings and rulers that was written by the power to exercise power. The so-called history of the country-Nepal is well-off, united, symphonic and glorious; rulers are saviors; monarchy is the symbol of national unity; it is the land of national heroes and martyrs; it is religiously and culturally rich; Nepali people are brave and patriotic - is nothing more than a lie for Sherchan.

**Theoretical Background**

As the research attempts to explore how Bhupi Sherchan dares to rewrite the history from the margin in order to institute the equality-based humanitarian just society dismantling the power-written history using literature as the weapon to fight against the discourse created by the oppressors and to depict the realities of the people, the new-historicist ideas of Michel Foucault, Stephen Greenblatt and Catherine Gallagher have been used. Traditional historicism focuses on whatness whereas new historicism on howness of the events. Lui Tyson in Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide (2006) writes: “Traditional historians ask, what has happened? And what does the event tell us about history? In contrast, new historicists ask, how has the event been interpreted? And what do the interpretations tell us about the interpreters?” (p. 282). New historicism claims that history is an interpretation of interpretation. In contrary to old historians, new historians challenge upon factuality and authenticity of the history. Tyson further mentions: Traditional historians generally believe that history is
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progressive, that the human species is improving over the course of time, advancing in its moral, cultural, and technological accomplishments. For new historicists, history is strictly a matter of interpretation, not fact. There is no such thing as a presentation of facts; there is only interpretation and reliable interpretations are difficult to produce. History cannot be understood simply as a linear progression of events. At any given point in history, any given culture may be progressing in some areas and regressing in others. (p. 283)

History is not the matter of progression and regression, but it is the matter of interpretation and reinterpretation. It is not fact-based as history is written by the power centers. When a person writes history, all the information is the understanding of himself/herself. When perception differs, fact also differs. Therefore, history itself is subjective rather than it is objective.

The event and culture are interconnected and interdependent. The event emerges out of the culture and thereby affecting itself. Tyson acclaims: “Any given event is a product of its culture, but it also affects that culture in return. All events are shaped by and shape the culture in which they emerge” (p. 284). In fact, Michel Foucault has suggested that “all definitions of insanity, crime, and sexual perversion are social constructs by means of which ruling powers maintain their control” (p. 286). Tyson in Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide (2006) asserts:

New historicism deconstructs the traditional opposition between history (traditionally thought of as factual) and literature (traditionally thought of as fictional). For new historicism considers history a text that can be interpreted the same way literary critics interpret literary texts, and, conversely, it considers literary texts cultural artifacts that can tell us something about the interplay of discourses, the web of social meanings, operating in the time and place in which those texts were written. (p. 286-87)

New historicism always subverts the traditionally created gap between history and literature. History and literature are synonymous. History can be taken as literature since it is written by power-holders or subjectively recorded by the historians affected by the socio-politico-cultural circumstances; literature can be considered as history since the defeated and marginalized people write their history in literature having no power to write their own history.

New historicism stands with the historical narratives of the marginalized people presented in literature. As both history and literature tell stories of their own kind, they are matters of interpretation. But, the fact is that one needs to challenge the so-called factual and realistic history discursified by the power holders. New historicism dares to do it. Tyson acclaims:

New historicists consider both primary and secondary sources of historical information forms of narrative. Both tell some kind of story, and therefore those stories can be analyzed using the tools of literary criticism. Indeed, we might say that in bringing to the foreground the suppressed historical narratives of marginalized groups. A focus on the historical narratives of marginalized peoples has been an important feature of new historicism. (p. 287)

New historicism struggles to bring the unwritten and deleted history of the suppressed and marginalized people to the frontline through discourses and counter-discourses. Tyson projects: “On the whole, human beings are never merely victims of an oppressive society, for they can find various ways to oppose authority in their personal and public lives. No discourse is permanent. Discourses wield power for those in charge, but they also stimulate the opposition to that power” (p. 285). Discourses are the sources of power though they are created by power itself. Text and context are interconnected. It means text is the outcome of certain context. Therefore, context is not only context, it is co-text. Tyson depicts:

For new historicism, the literary text and the historical situation from which it emerged are equally important because text (the literary work) and context (the historical conditions that produced it) are mutually constitutive: they create each other. Like the dynamic interplay between individual identity and society, literary texts shape and are shaped by their historical contexts. (p. 291-292)

