

Chapter I: Mulk Raj Anand and His Novel *The Big Heart*

Mulk Raj Anand is one of the most distinguished, committed and prolific writers of Indian English literature. He, who is well known for his writing not only in India but also all over the world, has not only written good, first grade novels but also good essays, short stories and art criticism. He writes about the common and poor people's life, their poverty, miseries and injustice perpetrated on them. His novels clearly show how common people being exploited in different forms like in the name of caste, class, colour, gender, etc. Anand severely criticizes the exploitations. Shreedhar Gautam says,

For him, literature is not merely a mode of personal expression but an instrument of social change [. . .]. His main contribution to literature has been his realistic depiction of Indian life [. . .]. His novels acted as a bridge between the national independence movement and the literary movement of the time. (qtd. in Gautam 1)

In a prospective note on Anand's fiction Saros Cowasjee's view is that Anand writes for the sake of the people. According to him, "Anand wrote the novel of the people, for the people as a man of the people" (33).

A man with commitment, Anand is a life long crusade for the cause of have-nots. His pen is devoted to aware the uneducated people. There is appeal for political consciousness in his works which draws the attention of freedom and humanity. He believes in struggle that can bring consciousness and ultimately change in the society. He says in the preface of *Apology for Heroism* (1986), "Always, however, I believe in the struggle – the struggle of men to free themselves to, and to expand freedom to others to sustain the ever expanding areas of consciousness, to make man truly human" (25).

Shreedhar Gautam regards Anand as the most distinguished socialist-realist writer. He says:

In fact, his fictional works testify to his missionary zeal and objective for the redemption of the poor and the oppressed of the society from the clutches of the rich and the powerful. His message for the poor and downtrodden is so broad that it can equally be applicable to all the suffering people the world over. (1)

Anand has contributed to Indian awareness for social change. One need not agree with his politics nor praise his assault on social institutions. To this work he brought, besides his Indian heritage, a university education, long experience in the West, devotion to art, and unquestionable dedication to humanity into India. His effort to order for himself and for his country, the experience of past and present of East and West, of science and the humanities culminated, on the other hand, in evolutionary socialism, and in the humanist ethic. Gautam writes:

Anand is the first writer to give the Indian novel in English a definite tone and clear texture. His novels belong to the category of socially conscious and realistic novels. His novels have also been termed as Marxist variant novels because of his deep rooted conviction that working class people can only be set free through the change of social institutions and establishment of socialistic system. Indian progressive or socialist writers like Anand were clearly under the impression of European socialist tradition of Marx and the general literary movement of realism and naturalism. Anand became the pioneer of social realism in the Indian

English novel with his first novel *Untouchable* (1935) which seems to be deeply influenced by the social realists of the then Soviet Union and other European countries. (7-8)

Although he is not against the western inventions, he awakes the people to be careful from these things. He supports Gandhi for his humanism and spiritualism. He gave a statement in 1945 when he had finished writing *The Big Heart* about his writing:

The theme of my work became the whole man and the gamut of human relationship . . . and though our main struggle remains the search for individual values . . . in so far as these are increasingly open to reinterpretation, it is necessary to explore the sensibilities of all human beings . . . in so far as they have been affected by the "iron age". (22)

Human values and sentiments according to Anand must be established in order to make the society better. For which previously established social norms and values should be revisited so Anand always struggled to establish these themes in his novels.

Moreover, Anand had an opportunity to feel the direct consequences of British economic policy brought about the ruin of India's traditional handicraft industries.

Gautam states:

Writers like him were simply found to take note of all the three forms of economic exploitation, namely through trade, industry, and finance. They realized that economic imperialism long in the subordination of the Indian economy to the British economy. Anand and his contemporaries did not take much time in realizing that India's growing poverty was linked with the British economic exploitation of India. (16)

How minutely Anand observed his country and his folks is clearly shown in the above extract. Exploitation in any form is seen very cleverly. His seer observation of the society has made Anand to deal with in his novels.

Anand's letter to Saros Cowasji is enough to conclude his theme and his source:

I wrote this novel at the end of the Second World War in London, when the machines of western civilizations had nearly destroyed the world. I was conceived that if India also went the same way, after freedom, without controlling the machine, but allowed it to become the instrument of exploitation, then we would also produce the same horrors. (121)

This very quote suggests the writer's inherent intention of his writing the novel, *The Big Heart* (1945). Anand actually wanted to beware the Indians exploring the dangerous consequences that might be brought by the machines.

Anand's works confirm his deficiencies as a thinker and the capacity of his Marxist enthusiasm to glide gaily across the most deeply entrenched differences. This together with his furious indignation, unself-critical ideology and habit of undue explicitness, make him a writer whose work has to be severely sieved. His carrier was launched by a family tragedy, instigated by the rigid caste system that continues to be the scourge of Indian society even today. He wrote a moving essay in response to the suicide of an aunt who had been excommunicated by his family for sharing a meal with a Muslim.

He was widely identified with the quest for a just, equitable and forward-looking India. Anand was a true revolutionary who wanted social change and dedicated his pen for the cause of the downtrodden. He wrote extensively in areas as diverse as art and

sculpture, politics, literature and the history of ideas. His literary achievement comprised not only novels, but also short stories and critical essays on literature and art. He was vocal supporter of the Gandhian non-violence movement for national liberation from British Colonial rules although his socialist sympathies took him considerably beyond the ambit of gradualist reform favoured by the Mahatma. He had gained international reputation before the Second World War. His novels set a generation of educated Indians pondering about their countries social evils perpetuated in the name of caste and religion.

For him, pen was a medium through which he voiced his social protest. As a critic and novelist, he wrote extensively on political instability, class and caste exploitation, capitalist corruption and object poverty in India and other parts of the world. Mulk Raj Anand supported the Bangladesh Liberation War and wrote extensively against Pakistani genocide to mould world opinion.

He was a politically committed writer of the left. His novels, like those of Prem Chand, attacked social injustice, but unlike the Hindi novelist, to Anand, revolutionary violence was inevitable, even essential, if any meaningful change was to be effected.

Suresh Rengen Bald writes about Anand's political revolutionary tone:

The revolutionary tone of Mulk Raj Anand's political commitment provides insights into the politics of the Indian revolutionary elites. His novels highlight the conflicts between the revolutionaries' cultural background and their profession of political faith, their images of themselves and the utopia they seek. The sentiment and morality revealed in Anand's writings, however, are not peculiar to the revolutionary elite to India; they apply whoever members of a self-conscious traditionally

privileged minority seek revolutionary change to the end their isolation and guilt, but not necessarily their privileged position. (97)

Here, Bald adds Anand's attitude towards his parents. He says, "what Mulk Raj rejected was not his 'peasant mother' but the more 'modern' father, who had in fact rebelled from the hereditary caste occupation of coppersmith to join the British Army, who knew English and was even aquatinted with English literature" (98). According to Bald:

It was from his mother that Mulk Raj first acquired a prejudice against the British Indian land settlement. His grandfather was made out to be a hero by his mother, for he fought the British and never compromised It was from his orthodox mother also he acquired his prejudice against the Muslims. (104 - 05)

For Anand the only way to gain justice is to 'stand up and fight'. The elitism of Hindu "Superior born" leader of society is not abated but intensified by the Leninist vanguard theory of Revolution. The revolutionary leaders profess faith in man and a commitment to Man's integrity; however, they decide what is "good" for man and force it down his throat. Anand himself is in the favour of revolution. He says:

The supreme value of life consists rather in the attempt to live as part of the whole of things, in the awareness of the struggle and the constant attempt to work and lesson the time lag between the awakening of men and the urgency of events. (160)

Anand was very much influenced by both Gandhi and Nehru apart from being influenced by the Western idea - Marxism prevailing in the thirties. Gandhi was a great

humanist who fought for the peace, liberty, freedom and dignity of human beings. He was a great fighter for socialism too. However, his way to socialism is through the path of non-violence. In Anand's own words, "My religion is based on truth and non-violence. Truth is my God. Non-violence is the means to realize Him" (163). Gandhi was a great political figure who fought for the freedom of human being. He gave a high value to individual freedom. In the same way he wanted peace and equality among people. But he didn't like to follow the way pointed out by the Marxists.

Anand's humanism was dedicated to free society from the hands of imperial power, social orthodox and religious dogma. He no longer believed in supernatural belief. His firm faith was on democracy, socialism and individual dignity. Apart from individual freedom he wanted equality and socialism. The ultimate solution in his humanism is the way of non-violence. He gives high importance to the place of human being. He says, "I believe, first and foremost in human beings in man in the whole man" (137). He has his supreme faith in human being. He further adds:

And yet how great a force is man in his ability above all animal and material life to adapt himself to the highest point in the evolutionary process under a better dispensation. He can become not only the vehicle of the most perfect beauty of form and movement, but he can acquire the capacity to assess nature. (138)

Above written lines very obviously tell that human is the supreme creature in this earth who can invent, guide, manage, and use the materials and resources available here. Religion, philosophy, art, literature and so on so forth are all the inventions that owe to human civilization.

The Big Heart (1945) is Anand's seventh novel where he shows the conflict between tradition and modernity, between the forces that tenaciously cling to the status quo and defend it with renewed though misplaced determination and who are victimized by the prevailing conventions and taboos which are projected as essential human experiences that have sustained the history and culture of a particular community. *The Big Heart* is one of the most representative novels of Mulk Raj Anand. Since its publication, the novel has lured the attention of many readers in India as well as abroad. Different critics have commented on this novel differently. There are many things about this novel that are attractive. Margaret Berry states, "In no other novel has Anand so attempted to organize a whole social, economic and political picture" (49).