The literary texts can create and transform the historical contexts though they are the products of the social context itself. History is also written in some context and so is affected by society, politics and culture added by the understanding and subjectivity of the individual writer.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Ithas (I Think My Country’s History is a Lie) by Bhupi Sherchan (1936-1989) is a poem with anti-establishment ethos best representing the revolutionary spirit of the poet himself. Through the medium of literature, Sherchan promotes his counter-arguments and thereby challenging the established argument of the society. He revolutionizes literature, especially poetry, not only in style but also in content. It means he raises the voices of the voiceless with destabilizing spirit main streaming the free verse style in poetry. His literary masterpiece, the collection of poems called ‘Ghumne Mechmathi Andho Manchhe’ (A Blind Man on a Revolving Chair) was published in 1968 AD that has proved Bhupi as an “extraordinary poet” (Lamsal 2012, The Gorkhapatra). Regarding his poems, he further acclaims, “His unique style, forcible expression, simple and lucid language, clear message, sharp attack on the decayed social and cultural practices and high degree of satire have earned a high respect among the Nepali speaking population both at home and abroad” (The Gorkhapatra).

In the same spotlight, Notesnepal.com asserts: “It is an immortal poem with a satirical tone when it comes to ‘blind man on a swivel chair’. The title itself is a whole poem. This poem, full of political satire, has severely whipped the rulers and abbots of that time. The style of governance of those who are not qualified is respected” (n.pg). Sherchan makes blistering attack and derogatory
comment on the so-called powerful rulers of the Nepalese society who are actually blind due to power. Seeing bitter realities of people in the society, the revolutionary spirit germinate within him. Lamsal claims: 

Even after working long and hard, the people hardly had two meals a day. He saw extreme poverty, inequality, exploitation, discrimination, torture and trauma of the people in the villages. The poor were getting poorer and the rich richer. The exploitation and discrimination were perennial and unabated. These conditions touched the tender heart of young Bhupi. As a rebellious boy right from the childhood, he then turned to be a revolutionary supporter of the communist ideology. (The Gorkhapatra) The discrimination prevailing in the society leading to dehumanization of the humans by the rulers makes him stand in favour of the marginalized dismantling the officially established facts and figures in the society. Raising the voice of the common people is the specialty of his writings. It names him the Sarbahara (proletariat) writer. In his drama Paribartan (Change), he fights for change in the society. Lamsal writes, “In the drama, which is full of patriotic and progressive political feelings, he has championed the rights, interests and justice of the common people and unleashed a crusade against exploitation, injustice and discrimination that was in existence in the Nepalese society as a whole” (2012, The Gorkhapatra). Standing for the oppressed and suppressed common people through his writings, he has been the opponent of the rulers and their system. The irony and the most aesthetic of all is his specialty. The later poems are figurative and equally strong. Striking against social inequalities and satire on the state system has become known as the Bhupi style. Many poets have since imitated his art of expressing profound expressions through symbols in few words. Bhupi has always been an antagonistic poet. (in nepal.com) Sherchan holds antagonistic relationship with the official structure of the rulers and their establishments. Both irony and satire on the state system has become the Bhupi style. Being the poet from ethnic community, Sherchan hits upon the deeply rooted and established inequalities and the iron-plated so-called equality claimed by the government.

Being a humanist with anti-current trend, Sherchan establishes himself as the trend-changer challenging the monolithic ideology and highlighting the demystification of depoliticized politics of the official history writers of Nepal. In this regard, Shreya Poudel (2016) displays, “Bhupi overtly challenges a monolithic sense of national identity and pride” (p.1). Sherchan denounces established structure of the nation. In this sense, he is the deconstructionist poet of modern Nepal. Moreover, the writings of Bhupi Sherchan are relevant to all periods, generations and times. Poudel (2016) further mentions: It is high time to ask why we have been unable to transform ourselves into a relatively happy country. A country that can feed, educate and employ its population without having to wave a begging bowl in front of the powers that be. To that end, Sherchan's evergreen poems provoke some food for thought.(p.1) Bhupi Sherchan's writings are timeless and spaceless as they are relevant to all times and places. It is so because his poems reflect the bitter realities of the society-injustice, inequality, oppression, suppression, exploitation, dehumanization, poverty, false representation, misuse of power, and so on. In this regard, his poems hold the universal issues of human societies beyond time and space.

In Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Itihas, Sherchan highlights the universal issue that naturalized official history is actually a politically generated discourse through the use of power. It is a new issue or topic in Sherchan's poem which has not been researched yet. Therefore, rereading of Nepalese official history in this poem is innovative and it adds a brick in the building of research.

**Textual Analysis**

Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Itihas (I Think My Country’s History is a Lie) by Bhupi Sherchan (1936-1989) dismantles the establishment culture in general and the conventional history written by power in particular. The so-called history of the kings and the rulers of Nepal is is totally a lie for the poet. Even the gloriously established history of Amar singh, Sita, Buddha, Araniko and Tenzing is incredible for Sherchan. The traditional history one-sidedly magnifies the powerful people making some mythical realities and inculcating it as truth to the common people. It always ignores the historical reality of corruption, hunger, humiliation, exploitation, oppression, dehumanization, atrocities of the elites, ruler's arrogance, hypocrisy and pomposity and all the prevailing social follies and fooperies in the nation. Therefore, the conventional history is not inclusive rather it excludes the real facts. Moreover, it is fiction not the fact created power-holders to fulfill the self-interests of the rulers and the elites. Therefore, the mainstream history of Nepal is a mere lie.