Anand's style of writing in this novel is the example of his successful art technique. The burning agenda of the then Indian poor people is portrayed exactly here. He is a distinguished novelist in the sense that such complexity is served in simple designation. So, Cowasjee writes:

Anand's perspective treatment of the complex Indian problem in a little over two hundred pages is an achievement, and we are further impressed that the action is narrowed down to the happenings of a single day. Many writers who restrict the action to a short unit of time cheat by restoring to flashbacks to overcome the limitation they have impressed on themselves. (132)

The Big Heart occupies a significant place in the study of Anand's works. Cowasjee says, "Anand had initially thought of calling his novel 'The Machine- Wreckers', after Ernest Toller's play of the same name on which it is modeled" (126). It was the time of World

War II while Anand was working on this novel. The Colonial British rule had been shaken to its roots by the mass upsurge of the Indian people under the leadership of Gandhi who had given the unequivocal call to the British to quit India. The Western civilization was being destroyed by its own war machine. Countries of imperialist expansion and colonialist economic exploitation to which the west subjected Asian and African people had come almost to a grinding halt. Anand was supporter of Gandhism for revolution, but he had seen the usefulness of machine what Gandhi had rejected. In one of his letters to Saroj Cowasjee, Anand speaks at length at the background of *The Big Heart*:

I insist that you must remember I wrote this novel at the end of Second World War, when I had been engulfed in the vast and endless destruction brought by civilization on itself. I was thinking of Gandhi's natural rejection of the machine. I wanted to show that, though we cannot reject the machine altogether, we have to control it, as a driver controls a railway engine. (123)

Anand suggests if one has the controlling switch in his hand, he can make the machine a slave rather than his master. Anand was quite dissatisfied with the prevailing condition of Indian society. Because of the Western colonization the domestic people were exploited. People were victimized from various blind beliefs, social and religious orthodox and class distinction as well. Such situation of the nation forced Anand to write about the reality of Indian society. But today, the novel seems to give the universal theme. Today, the poverty, exploitation, and justice, and atrocities are not confined to

India. This problem has a universal aspect. So, the novel is quite relevant in the present situation of the world.

The introduction of machine boosts the concept of social-discrimination as the low-level people and the capitalists. In turn, it brings gap in rich and poor. Machine is the image of modernism. K. R. Srinivas Iyengar supports this view:

The Big Heart (1945) reproduced the traffic intensity and concentration of untouchables. The issue here is not between the 'untouchables' and 'higher castes' but between the thathiars (the hereditary coppersmiths) and the capitalists (Lala Murli Dhar and Seth Gokul Chand). (350)

Mulk Raj Anand seems to be motivated by the desire of synthesizing the modernity of the west with what is of permanent value in the wisdom of the east. His protagonist of *The Big Heart*, Ananta represents a happy synthesis of the Marxist urgency for action and the Gandhian necessity of love. Dr. Shridhar Gautam has compared Ananta with the existential hero of *Untouchable (1935)*, Bhaka:

Actually, Ananta is Bakha reborn as a revolutionary. There is, however, no denying the fact that Anand's ideal of a revolutionary does not conform frame by frame to the popular Marxiam hero who purposes only action, who does not pause to consider human feelings of sentiments. (193)

Ananta believes that, 'one must become a man oneself, to battle with the despairs which assailed one' (Ibid. 135). He is confident that working class people have all the capabilities to abolish the state of perpetual suffering and enter into the new age of revolution.

Some critics do not believe that this novel has taken the proper direction as it should be. To them it is only the heap of tragedy. The Bombay group of the Progressive Writers' Association, dominated by communist writers, declared Anand as a decadent hanger-on, because of the scandals he had occasioned by living in the local bohemia, but chiefly because he did not portray in his poor all the virtue the party line demanded. Even in the very laudatory article on Anand in *Soviet Literature*(1953), a Russian critic, Y. Tupikova takes him to task obliquely for 'failings' in *The Big-Heart*, "The author does not go to the root of the problems he has raised, and indeed the very structure of the novel (the whole action takes place in a day) does not give him enough scope to deal with them thoroughly" (qtd. in Cowasjee 31).

Indeed, Anand wants to present the duality between tradition and modernity in his novel *The Big-Heart*. Anand is not a failure writer in this novel as Y. Tupikova writes but modern and appreciable. He is not in favour of rejecting the whole Westernization. Anand's motto is to unite the poor workers, especially the poor Indians and struggle for their livelihood as Margaret Berry says, "*The Big-Heart* and *Coolie* (1936) view the city struggle, in which factory workers struggle with magnates of Industry. In all these books a major theme is the need for the proletariat first to unite . . ." (63).

Further Berry says, "Like the *Sword and the Sickle* (1942), *The Big-Heart* offers personifications of capitalists, labourers, and respectable compromisers" (65). Many Indian writers attempt to show some sort of interrelation between man and nature. Anand as a realist makes no conscious effort to harmonize nature's moods with men; he gives to nature an independent existence and reveals her both in her beauty and in her cruel

aspects. Central to his theme is man's struggle in society: the poor are too occupied making a living to communication with nature, the rich too engrossed in becoming richer.

Anand's writing style is praised by many writers. Cowasjee says:

The Big Heart, a novel for which the author has a particular liking, has been acclaimed by Margaret Berry, K.N.Singha and M.K.Naik in their respective books on Anand The British critics had unreserved praise for it: Walter Allen called it 'a most impressive work', and Jack Lindsay wrote: 'If Anand had written nothing else, his place in the history of the novel would be secure - his place profound interpreter of Indian life in a phase of pervasive crisis'. (125)

Above said statement evidences how Anand's writing is acclaimed not only in India but also abroad. These lines even speak of his peculiar writing that is liked by renowned writers like Margaret Berry, K.N.Singha and M.K.Naik.

Suresh Rengen Bald finds the dialectic structure of the society in this novel. He judges it through Marxist traditional concept. He writes:

The villainy of capitalism as portrayed in *The Big Heart*, however, is different from the "horrorful" of capitalism sketched by Marx.

Nevertheless, Anand's protagonist's way of taking the villain is in keeping with the Marxian tradition. The thathiars (coppersmiths) in *The Big Heart* are deprived of their age old caste right of artisans, and thrown out of business by the competition of the cheaper and more efficiently produced machine goods. The correct response for them Ananta points out, however, is not to destroy the machines as the desperate artisans Ralia . . .

but to "make a Revolution" and destroy the illegitimate owners of the worker's labour, the capitalists who use the machine and the worker for profit. (128)

This is how the Thathiars community people are workless just because machines are doing their jobs more efficiently and effectively. Since the factory has snatched their jobs, the Thathiars even have lost their human feelings towards one another that is the most essential part of a society.

It is very difficult to know the bravery and positive aspects of the hero during his life in Anand's novel. Bald's view is enough to support:

Mulk Raj's novels follow an identical pattern: each describes a principal figure who brings to focus the injustices of society; his abortive and misdirected attempts for a better life in the existing unjust states; and the appearance of the revolutionary hero, who shows him that realization of a good life only possible after the destruction of the present order. (116)

Mr. Bald explains how Ananta is seeking for better life in the contemporary society. But the case is not only this but also beyond. Ananta is not looking ways out in order to improve the life standard of his own family but of the Thathiar brotherhood as a whole which will be an endeavor of the researcher to excavate in the dissertation.

None of these critics, however, analyze the commodification of the protagonist and the thathiars at the hand of Capitalism. Almost all the characters in the novel are the space goat of commodification. Even minute relationship is determined by the new God, Money. Not only this but also caste and creed is based upon this ghastly arm of the Capitalists. Human feelings, love, compassion, brotherhood, sisterhood, ethos, pathos and

gratitude, all are objectified and materialized. Thus, the present research work undertakes in order to explore the commodification of Ananta, Ralia, Dina Timur Lang, Mehanga and other thathiars in Anand's novel *The Big Heart*.

In this ground, Mulk Raj Anand's *The Big Heart* does nothing but commodify the human values, especially of working class people, the thathiars. Commodification of human values reveals human values as an object or commodity, marketable thing, which is the concept of upper class members of the capitalist society. Thathiars, the coppersmiths are dominated by the so called Lalas because of economic power, the money that is the main cause of oppression of lower class people, the Thathiars. Each and every relationships, similarly, are established and destablished on the basis of money and position. Social status even is determined by the new God, Money, itself.

Chapter II: Commodification and Marxism

The word 'commodification' refers to 'reification' or objectification which is derived from Hegelian-Marxism. But this term was itself used by Georg Lukacs in his work 'History and Class Consciousness'. The root word of reification is 'reify' which means to convert mentally into a thing. "To materialize" as The Oxford English Dictionary defines. It further defines reification as "the mental conversion of a person or an abstract concept into a thing". Thomas Mautner defines reification as "the turning of something into a thing or object" (363). Thus, reification means changing of something according to the will of its users. Commodification occurs when an abstract concept describing a relationship or context is treated as a concrete "thing", or if something is treated as if it were a separate object. This is inappropriate because it is not an object, or it does not truly exist in separation.

According to Marxist concept in capitalist society, workers are used and treated as the capitalists' want. Workers can be purchased and sold, according to capitalists' desires. Again Mautner asserts, "Reification occurs when something that depends on human decision and action" (363). So, capitalists reify human beings, especially workers. Reification means state of mind or practice when something is treated as an object or a marketable commodity (Mautner 363). In this context of social reality so called high class people from bourgeoisie culture wants nothing but to make profit even by marketing human beings and their relationships. Capitalists change human relations, emotions and feelings into commodity or thing without giving the real essence to those abstracts.

In capitalist society, labor class people are always treated as commodities thus reified. They are reified because of hegemony of capitalists. Hegemony was a concept

previously used by Marxist but developed by Gramsci into an acute analysis to explain why the “inevitable” socialist revolution predicted by orthodox Marxism. Capitalism, Gramsci suggested, maintained control not just through violence and political and economic coercion, but also ideologically, through a hegemonic culture in which the values of the bourgeoisie became the ‘common sense’ values of all. Thus, a consensus culture developed in which people in the working class identified their own good with the good of the bourgeoisie, and helped to maintain the status quo rather than revolting.

Gramsci further emphasizes about hegemony in this way:

Permeation throughout society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality that has the effect of supporting the status quo in power relations, hegemony, in this sense might be defined as an ‘organizing principle’ that is diffused by the process of socialization into every area of daily life. (qtd. in Boggs 39).

This extract makes clear that hegemonic power is the mere a consent. It is the consent between the Capitalist and the Proletariats. Working class has always given consent to the capitalist in order to govern them and thus they are always dominated by the Capitalist. This very hegemony creates domination of working class in the hands of capitalist who thus easily exploits proletarians. Capitalists objectify each and every thing available in this earth. Abstract things like love, hatred, compassion, togetherness, sentiments, etc. are made marketable things in the hands of so called upper class.

Commodification mainly is caused by modernization, globalization and industrialization. As a commodity becomes universally dominant, the fate of the worker becomes the fate of the society as a whole. Commodification means objectification. The

concept of commodification is pregnantly used by Karl Marx and developed mostly by George Lukacs. In the similar way, other philosophers from Frankfurt School like Horkheimer Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Raymond Williams did. Marx has given emphasis to the labor's work which should be valued as their own right and others too associated the capitalistic society which degraded human relationship with money. So, commodification means changing of something according to the will of its users and devalorizing human values as mere commodity. All the time industries produce more goods. Labor class works in the industries to produce goods. To see the industrial production in the market with high price, capitalists use human being as commodity.

Commodification is that idea which involves separating out something from the original context, in which it lacks some or all of its original connections yet seem to have power or attributes which in truth it does not have. Actually, commodification is occurred when an abstract concept describing a relationship or context is treated as a concrete 'thing' or if something is treated as if it were a separate object when this is inappropriate because it is not an object or because it does not truly exist in separation. Marx argues commodification is an inherent and necessary characteristic of economic value such as if it manifests itself in market trade, that is the inversion in thought between object and subject or between means and ends, reflects a real practice where attributes which exist only by virtue of social relationship because people are treated as if they are the inherent natural characteristics of things, or vice versa, attributes of human subjects.

Marxism disproves the bourgeois economic, political and social mechanism. Actually, Marxism starts a moment of proletariats against bourgeois by raising a voice in favor of proletariats. Proletariats are only workers who build the foundation of

production, each and every time they consume their energy with machine for better production but they do not possess material things means of production. When proletariats lose their power of patience and tolerance they raise their voice against bourgeois who control a lot of wealth, accumulated from the means of production without their toil. Commodification, thus, comes under this process when bourgeois use the working class people to make their profit. Reification then involves a distortion of consciousness. Karl Marx asserts:

Reification is an inherent and necessary characteristic of economic value such as it manifests itself in market trade i.e. the inversion in thought between means and ends, reflects a real practice where attributes (properties, characteristics, features, powers) which exist only by virtue of a social relationship between people are treated as if they are the inherent, natural characteristics of things, or vice versa, attributes of inanimate things are treated as if they are attributes of human subjects. (Formation and Transformation of Commodity Values..., 411)

This implies that objects are transformed into subjects and subjects into objects, with the result that subjects are rendered passive and determined, while objects are rendered as the active and determining factor. Marx has taken positively in economic sector to be commodified those subjects into objects but he also seems that the animate attributes should not always be treated as inanimate attributes. He expresses that the reification starts with the primitive direct barter system where he focused that it was the exchange of use value. This is changed by exchanging goods and other human labor with money value.

So, Marx has put inside the concept of reification in his text *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*.

Commodities, which exist as use-values, must first of all assume a form in which they appear to one another nominally as exchange-values, as definite of materialized universal labor time. The first necessary move in this process is, as we have seen, that the commodities set apart a specific commodity, say, gold, which becomes the direct reification of universal labour-time of universal equivalent. (3)

Although the idea of reification is implicit already in the early works of Marx (e.g. in the economic and philosophical manuscripts), an explicit analysis and use of ‘reification’ in his later writings and reaches its peak in the *Grundrise* and *Capital*. In his writings, there is no definition of reification but basic elements for a theory are nevertheless given in pregnant statements of his writings.

Marx summarizes briefly that reification is characteristics not only of the commodity, but of all basic categories of capital production (money, capital, profit, etc.). He insists that reification exists to a certain extent in all social forms in so far as they reach the level of commodity production and money circulation; but that in the capitalist mode of production and in capital which is its dominating category. Thus in the developed form of capitalism reification reaches its peak. Clarifying the matter, Marx, further, asserts:

In capital-profit, or still better capital interest, land-ground rent, labour wages, this economic trinity represented as the connection between the component parts of value and wealth in general and its sources, we have

the complete mystification of the capitalist mode of production, the reification of social relations and immediate coalescence of the material production relations with their historical and social determination. It is an enchanted, perverted, topsy-turvy world, in which Monsieur le capital and Madame la Terre do their ghost-walking as social characters and the same time directly as things. (48)

Human relations, that's why, stand only in use-value. Where there is value, capitalists society used them and exchange them with materials. The material enchanted world rolled over the human relations. All the human relations connected with profit-based relations not with heartily relations.

For Lukacs, commodification becomes an even important concept. It is seen as being the root of many problems of contemporary society. Capitalism defines everything in commodity terms because everything has an 'exchange value' an amount of money for which it can be bought or sold. This rates one 'thing' – money as more important than any other thing.

Throughout his career, Lukacs addressed the problem of the relation of form to content, art to politics. He was eventually to be regarded as the principal Marxist aesthetician of his time. His aesthetics was thoroughly Marxist; he viewed works of art as products of the social and economic circumstances within which they are created and as expression of their creator's ideology. Here his ideas are Marxist and what he sees in literature is social reality. He condemned the art for arts sake stance. In this way, he sees the role of art in society and develops a principle which tells that the social reality should be reflected in any work of art.

Lukacs was one of the fiercest Marxist critics of modernism and an unfaltering upholder of their realist position. Disagreeing with the experimental aesthetics of high modernism, he argued that its obscure and fragmentary literary forms were symptomatic of the alienation characteristics of life under capitalism. He was for reenergizing realist literature in the modernist experimentation but also play a leading role in the democratic rebirth of the nations. *In the Dictionary of Important Ideas and Thinkers* Luckacs has been described as:

In his major work of political theory history and class consciousness, Lukacs reconnected Marxism to the Hegelian dialectic and repudiated the historical Determinism of prevailing Marxist thought. He dismissed the positivist claim that the methods of natural science can be applied to social analysis, on the grounds that the nature of human consciousness involves volition and choices. (239)

Here, Lukacs revived Marx's notions of reification, the process within capitalist society that makes people relate to commodities as if the objects were independent of the complex social processes and individuals' labor that produced them. This process turns social relations into relations with objects, or commodity fetishism, a symptom of the false consciousness that pervades bourgeois society and creates alienation, the split between existence and understanding that separates people from their essential natures. It also obscures and fragments the totality of existence, which only dialectical analysis can capture. To Lukacs, both modern society and Marxism were guilty of reification, the latter because the doctrine of dialectical Marxism assumed that history is governed by objective, unchanging laws, not people. The dialectic, he argued, works through praxis –

the unit of theory and practice – to ‘demystify’ the working class consciousness that has been dazed by capitalism.

In the long essay of 1954, “Art and Objective Truth”, he argues that “the work of art reflects an objective reality but it does this not by slavish copying. Rather it succeeds by presentation of a concrete universal, and the formal integrity and objectivity of the work lies in that relation” (34). He further writes:

The goal for all great art is to provide a picture of reality in which the contradiction between appearance and reality, the particular and the general, the immediate and the conceptual, etc., is so resolved that two converge into a spontaneous integrity in the direct impression of the work of art and provide a sense of an inseparable integrity. (35)

He holds that art must have a certain formal objectivity by virtue of a dialectical unity of form and content. He rejects the subjectualization of art that comes with the confusion of form with autonomous technique. He was just as skeptical of socialist realism, insisting that proletarian artists must struggle critically with social issues, not merely act as instruments of party orthodoxy.

For Lukacs, social reality is a distinct background out of which literature arises or into which it blends. He argues that literature should not be mere copy of the social and economic circumstances but also show the conflict of social classes. In this way he rejects the contemporary principle art for art’s sake as bourgeoisie ideology or as the products of capitalist society.

Georg Lukacs is one of the best critics who practices ‘the reflection model’. The reflection model sees literature as reflecting a reality outside it. As a matter of fact, it was

quite safe and rather conventional to treat literary works as something referring to a reality outside them. Not only for Lukacs, but, before the structuralist revolution, this thinking had a firm hold over Marxists for a long time as Marx himself maintained against Hegel that external reality is prior to ideas in the mind, and that the material world is reflected in the mind of man and translated into forms of thought.