Sherchan questions the conventionally established notion that whole Nepal and Nepali people are prosperous and so this land is heavenly; there are no problems in any sectors in Nepal. But, when the poet observes the crossroads and the streets, he finds them full of hunger, disorder, dimness and pessimistic, poignant and pathetic conditions. The so-called history of heavenly land, streets, crossroads and the human dwellings is nothing more than the fake reality created by the power-holding historians. It is the trend of the rulers of not only Nepal but also the whole world to conceal the reality and manufacture discourses, knowledges, truths and histories. Therefore, the history by power is a discourse that produces effects of truth. But it prevents people from thinking critically about it inculcating false consciousness of “history as reality” upon the emotionally patriotic people and plays upon the innocent sacrificial nature of the commoners. The poet utters: 

When I  
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Observe dwelling one-two days
In these hunger-immersed crossroads
In these streets like withered flowers
Then, I think
My country's history is a lie. (Self trans., 1-6)
The observation of the streets and the crossroads helps to
mock at the historical discursivity that no Nepal and
Nepali people suffer from troubles and difficulties. The
power-driven history duplicitously records that all the
streets, chowks and the dwellings are rich and happy which
is totally challenged and falsified by the true picture of
hunger, suffering, trouble and haziness prevailing in the
Nepali society. When the poet looks at the problematic
lives of the people and the smeared condition of the
human surrounding, he concludes that the so-called
history of prosperity is only a lie made true in order to
rule over the people and ultimately deceive them.
Bhupi Sherchan attacks upon the so-called superiority,
magnificence, omnipotence and omniscience of not only
the great people standing still in the form of the statue
but also the gods in the steeple of the temple. The truth
recorded in the history is that the gods are allmighty and
all-knowing, and the great people in the statue always
speak for the welfare of whole mankind. The gods
always listen to the poor people and help them solve their
problems. The great people even from the statue speak
the voice of the common people against corruption,
exploitation, poverty, hunger, injustice and violation of
human rights. We believe it because of the recorded
history and the so-called truth. But, the deafness and
dumbness, passivity, stagnancy and helplessness even of
the gods in the temples and the great men in the statues
prove that the traditional history of their bravery, sacrifice
and helpfulness is only an effect of truth, not truth as
such. Sherchan asserts:
These gods dwelling
In all down the street digging mud
These knowing gods
Are but deaf and dumb,
These knowing men,
Are but deaf and dumb,
These temples ravaged by earthquakes,
And,
These leaning steeples (gajur),
These great men in statues
Standing at the crossroads
When I see all these, ever present,
Always there, never changing,
Always all alike,
Then I think it is a lie,
The stormy history of my country. (Self trans., 7-22)
The constructed-truth that Nepal is a land of gods and
goddesses and the national heroes fighting and sacrificing
for the sake of whole mankind has been subverted in
the poem. When he looks at the surrounding, he finds
the silent and unchanging statues of the heroes at the
crossroads and the passive idols of gods in the temples
which make him to the factual belief that the mainstream
history of Nepal is problematic. Sherchan questions such
powerful history with the help of the true observation
of different streets, chowks, dwellings and the lands of
Nepal. The conventional history is stormy as it glorifies
Nepal, Nepali rulers, Nepali people, Nepali cultures,
Nepali national heroes and the natural heritages. But,
it exaggerates the constructed truths sidelining all the true
realities of the people and the society. The silence of
even the gods and the heroes symbolizes that nobody
and no source speaks the voice of the marginalized
people who are the real holders and beholders of the
realities. Therefore, this type of Nepali history is totally
questionable; it lacks even a single ounce of truth.
Sherchan challenges the ritualistic glorification of the
national heroes and the emblems like Sita and Bhimsen
Thapa in history. The rulers preserve and worship the
idols and the statues of the emblems but show the
corrupt behaviours in real life. They loot the nation and
oppress the people but show the lip-laced respect to the
heroes destroying the dreams and sacrifices of them.
The rulers always prioritize the words rather than the works
as their intention is wrong. In the name of the country
and the people, they exploit them. But, our history magnifies
the contributions of the rulers who are shown to be
responsible to the nation and people. It is their double
standard that destroys the real truth and creates the false
truth that the poet excavates an exposes in this poem.
Sherchan acclaims:
When I
Constantly see numerous young Sitas
In the alleys - crossroads,
In all the streets,
In my country and in foreign lands,
Stripped bare like eucalyptus trees,
When I see countless Bhimsen Thapas,
Standing still and silent,
Slaying the songs of their souls,
Like kalki trees
With their hands hanging down,
Then I really feel like
Mocking my own blood. (Self trans., 23-35)
It is nothing more than the mockery to worship and
garland the national heroes like Sita and Bhimsen Thapa
compelling so many Sitas to live a hellish life and so
many Bhimsen Thapas to live a helpless life destroying
their dreams and voices. In the street, there are so many
young girls selling their own bodies and souls for their
livelihood. Even in such conditions, they are exploited
more and given torture. Then what will be the meaning
of writing the history of Sita as an ideal woman? It is only
the hypocrisy of the rulers and the history constructed by
them. The girls have been suffering in both motherland
and foreign land exposed naked like the “eucalyptus trees”. They
have been brutally exploited both physically and
psychologically. But, this history never raises the voices
of the wandering girls in the street and their sufferings.
Moreover, the warriors for democracy are limited only in
the statue like the Kalki tress hanging their hands down. It
…throughout the poem, Bhupi avertly challenges a monolithic sense of national identity and pride (centralized Pahade Hindu nationalism) evangelized particularly by king Mahendra after he wrestled away a hard-fought democracy to institute absolute rule once again in 1960. If recent political empowerment of marginalized communities is making inroads into demystifying this convoluted sense of a singular, all-encompassing identity, Bhupi was already denouncing it right from the time it began to take root. (The Kathmandu Post)