Lukacs did not see literature as reflecting reality as a mirror does. But since literature is knowledge of reality, knowledge is not a matter of making one-to-one correspondences between things in the world outside and ideas in the head. He insists on a shape of dialectical all the parts are in movement and contradiction. To be reflected in literature, reality has to pass through the creative form giving work of a writer. Then, if the work is correctly formed the form of the work reflects the form of the external world. In regard to his use of the term 'form', Lukacs is rather traditional (in contrast with the Russian formalists notion of form as the sum total of devices used in a text).

In this way, Lukacs leaned more towards the Hegelian side of the Marxist thinking by treating literary works as reflections of an unfolding system. The crux of his idea is that a realist work must reveal the underlying pattern of contradictions in a society or a social order. His view is Marxist basically in its insistence on the material and historical nature of society.

Lukacs focuses on the objectivity of art which seems more scientific. According to his principle, any work of art should provide the picture of reality that means a work of art should present the social reality. Here social realist consists of the class struggles too. Different social classes are reflected in the literary text. In this way if we see *The Big Heart*, we can take it as a picture of contemporary social reality. In Lukacs' view, work

of art not only provides sacrificial reality but also reveals the underlying pattern of contradiction in society or social order.

For Lukacs, the correct form is one that reflects reality in the most objective way. In this ground, he finds the form of the early 19th century novels of Scott, Balzac and Tolstoy to be correct for embodying knowledge of the contradictory content of capitalist society. For instance, he examines Balzac's novel *Les Paysans* and finds a significant form in the triangular configuration of three social classes; landed aristocracy, bourgeois, and peasantry. The conflict between classes was the form of the then society and it got reflected in the novel in the form of characters' interrelations. The shift from Balzac and Tolstoy to Zola and Flaubert was actually the shift from realism to naturalism. Lukacs argues that when presenting naturalistic details the reflection becomes one-sided and hence a presence of unmediated totalities. In such a case there can be no true reflection of the dialectical shape of society. Lukacs' point is that to reflect the underlying pattern of contradictions in a society, the writer should maintain a certain distance. Unmediated totalities result in one-sided emphasis on minute-details. This is the case with James Joyce, Marcel Proust, criticizes the writers is that these unmediated totalities have a political significance because when we are always exposed to only one side of the society or social life, we are in a way accustomed to that kind of perception, turning blind to other aspect of life.

Lukacs also expands Engel's views espoused in his letter in relation to Balzac's writing that reality transcends class sympathies. Indeed, Balzac was a political reactionary in his real life, but his novel *Les Paysans* reflects the structure of reality and, in this the novel goes against Balzac's ideology. While Engels does not explain why it

could happen, Lukacs argues that it is the form of the novel itself that reflects the structure of social reality. Had it been for another, the same correct form would have been seen in the rest of his works also, which in fact does not happen. By doing so, Lukacs is greatly playing down the role of the author in the process of reflection.

Adams says, “Balzac is Lukacs’s principal example there follows a strong sense that human wholeness has been completely suppressed. Realism proceeds to reject harmony and beauty as illusions. The opposition of idealism and realism explicates the division in humanity that is the product of bourgeois society” (902). So, Lukacs calls for a reawakened social humanism that would heal the breach between life and beauty and create a new harmony that would be worldly.

The concept of type or typicality is a central component in Lukacs reflection model. The type is not a statistical ‘average’ but the character or situation in the literary work which brings together the general movement of history and number unique individual traits. The concept of the type consists of the combination of individual character with particular traits and general trends of history. For example, Scotts Waverley in the novel of the same name is a romantic youth, full of literary fantasies. These are his particular traits, but they have been described within the general trends of history with opposing forces.

Theodor Adorno, however, emphasizes that “the interior monologue far from cutting the literary work off from reality, can expose the way reality is” (189). But, for Adorno, this reality is not photographic as far Lukacs and at the same time the duty of an author isn’t saving to the objective pre-existing in the society. Adorno clearly states that “art is the negative knowledge of the actual world” (189). However, according to David

Forgues, Adorno by negative knowledge “doesn’t mean non-knowledge. It means knowledge which can undermine and negate a falls of reified condition” (189).

One of the Adorno’s theme was civilization’s tendency to self-destruction. In their widely influential book *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947), Adorno and Horkheimer located this impulse in the concept of reason itself, which, the enlightenment and modern scientific though had transformed in to irrational force that had come to dominate not only nature but humanity itself. Adorno concluded that rationalism offers little hope for human emancipation, which might come instead from art and the prospects it offers for preserving individual autonomy and happiness, the enlightenment use of reason is used by culture industry for their benefits. Their view about cultural industry is:

The culture industry perpetually cheats its consumers of what it perpetually promises. The promissory note which, with its plot and staging, it draws on pleasure is endlessly prolonged, the premise which is actually all the spectacle of, is illusory, call it actually conforms is that the real point will never be reached that to be a dinner most be satisfied with menu. (213)

Their view is that, art culture and beauty is commodity under capitalism. They defend art against mass culture. Tradition of mass production ought to be distinguished via art and literature for them.

In his book *Intellectual History Reader: A Critical Introduction*, Birendra Pandey has critically analyzed Horkheimer and Adorno’s theory. Dr. Pandey writes, “They dismiss the enlightened modern culture, which is essentially an exhaustive technological mediation by, of, and for the masses – a mass mediation with mass media which makes

everything appear ontologically similar, as mass deception” (36). The very achievement of enlightened modern culture, according to Horkheimer and Adorno, turns out to be loss because the mass deception forces the culture industry to camouflage what seems to discover and expose. The loss, which conduces to wrapping up of whatever resists the mediation, makes the culture industry veer towards the totalitarian direction of modern capitalist society.

The culture industry instills a sense of resignation orientating the consumers to “the everyday drudgery . . . which the whole culture industry promises may be compared to the daughter’s abduction in the cartoon: the father is holding the ladder in the dark. The paradise offered by the culture industry is the same old drudgery, ‘Culture Industry’” (140). Horkheimer and Adorno lament that “criticism and respect disappear in the culture industry; the former becomes a mechanical expertise, the latter is succeeded by a shallow cult of leading personality” (157). Such a state of submission rules out critical distancing, which makes them acknowledge that “the triumph of advertising in the culture industry is that consumers feel compelled to buy and use its production even though they see through them” (162). The prominent writer Adorno and his friend conceptualize mass media as the part of society and focus on how socio-economic imperatives have made them function as instruments of social control and thus serve the interest of social domination (qtd. in Pandey 13).

Similarly, another prominent critic and theorist, Terry Eagleton in his famous book *Marxism and Literary Criticism* observes:

Books are not just structure of meaning. They are also commodities product by producers and sold on the market at a profit. Drama is not just

a collection literary text it is capitalist business which employs certain man (authors, directors, and actors, stage hands) to produce a commodity to consume by an audience at a profit. (55)

It, hence, becomes crystal clear that, in Eagleton's view, capitalist commodity art and literature they use are and literature saleable object in the market they don't understand the good aura of real art. Writers are hired by the publishing house to produce commodities which will sell.

Eagleton's opinion towards modernist as well as post modernist development in art and culture is that it makes boundary over the all political socio-economic relevance. Eagleton observes that "the depthless, styleless, dehistoricized, deathed surfaces of post modernist culture are not meant to signify an alienation, for the very concept of alienation must secretly posit a dream of authority which post modernist find quite unintelligible" (386). He argues that such attempts to disengage art and culture from socio-economic determinate lead them to unprivileged humble position. Art becomes nothing but the production of any commodity. Marxist literary theoreticians, in this way, straight forwardly acknowledge the literature relevance to the socio-economic situation of a society despite lots of diversity among themselves.

Marxist philosophy believe that it is man's social being that determine his consciousness and it is that consciousness which determine the nature of his literary work. Orthodox Marxist theory of art insists that primary function of art is to serve the working class representing their falling and heightening the class struggle. The common idea of all Marxist critics is that the literature can be best understood within a large framework of social reality.

Chapter III: Commodification of Human Values in Mulk Raj Anand's Novel *The Big Heart*

Mulk Raj Anand's novel *The Big Heart* displays commodification of human values. Universal norms and values of human being are taken merely as commodity by the Lalas and so-called rich people of capitalistic society of Kucha Billimaran. Lower working class people especially the Thathiars are commodified throughout the novel. These people despite their belonging to the second highest caste Kshetriyas according to Hindu caste system are considered mere an object that can be sold and bought in the capitalist market place. Thathiars are traditionally apprenticed in the art of coppersmithing which is considered to be lower job and they hence are degraded in the capitalist bourgeois society. Almost all the characters in the novel are taken as mere object in the Kaserian bazaar and the streets of Kucha Billimaran, the Cat Killer's Lane.

Anand's protagonist Ananta endeavored in order to master the machine throughout his life but dies at the hands of Ralia one of the thathiar brothers. Ananta wanted to win everything with his big heart but could not succeed in the bourgeoisie society. He wished to form a union of the thathiar brothers both employed and unemployed and revolt against the owners of the factory which had snatched their age long craftsmanship of coppersmith. But, ironically, Ananta died at the hands of his own thathiar fellow whom he wined, fed and supported always. This very death signifies that the factory owners had taken Ananta as a threat to their social strata. Ananta wanted to overpower the machine, one of the most powerful weapon of the capitalist. That is why, he endeavored to form union in order to bargain against the masters of the factory and revolt if needed.

Along with the establishment of the factory, thathiars who used to earn their living through the job of making utensils lost their jobs. Few thathiars like Ananta who got piecework outside the factory were also not provided full established wage. And others like Mehru who were employed in the factory were given very low job like sweeper in low salary. When Ananta went to Lala Lal Chand to ask the wage for the deg he made he was shocked that the wage had been reduced. Lal Chand proudly said to Ananta, “That is the wage for a deg in the bazaar today. Go and ask any Kasera. We have had to reduce wage because there is no demand for these utensils now. people haven’t the money to buy utensils. And the market for this kind of work is contracting everywhere” (106).

This very extract exhibits how so-called masters objectify the workers. Owners ask their workers to work for them and so do the workers. Yet the masters pay very low wage for which they put lots of pretending forward. They do so not for anything else but in order to profit more and make more money. No matter how hellish the worker’s life might be. As the protagonist does, Ananta too insisted the wages that was previously agreed to pay. At this, Lal Chand boasted how Ananta was given work when others were straying idle due to worklessness.

‘But you can’t reduce an established wage. Give me what you have always given me. It is not a mere figure in a ledger. It represents work, labor, the three days I have spent on it – this deg!’

‘I say you should think yourself lucky that you got work at all. Think of you other friends, Ralia and all the others. We believed in your craftsmanship and we gave you the copper to make a deg. It is dead stock

and won't be sold for years. Now take this money or throw it away – that is your own look out!' (107)

Lal Chand gave work to Ananta. Yet he refused to pay him the right amount of the wage he had promised or been giving before. Above all, Lal Chand pretended that the deg wouldn't be sold for years as it was a dead stock. Similarly, the masters provide job for few chosen workers and create dearth of vacancies. Ananta is the only person in the whole thathiar brotherhood who got the piece work outside the factory. Lal Chand, thus, reminded Ananta the same thing that he was the only thathiars who was getting job though in the form piece work.

Employer Lal Chand here is commodifying the employee Ananta. He is treating Ananta as if he were mere an object. Despite Ananta's protest, Lal Chand is not ready to provide him right amount of money. Through it even he wants to make more profit and surplus. Lal Chand is using Ananta according to his will, thus, reifying Ananta.

Relationship between human beings: master and worker or employer and employee has no value at all. What matters is money; making money by hook or by crook is the motto of these bourgeois people.

In capitalistic system, relationship between employer and employee is similar to the commodity and its owner. Capitalists have everything but proletariats have nothing except their labor. This is a way for their emancipation. When proletariats came to know that they are exploited, they are not getting proper wage, they try to find out where and how they are exploited. Then they revolt against the exploitation imposed upon them. The class consciousness inspires them to revolt against every kind of injustice. They revolt freely because they have nothing to lose but bourgeoisie have everything to lose.

Thathiars, thus, marched towards the factory as they had lost their traditional job of making utensils which was gone with the establishment of the factory. Even the thathiars were not getting employment in the factory. Who were employed were also not satisfied as they were not provided job according to their status and skill. Mehru, one of the thathiar boys, for instance, was recruited in the factory. He knew good craft but given a job of sweeper. Gopi, the manager came to Mehru and promoted him in making boxes. Still Mehru found the job mere a childling's play. The novelist sketches his state of mind: "And then he stood making boxes automatically, while his mind ran riot, thinking of the possibilities of the future, whether he would be happy doing this job which more child's play or whether he could do a little of the old craft at nights" (128).

Mehru's promotion came under the capitalist motto: divide the workers and rule them. Firstly, Gopi, the manager promoted Mehru from sweeper to a simple machine operator. Secondly, came the factory owners Khushal Chand to Mehru. He even disclosed some secrets. But in return did his own business of dividing the thathiars.

'Han, there are heaps of things in the store room, and for all I know, they came from the thieves' kitchen'. said Khushal Chand, laughing. Then he looked towards the courtyard warily and , leaning over to Mehru, said, 'Will you be seeing Ananta today?' Mehru hesitated imaging that the employers were manoeuvring him into the position to do something wrong and that 'they' had sent Khushal Chand to spy on him or to pump him for some secret information. 'Give him this money which I owe him', Khushal Chand said. He handed him some notes, and nervously looked at his watch and said, 'Oh, five to one. I must go. Tell Ananta I will get the

boys here to join his union if he succeeds in getting the other themselves.

(130)

One of the owners of the factory, Khushal Chand here is endeavoring to divide the workers and rule over them, ultimately commodifying their values. That very trick of 'divide and rule' stirred the movement of the thathiars who wanted to form union in order to revolt against the factory owners and ask for job. They even got success in doing so.

Ananta the protagonist was about to form union at his shop after meal in the presence of poet Puran Singh Bhagat, Mahasha Hans Raj and the student leader Satyapal though Satyapal was against forming union rather immediate action. Latter three learned men were busy in their scholarly talk. Mehru meanwhile reached there looking for Ananta.

'I looked in,' said Mehru, addressing Ananta, 'to give you this money which Khushal Chand gave me for you.'

'So that is the game!' said Ralia.

'All eyes may be black but they are not alike,' said Viroo. 'I didn't think Ananta could be speaking to us and be winking at the dealers at the same time. (158)

His own thathiar brethrens for whom Ananta was going to fight with the factory owners were suspecting him. Ralia and Viroo, expressed their doubt in those above extracted lines. They were not expecting Ananta to be a traitor. On this Mehru gave clarification to all, "there is no unanswerable riddle in this message. It is the wages they owed Ananta" (158). And Ananta gave that money to Ralia and the party not to prove that he was not betraying the thathiar brotherhood. He heartily gave the sum so that they

could buy food for their family members. But that very suspicion worked out and Ananta's dream of forming union against the factory owners went in vain. Instead of forming union and bargain for their rights thathiars turned deaf ears to Ananta and followed the student leaders Satyapal. Ultimately, the thathiars destroyed the machines and killed their own benefactor Ananta via the hands of Ralia.

Ralia always wanted to kill the masters or the owners of the factory which had snatched thathiars' traditional job of making copper utensils: 'I should like to kill the whole lot of them', Ralia said, awakening suddenly. 'The thieves and robbers who have gathered together and deprived us of work. Look, folks, the darkness has come! Where is that boy, babu Satyapal?' (157). Ralia always used to be so violent "because thathiars live in a small world, full of denial and refusal, insults and humiliations" (142) as Ananta asserted. Ralia's instinct of killing oozed out because Ralia and his thathiar brothers were deprived of work and the meal ultimately. Thus, against the will of Ananta who wanted to master the machine, Ralia ruined the machine spell-bounded under the student leader Satyapal's inciting speech.

Capitalist's 'divide and rule' technique worked out but the relationship between masters and workers is just objectified. Hence, thathiars revolted against the factory owners and destroyed the machines merely because bourgeoisie Lalas: Gokul Chand, Lal Chand, Khushal Chand, Murli Dhar, and the party, took the thathiars mere an object but not human beings.

Unless the thathiars have not been deprived of the single meal of a day they would not have destroyed machines inside the factory. Ralia who bull-heads into the factory and destroys almost all the machines in the factory is a mere mean. If he had been

provided employment in the factory by the Lalas: Gokul Chand, Kushal Chand, Lal Chand, Murli Dhar, Sadanand or Gopi, Ralia would not have been so violent as Lord Shiva, the destroyer, on the demise of his spouse Sati Devi. Ralia declared:

‘This is THE KALI YUG . . . I am the destroyer of this madar-chod age, . . . Come, brothers, I am Shiva’ Ralia mumbled as he swung the hammer with both hands and capered like a monkey from machine to machine in the factory, with all the maddened murderous power of his giant body, while Satyapal and Viroo stood away frightened after they had exhausted themselves breaking the machines. The crowd of workers, unemployed thathians, students, and other sightseers, with Gopi and Channa at their head, looked on stunned from the verandah. They could all see what was happening, but for a while the wild swing of Ralia’s hammer struck a terror into every heart so that no one dared to go forward and interrupt him. (214)

Destroying the machines Ralia not only threatens the machine owners but also his own brothers. Anand carries out this mythology of Lord Shiva in order to depict the rage of a common person who can reach to that stage when he is inhumanly suppressed. All the 33 million Gods and Goddesses including Lord Vishnu, the preserver and Lord Brahma, the creator stood spellbound and could just see the tandav of Shiva, the destroyer in the castle of Daksha Prajapati. They all did their best in order to check that destruction of Maha Roudra but to no avail. Same is the condition of Channa, the foreman and Gopi, the manager as well as owner of the factory along with other owners.