For Paudel, the conventional history glorifies only the singularity-based nationality, pride, glory and the fame. The monarchy magnifying history has been denounced by the poet in the poem orienting the thought towards all-inclusive democratic history even from the margin.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Bhupi Sherchan, being the voice of the voiceless, strongly claims that the mainstream history of Nepal is a lie through his poem “Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Itihas”. He repeats the first stanza with total disbelief to the history twice in the poem adding the line: “My country’s true history is a lie” (54) in the last stanza. The so-called true history of Nepal is nothing more than a lie for the poet. He boldly challenges the history of the power holders calling it totally fake made to misguide and mislead the people and to continue the rule. As there are lacks, puzzles, troubles, sufferings, exploitations, tortures, insults, hypocrisies, pomposities, atrocities, follies and corruptions in the nation, the history officially written is only a fictitious fact. How can such history be the history of the nation and people without including the voice of the common people and the advancement of the nation?

The glorious history can be believed only if it addresses the problems of the people and attempts to establish a humane, moral, equal and just society. Otherwise, it is nothing more than a license for the rulers to loot the nation and the people.

The gold-plated history of Amarsingh, Sita, Araniko, Bhimsen and bravery of Nepalese people cannot be believed when the bitter realities of society with hunger, poverty, rape, murder, violence, decadence, faithlessness, death of humanity, disloyalty, forgery, and falsity are prevailing elsewhere. Therefore, such history is actually a gold-plated iron for Bhupi Sherchan; it is all-excluding and misrepresenting the Nepalese reality. By presenting the claim with proofs that the history of Nepal is a lie, Sherchan advocates for rewriting the history from the perspective of the margin in order to make it all-encompassing and real.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, Bhupi Sherchan dismantles the conventionally recorded history of Nepal based on the principle of exclusion and attempts to rewrite history from the margin reversing the center through his poem “Galat Lagcha Malai Mero Deshko Itihas”. Though the official history records the contributions of national heroes like Amar
Singh, who extended the kingdom to Kangra, Bhimsen Thapa, who fought for democracy, Tenzing, who climbed the world tallest mountain Sagarmatha representing Nepal, Araniko, who astounded the world with the art, Sita, who is the ideal woman, and Buddha, who sowed the seed of peace, it sidelines the true voice of the people. Therefore, seeing the sufferings of so many Sitas in the society who are exposed naked like Eucalyptus trees silenced Bhimsen Thapas murdering their own dreams and souls hanging down their own hands like Kalki trees, and the dumb and deaf people, gods and the statues, the poet claims the official history of Nepal to be a truly false history. He feels shy and mocked at when he hears and reads such history of Nepal. He shows strong disgust to the traditional history created by the powerful rulers to exploit the people and nation and prolong their rule. By proving the so-called true history of Nepal as only a lie, Sherchan endeavours to rewrite the true history of people and nation including the excluded voices of the marginalized people in the society. Sherchan's New Historicist perspective is remarkable for the advancement of the world rewriting true history from the below with real voices from the real grounds. This research can be a brick in the building-making process of revisiting problematic issues of history.
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