During the thathiars' destruction of machine the owners called the police. Anand says, "some of the crowd moved away, shaking their heads and blinking nervously" (215) when they heard that the police were coming. But as Ralia heard this, Anand inks:

He stopped laughing suddenly for a moment, wiped the sweat off his forehead, so that his whole face glistened with a savage energy and warmth. 'Now tell me how you feel', he said, addressing a machine before him . . . What is made must be broken, the cause of ruin must become a ruin – then only will the bosses learn! (215)

Ralia's rage signifies how so called Lalas of the capitalist society suppressed the thathiars and how they had played with their lives as commodity. Ralia's firm stand against the police reminds us that he doesn't want to stop whatever the situation may happen. During the destruction he was so violent that he killed his own benefactor and well-wisher Ananta. Only after Ananta's death Ralia's Roudra Roop calmed down. Anand describes the situation:

And he viciously lifted and struck Ananta's head on the broken part of machine with a maniacal fury, till Ananta's skull cracked like a pitcher, and a stream of blood shot out in thick spurts. . . Ralia stood shaking with fear and excitement now, his face a place blank, with not the slightest trace of anger or pity in it. (219)

At the hand of Ralia, this very death of the protagonist, Ananta signifies a lot. Despite the knowledge that machines are the strongest means of Capitalists in order to exercise power over proletariats, the Communists, Ananta is very much optimistic. He wanted to master over those, machines that has snatched the thathiars' traditional job of

making metal utensils. Ananta always wanted to master the machines with the help of heart and brain. Even he wanted to show the power of togetherness that only comes through heart. But this Anand's Big Heart is destroyed ultimately by the rage and irrational desire that came via hungry belly. Dr. Saros Cowasjee in his essay comments:

It is significant that Ananta should die at the hands of Ralia, who is carefully drawn by the author for the thoughtless crime he commits. Or those laid out of work by the machine. Ralia and his family suffer the most, and Ralia is shown ranting at the machines early in the novel. During the political discussions he is for the most part shown drunk or asleep, and he kills Ananta unintentionally while wrecking the machines. Ananta is thus a victim of rage and insanity, not of a religious or political creed, and his sacrifice is the sacrifice of the unselfish man for humanity.

(10)

Dr. Cowasjee found Ananta's murder as the result of wild rage of Ralia. But question arises why Ralia became so wild. It is due to excessive oppression and objectification of human values. When humans are considered just to be objects, this sort of situation arises and man is overwhelmed by animalistic features when he is not hesitated to kill his own brother. Bourgeoisie people exercises the same practice and create such circumstance so that there would be less chance of revolting against their realm of capitalism.

As Cowasjee says Ralia through out the novel is shown a drunkard and high tempered who can be easily gullible. Such is Ralia because as Cowasjee in above excerpt "Ralia and his family suffer the most" (10) in the hands of so-called upper class Lalas, owners of the factory. Ralia and his thatthiar brothers are so oppressed that they even

didn't have a single morsel of food to eat. Instinctively Ananta, as a result, provides some money to Ralia to buy something so that he can feed his family – “Go, take this money and buy some flour for yourself at Mohkam's shop” (159). Ralia is not content even at this generosity of his mentor Ananta and suspects, “I suppose you want to gain time so that you can promise to one and perform to another” (159). Ananta could have answered Ralia immediately as the narrator discloses Ananta's mental disturbance: “Ananta's heart grew heavy with the silent oppression of heat and suspicion that now surrounded him. In vain he had tried to prove to these bitter maltreated men that he was with them” (159). But he did not rebuke because Ananta knew quite well that if Ralia could be rude and pessimistic to that extent it was merely because he was merely treated as a marketable object in that bourgeoisie society. Let us see how unmannered are these thathiars. This sort of frustration in their mindsets is sowed by the very social order of oppression where everything is determined by money and upper class capitalists Lalas. Firstly, thathiars' job of coppersmith was snatched by those bourgeois people and secondly they were not provided piece work of making utensils even. Worst of all, wages of the piecework had been reduced to the lowest. Ananta knows that hungry stomach can recognize nothing. “‘A well-fed man needs religion’,’ Ananta quoted the proverb (155) during the hot discussion with Mahasha Hans Raj, student leader Satyapal and the poet Puran Singh. Ananta further bewares the leaders, especially Mahasha Hans Raj, “Mahashaji, it is a question of the belly! The soul is with us all the time, because we are ourselves according to the Hindu faith” (155).

Ananta is true to the large extent here because hunger wants to fill its belly only. Unless the belly is not fed timely, it can even insane its owner. Thus, a person can be

very dangerous at that time. Ralia easily was inticed by Satyapal in comparison to other thathiars because he was more tortured due to his hunger as a result he not only destroyed the machines but also killed his benefactor Ananta. Ralia, thus, fed up with the talk roared furiously at that scholarly talk:

‘Stop this talk!’ said Ralia, awakened from his drunken stupor. ‘Let us eat in peace.’ He seemed to have spoken for the most of the thathiars, as the argument between the two learned men had soared above his heads. So the leaders became silent. Ananta got up, pot and ladle in hand, to cover the embarrassing situation, saying: ‘There is no talk, brothers, one just have a big heart. (151)

Through this excerpt even it is crystal clear that hunger needs nothing but just a morsel of food. Only talk can’t fill one’s belly and satisfy the hunger. Had Ananta not provided Ralia food, Ralia would have been taken action against those learned personnel. This incident evidences how the Kaseras were exploiting the thathiars despite the fact that both the castes fall under the second highest class. Brotherhood and humanity are replaced by money and commodity resulting this pathetic situation.

Unless the factory had not been established, the thathiars would not have to suffer to the state this sort of frustration and dejection. Merely through commodification, this has happened. Even the thathiars had crossed the limit and went to the state of killing each other just for some grains of food. Scenario of the local grocery shop better proves how people are crazy for little amount of flour.

When he got to the grain-shop Ananta found not so much a queue of the kind with which he had become familiar in Bombay, but a crowd of men

who had besieged the closed doors of the store. Back to back, eager, shoving, pushing and shoving again, swaying this side and that, with ripples of curses and abuses rising from their lips and dying on the edges of the thick atmosphere, they filled the square. . . they trampled on each other's corns and stretched their hands out more and more, for their wants, anxious to grasp the least little remnant of security for themselves . . .

(177)

What an ironical situation Anand describes here. The shop is closed yet people are gathering, cursing, pushing each other just to get few kilos of food stuffs. They are cursing their own fellows who has done no harm to them. People are not patient enough to wait for their turn because if they waited for their turn the shop may be closed and they have to die of starvation.

Not only this but also rich people of Kucha Billimaran behave working class people as cattle who dine, urine, stool, live and die at the same place. People were waiting for the shop to be opened but Mohkam Chand the owner of the shop had a siesta in his home. People could no longer tolerate that waiting and some shout at him while others beg.

'What about the flour now? give us a rupee's worth, Seth!'

'Ohe, give for the sake of my hungry children!'

'Ohe, for the sake of God!' The voices of the crowd were echoed and re-echoed and multiplied by other appeals. (183)

But this voice and ardent appeal is not listened to him. In place of distributing the goods Seth rested at home with his wife making love. When voice from the crowd rose higher

and louder Mohkam Chand complains himself. “ ‘Seth Mohkam Chand came out and beat his head and shouted: ‘Oh, I am being looted! I am ruined! Ohe, come to your senses, you two! Oh, see, folks, how hooligans have turned on the honest, turning the streets into the haunts of banditry!’ ” (181). And the Seth ordered his private guard to fire at the crowd. Still the mob was not threatened so he called the police instead of selling goods to the crowd. As police interrogated Ananta protested at this.

‘How much have they looted?’ the policeman asked Mohkam Chand.

‘And how many have died through that firing?’ ‘Nothing has been looted nor anyone killed,’ Ananata answered. ‘But if he will not open his shop till midday, and there is no flour in people’s homes, do you expect them to wait till he has finished making love to his wife before he comes out to serve them?’ (182)

This is the real picture of bourgeoisie culture and society. People are asking goods giving Seth the money but in place of providing what they need Seth Mohkam Chand disgraced them and complained the police that he had been looted. He even used his all power in order to subdue the crowd’s voice. Seth Mohkam Chand called police and dispersed the mob when his private guard could control the crowd even by firing. Ananta got scolding from policeman who was talking of their right to buy things when needed. “ ‘Don’t talk so much, and go home if your value your live,’ said the policeman to Ananta, before he turned to scatter the other men with the baton raised in his hand. ‘And who did the firing? I want that man to come to the police station with me,’ he continued as the men were dispersing” (184).

Although the lower strata's people have money it does not count just because they are from lower social status, the proletariat. This is how throughout the novel *The Big Heart* not only human values are objectified but the human being are reified as a whole. Each and every relation is broken and repaired on the basis of money. This new God, money had played its part throughout the novel.

Ralia, Anand's one of the major characters is never shown going his home and attending family duties and responsibilities. When there was not a single grain to eat at home Gauri, the wife of Ralia searched him out. She found him and requested Ralia to go home. In return, he dragged Gauri by the hair. Gauri while she staggered after him alternately protesting struck him with a broom in her hand. This scene became a play in the square of Cat Killer's Lane.

'Rape the mother of your mother!' Ralia roared. 'I will drag you to that drain, until you drink urine and eat dung for arousing me!' 'Vay! May you die! May you die!' Gauri whined as she ran with short jerky steps. 'Look, folks, he is going to murder me! Look, brothers, he is going to murder me! This nasty man! Look, folks, for the sake of my children, save me, oh save me from his clutches. Folks, he is going to murder me!' At this Ralia pulled her hair in a fury of chagrin and shame and struck her on the face.

(43)

Above extract depicts true picture of commodification which had permeated Billimaran's society. There was no mutual relationship between husband and wife. When Gauri searched her husband Ralia and informed that there was no food at home to eat, she got beating. He became so furious that he tried to kill his wife. What could poor Ralia do?

Whether Ralia counseled her that he had lost his job and not employed till Gauri would have become more furious than Ralia. This desperate state came due to the capitalistic social system where human being is objectified.

At that fury duel, all the people gathered there and enjoyed the scuffle. Rhoda and his little baby brother were welling at their parents' shameful fight. But Ananta, with the help of Bali separated both of them as he could not tolerate children's and Gauri's yelling. Had Ananta not separated them Ralia could have killed Gauri. She is not even emancipated from bourgeoisie social norm and values where humans are treated as marketable things.

The person who generously snatched Gauri from her death i.e. Ralia's rage got the curse. What an irony!

Meanwhile Gauri had rushed to her children and picking up the little one, stood bleeding at the left ear while she shouted. 'Look, folks, the darkness has come. No food in the home. The rent owing. And he wants to murder me for telling him! The lazy scoundrel! Why doesn't he go and do a day's work? Drunkard! The brother of drunkards! And of whoremongers!' (43)

Gauri instead of thanking Ananta for saving her life adjectivized him as whoremonger. She could not have feelings in her heart at all only because everything is reified. Instead of strengthening relationship with her savoir Gauri scolds Ananta. She does not acknowledge the cause of her husband's worklessness. Even she knows not that all this has come to the fore due to capitalism. Not only of Ralia's but also of whole thatthiar brothers' idleness is created by this very capitalism which has introduced machines. The machines has devoured the thatthiar's traditional job of coppersmith. That is why, Gauri,

wonders why her husband does not go and do a day's work. Similarly, she curses Ananta vulgarly who has saved her from her husband's rage. Her anger against Ananta who even has provided food for her children is nothing but the result of hunger. Whether Ralia had work to do she would not have cursed Ananta and Ralia as there were food to eat at home.

This family scuffle is just the representative event of the thatiar brethren's heart rendering plight. It shows how money is saturated inside the families that has ruined the human sentiments and feelings. No family relation can work properly in this capitalist society where everything is determined by profit, surplus and money. A family the unit of society does not run smoothly in this capitalistic culture.

Let us see so-called upper class Lala families. Murli Dhar is Chaudhari, the head of thatiar brotherhood. He was arranging marriage of his grandson Nikka with daughter of the people from Jandiala, Ram Saran and Binde Saran. Both the parties are dealing the marriage in cash and they have not any shame for that – 'Han – brothers, - - so we will do straight talk,' said Ram Saran, 'We are villagers. Our need is so bad that we have come to selling our daughters!' (76). Without any hesitation father of prospect bride Ram Saran asked for the money so that he could decide whether it was profitable for keeping relationship with Murli Dhar or not. As Ram Saran cracked the nut in a straight forward manner the talk started and even finalized in three bags full of hundred rupees notes.

'Sadananda, bring two bags of a hundred rupees each from that safe so that they can get the girl's trousseau.' said Murli fanning himself. 'Are you sure that will be enough to prepare the girl's trousseau with?' said Sadanand, giving Ram Saran a significant look. 'Why, Bindu?' Ram Saran

turned to his younger brother. ‘Oh, don’t ask me, I am melting with shame,’ said Binde Saran. ‘That it should come to this! There are a thousand miseries in one daughter.’ . . . ‘Give them three bags, Sadanand,’ said Murli, for he saw in the reticence of his guests about the sum offered an occasion to clinch the bargain on the cheap. (77)

Quite greedily both sides have finalized the deal. This practice emphatically declares how people can stoop so low. There is place for relationship between human beings if there is no money or surplus or profit. Instead of marrying their daughter to Ananta, Ram Saran and Binde Saran gave their daughter’s hand to Nikka the weakling who is quite younger than the bride. Previous relation that was offered by Karam Devi as known as Karmo for her stepson Ananta was denied just because Murli Dhar the owner of factory was wealthier than Ananta the worker.

Ram Saran was evidently grasping for more money. And yet he knew that if they didn’t accept the bargain now the disgrace would be unbearable, as the whole world would know that the folk from Jandiala had sold their daughter. On the other hand, Murli and Sadanand knew that if Nikka didn’t get the girl, the weakling would probably never get another offer. But neither side could go on bidding for a girl as if she were a slave on the market. (78)

Even caste is determined by the money itself. People can easily climb the ladder of social class. In this matter, Cowasjee pens, “The problems of caste and class are complex, and they cannot be solved separately, for they are often linked together and influenced by cash nexus” (10).

Anand inks, “the fact that Murli heard that Lala Ram Saran and his brother Lala Binde Saran had arrived to offer him the match of the latter’s daughter for his grandson Nikka had elated him with the knowledge that, with his wealth, his prestige was rising . . .” (47). Before settling the marriage with Murli’s grandson Nikka Lala Ram Saran had promised to give his daughter’s hand to some other thathiars. As he knew that Murli could grant him more money he approached to Murli and there was the deal finalized in three full bags of money.

Murli Dhar, one of the thathiars, climbed the social ladder and joined the upper caste the Kaseras. The thathiars who belonged to the second highest caste of Kshetriya in Hinduism and were yet degraded for following a dirty profession of coppersmith. Still Murli wished to join the Kaseras who were one step above the Thathiars. Due to the very reason, Murli on the occasion of Nikka’s betrothal ceremony sent his son Sadanand to invite Chaudhari Lala Gokul Chand, the head of the Kaseras, school teacher, Babu Devi Datt, and few other distinguished guests. But Murli did not call the thathiar brothers on that auspicious occasion. When Sadanand invited Gokul Chand on the occasion Seth Gokul Chand refused to attend the ceremony saying that “ the thathiars still have a bad reputation” (134). But Sadanand fell at his feet, reminded their joint venture in the factory and after a long persuasion Gokul Chand became ready to visit yet secretly. Sadanand invited all high profiled people of Billimaran but didn’t send a public message for his own thathiar brothers. Dina Timur Lang infuriated over the matter:

‘If you knew that not one of us of the thathiar caste has received an invitation to go to the betrothal ceremony of Murli Dhar’s grand son, Nikka, there,’ said Dina pointing towards the lane, ‘but that Sadanand has

been putting his turban at the feet of all the rich dealers, begging them to grace his house on this auspicious occasion, then you would know if it is caste which counts or money.’ (154)

Knowingly thathiar brethrens have not been invited merely because they were poor. But Murli had sent his Sadanand to visit each and every doorsteps of the rich and alm them to grace their home with their presence personally. Obviously this shows how so-called upper class people treat lower class people in capitalist society. Money the new God of the capitalists determines the social class and caste even. Why Murli not invited his thathiar brothers only because he wanted to join higher caste. He did not want to show the society that he also belonged to thathiar brotherhood. Murli even didn’t employ the best thathiar craftsmen in his factory because he did not want to opportunity any of his fellow thathiars who could later challenge his social status.

There happened a terrific dual at the visit to a thathiar’s home by any Kasera. Gokul Chand and his family was condemned to have fallen into lower caste. One of the Kaseras Seth Ghansham Das abused Gokul Chand, “ ‘ . . . what about your visiting the house Murli Dhar, shameless one! Next you will be giving your daughter in marriage to a bellows-blowing thathiars.’ ”(186). As Gokul Chand endeavored to console Seth Ghansham Das and offered him hookah, Ghansham Das refused, “I’d rather drink urine that smoke hookah with one who ahs spoiled his mouth with the food and water of Murli! . . . Look, folks, they have spoiled our religion and talk as if lapers have no lice.’ ” (187). This incident even depicts that there is no sentiment of brotherhood among the Kaseras. Gokul Chand, despite being Chaudhari, head of the Kasera society has lost his hold and respect of his post in Kaserian eyes. The members of his brotherhood are not ready to

join him and smoke hookah which is considered as a respectful manner in the brotherhood.

Both Thathiars and Kaseras are losing their spirit of togetherness in their society and neighborhood. Murli Dhar, the head of the Thathiars did not invited his thathiar brothers in his grandson's engagement ceremony because they were poor and live low standard of life. Gokul Chand on the other hand visited Murli's home secretly so that he would not have to be questioned by his Kasera brethrens and remained the Chaudhari. Each relation is determined by the bourgeoisie norms and values where proletariats have no place, thus, inhumanly treated and objectified.

Worst of all is the relation between the masters and the workers and the rich and the poor. Money exercises power here. How this very money determines their relationship is instanced in above said instances already. There is not human feelings and sentiments at all among the inhabitants of Kucha Billimaran. People were craving for money especially the capitalists, the Kaseras and few thathairs like Murli Dhar. Even the proletariats, poor thathiars were wanting it but the difference is that former wanted to make profit while later just to survive in this cruel inhuman world.

Bali who run little grocery and serbet shop exploited the poor thathiars. Running grocery shop Bali had been selling local wine. Most of the time Ralia and Dina were seen drinking alcohol at his shop. He denied to give any more liquor to them when they finished their money. Bali even treated them as if they were empty cans of beer but not his customers and human beings after all: “ ‘ . . . Go – have some respect for my customers. Look, there is Mahasha Hans Raj coming.’ ” (111) Dina became angry at Bali's behaviour and said, “What are we if not customers?” (111). Ralia too became

furious at the behavior of Bali and taunted, “we are not the lovers of your mother!” backing up Dina. “All we want is more – – ’ (111). Furiating at Ralia’s expression Bali ignored them as non-living things, he went to welcome his so-called customer of high profile: “ ‘Ohe, chup kar!,’ Bali said, cautioning him. And twisting his face deliberately, he put on a meek expression and joined his hands respectfully to the august person who was approaching” (111).

In that realm of objectification, it is only Ananta the protagonist who labors to protest against those upper class’s factory owners. “There is no talk of money, brothers; one must have a big heart!” (19) asserts Ananta in the very beginning chapter of the novel. Mulk Raj Anand, the novelist commences his novel with above said statement. Author’s hero Ananta frequently utters this thesis statement that is motto of his life as well. Throughout the novel Ananta endeavors, his fellows, and brethren, to impart the very sentiment. Despite being one of the thathiars, the poor working class, Ananta feeds the thathiars, preaches to form a union against the factory owners and lessons how to master the machine.

In the age of commodification where everything is determined by the new God, Money, Ananta is the only what Anand terms him rogue who doesn’t care it. Frequently, he asserts that ‘there is no talk of money, one must have a big heart’.

Ananta talks of the heart that one must have in order to fight this devil with. It is the age of commodification where every thing: whole social, economic, political, and interpersonal relationships is determined by the new god, Money. Cowasjee writes, “Money is the great God, and in the novel . . . Anand repeats . . . money decides both caste and class; it also decides one’s political affiliations. The factory owner Murli Dhar

has as little choice of being a communist as Ralia or Ananta has of being Capitalist (10-11)".

It was Anad's hero who got the work to do even though it was a piece work of making utensils out of copper provided by Gokul Chand and his party. The employers provided very low wage reducing to nothing yet they boasted that they had given the thathairs job. When Ananta went to submit the deg he made to Gokul Chand and his party's shop in Kaserian bazaar, lala Lal Chand said that the wage had been reduced. As Ananta insisted to grant him the wage previously agreed, Lal Chand said:

I say you should think yourself lucky that you got work at all. Think of you other friends, Ralia and all the others. We believed in your craftsmanship and we gave you the copper to make a deg. It is dead stock and won't be sold for years. Now take this money or throw it away – that is your own look out! (107)

Still Ananta vexed for his right wage but to no avail. With that little money Ananta managed to buy flour and meat for the feast that he gave in his little shop like open cottage where he mends the utensils. Even he provided few pice (smallest amount of money like cent of a dollor) to Rhoda and his friends.

Ananta separated Gauri from the monstrous grip of Ralia. He fostered Janki a young widow whom he had been sheltering her from his stay in Bombay. Despite being charged as 'whoremonger' he performed his job quite well and looked after Janki even though she had been on her death bed due to not remediable tuberculosis. The novelist describes the touchy situation when Ananta took meal for Janki who always was on bed.

And, drawing a stool up to her bed, he placed the bronze plate on it and uncovered the small brass cups and chapattis. He felt a trifle impatient with her because she was ill and an extra responsibility on his troubled soul. For a moment she did not move, but just sat pale, looking, hauntingly beautiful as death. He smiled at her deliberately and tried to avert his eyes as though he were frightened of the thing he could as clearly see written on her face. (140)

Even though Ananta got curse and abusing from Gauri and other thathiars he never ignored them but took as his own family members. Hence, he gave the money to Ralia and other thathiars in order to buy flour from the grocery shop: “ ‘Let us divide this money and buy ourselves the peace to think of our sorrow,’ said Ananta. ‘And then perhaps we can plan to cure it. Go, take this money and buy some flour for yourselves at Mohkam’s shop. It may have opened by now’ ” (159).

Endeavored in order to form the union of the thathiar brothers even. But at the last crucial hour, the thathiars disbelieving Ananta followed a student leader Satyapal. They led by Ralia broke into the factory and ruined the machines which had displaced their traditional jobs and killed their mentor Ananta ultimately. Hence, losing his life for nothing-to-do.

What succeeded here is so called upper class’s bourgeoisie norms and values. Each and every characters in the novel is haplessly stranded by commodification. Although Ananta the protagonist has a big heart in order to challenge this capitalistic social system, he failed at the last hour and the novel ends there. The way of emancipation of poor thathiars thus destroyed and ruined in this way.

IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, the thathiars in Mulk Raj Anand's novel *The Big Heart* are excessively victimized, objectified and commodified. Evidently, Anand wants us to draw the conclusion that Ananta and his poor thathiar brethren have become the scapegoat of the commodification in the hands of Kasera and few well-to-do thathiar Lalas like Murli Dhar. Exploitation of poor thathiars in the novel takes the form of objectification of worker. As the capitalistic system practices, thathiars are inhumanly treated and objectified. Ralia and his party suffer the most. These thathiars are treated so badly that they even kill each other.

No doubt Anand is a versatile writer of Indo - Anglican literature, his novel *The Big Heart* (1945) portrays merits and demerits of the commodification. Critics like Saroj Cowasjee, Margaret Berry, P.K. Rajan and Pramila Paul have taken Anand as a humanistic writer who deals with the lower and working class people. His feelings are the influence of communism. Anand shows the problems which are existing in the society. In the bourgeoisie social order lower classed thathiars are so maltreated that they seem to be mere object. On the other hand, despite being thathiar, Murli Dhar is able to join the upper class and form new Arya Samaj. Even he ignores traditional rite of inviting all the brotherhood in his grandson, Nikka's engagement ceremony. As a true disciple of capitalism Murli only makes the way from where surplus comes and be profit there. He very business-mindedly deals with the folks of Jandiala.

Anand's most of the novels are concluded with tragic theme. Life is far too rich, subtle and comprehensive a business to preclude everything else but bread and butter questions. The revolutionary tone of Mulk Raj Anand's political commitment provides

insights into the politics of the Indian revolutionary elite. His novel highlights the conflicts between the thathiars and the owners of the factory. Saros Cowasjee writes, in the introduction of *The Big Heart*, "The whole man's nature is governed by the new god Money power . . ." (11).

Capitalism is another name for exploitation, but there are very few Capitalists like Mahatma Gandhi who have the welfare of the workers at heart. Anand as a writer shows his concerns to the poor, suppressed and oppressed section of the society. Capitalism has developed the places with new inventions and discoveries. But it has snatched the tradition long job of making utensils of the thathiars.

This research has proved that in every work there are two poles: action and reaction, good and bad. Anand is not in favor of the exploitation of the poor people. Factory can produce many items in large quantity in cheap price. At the same time it exploits the poor and marginalized people. In *The Big Heart* the factory has become enemy of the thathiars. Their jobs are snatched by it, wage is lowered. They have to run for bread. Anand's protagonist is not free from this situation. Ananta is in support of his coppersmith brotherhood but he can not be against of the modern machine. Thus, in place of destroying the machine he is in favor of negotiating with its owner forming the union.

Finally, one can say that Mulk Raj Anand's novel *The Big Heart* is really an example of the big heart of a great man Ananta who never get frustrated by the exploitation of bourgeoisie society. It is better to form a union and march for revolution rather than to expose the agony in front of an inanimate object. Anand does not hate the machine at all but the narrow concept of few people. He has the repulsion towards the capitalist ethos of domination and exploitation of the native.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Harcourt: A Harcourt Publishers International Company, 1999.
- ., ed. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Vol. II, New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.
- Adams, Hazard, ed. "The Ideal of the Harmonious Man in Bourgeois Aesthetics." *Critical Theory since Plato*. U.S.A.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971: 902-903.
- Adorno, Theodor and Marx Horkheimer. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. London: Verso Books, 1997.
- Anand, Mulk Raj. *Apology for Heroism*. New Delhi: Arnold Heinemann, 1986.
- . *The Big Heart*. Delhi: Arnold Heinemann, 1945.
- Bald, Suresh Rengen. *Novelists and Political Consciousness*. Delhi: Chanakya Publication, 1982.
- Bartolovich, Crystal, and Neil Lazarus, eds. *Marxism, Modernity, and Postcolonial Studies*. Cambridge: University Press, 2002.
- Berry, Margaret. *Mulk Raj Anand: The Man and the Novelist*. Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1971.
- Boggs, C. *Gramsci's Marxism*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.
- Cowasjee, Saros, ed. *Author to Critic: The Letter of Mulk Raj Anand*. Calcutta: A Writer's Workshop Publication, 1973.
- . *So Many Freedoms: A Study of Major Fiction of Mulk Raj Anand*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1977.

- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976.
- Gautam, Shreedhar. *The Changing Perspectives of Social Reality in the Novels of Mulk Raj Anand*. PhD Dis. Vanaras: Hindu University, 1998.
- Hanna, George, ed. *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works*, Vol. 33. Moscow: Foreign Language Progress Publishers, 1965.
- Harris, William H., and Judith S. Levey, eds. *The New Columbia Encyclopedia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Iyenger, K.R.S. *Indian Writing in English*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1984.
- Lenin, V.I. *Alliance of the Working Class and Peasantry*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1971.
- Lukacs, Georg. "The Ideal of the Harmonious Man in Bourgeois Aesthetics." Hazard Adams, ed. *Critical Theory since Plato*. U.S.A.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971: 903-908.
- . *History and Class Consciousness*. Merlin Press, 1923.
- Mandel, Ernest. *Marxist Economic Theory*. 3rd ed. London: Merlin Press, 1974.
- Marx, Karl. "The German Ideology." Hazard Adams, ed. *Critical Theory since Plato*. U.S.A.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971: 625.
- . "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." Hazard Adams.: 625-627.
- . *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. New Delhi: Penguin Classics, 1991.
- Mautner, Thomas. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. London: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.
- Pandey, Beerendra, comp. and ed. "Preface". *Intellectual History Reader: A Critical Introduction*. Kathmandu: M.K. Publishers and Distributors, 2005: 13-36.

Paul, Pramila. *The Novels of Mulk Raj Anand: Thematic Study*. New Delhi: Sterling
Publisher, 1983.

Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. *Poor People's Movements*. New York: A
Division of Random House, 1979.

Rajan, P.K. *Mulk Raj Anand: A Revaluation*. New Delhi: Arnold Associates, 1994.

Rohmann, Chris. *Dictionary of Important Ideas and Thinkers*. London: Arrow, 2002.