

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

**Critique of Casteist Ideology in Anand's *Untouchable*
and Roy's *The God of Small Things***

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English, Goldengate International College,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English**

By

Dhana Bahadur Mijar

Symbol No.: 4530002

Regd. No.: 6-1-260-101-2002

Department of English, Goldengate International College

Battisputali, Kathmandu

September 2015

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

Department of English

Recommendation Letter

This is to certify that Mr. Dhana Bahadur Mijar has completed this thesis entitled "Critique of Casteist Ideology in Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things*" under my guidance and supervision. Thus, I forward it to the Research Committee, Department of English, Goldengate International College for viva voce.

Badri Prasad Acharya

Supervisor

Lecturer

Goldengate International College

Battisputali, Kathmandu

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

Goldengate International College

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled "Critique of Casteist Ideology in Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things*" submitted to the Department of English, Goldengate International College, Tribhuvan University, by Dhana Bahadur Mijar, has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Supervisor

External Examiner

Head

Department of English

Goldengate International College

September 2015

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my reverend teacher Mr. Badri Prasad Acharya, for his inspiring suggestions, encouragements and scholarly guidance. He even provided me with the necessary materials that I actually desired for. As an academic expert, he guided me very well. I am highly impressed to his research expertise and intellectuality that I was benefitted well.

I also extend my especial gratitude to Prof. Dr. Rebati Neupane, Head of Department of English, Goldengate Int'l College, for his suggestions and inspirational guidance. I am indebted to CEO of the college, Mr. Ramesh Silwal and Principal Prof. Dr. Bhadra Pokharel, who also offered me necessary guidance. I am thankful also to my friend-like Lecturers of TU, Mr. Rudra Bahadur Charmakar, Mr. Saleem Khan and respected teacher Mr. Mahesh Poudel for inspirations.

I express my warm love and gratitude to my brother Gopal Mijar, sister Bidyadevi Mijar, brother Sammar B. Mijar, big daddy Mr. Ratna Bahadur Mijar, elder sister Dhana Kumari Mijar who provided me with necessary support and inspiration in a way or other.

At the end, I dedicate this research to my loving and caring (Late) Father and Mother, Man Bahadur Mijar and Daku Kumari Mijar respectively, who always inspired me to read, read and read. Similarly, I extend my gratefulness to Late Grandpa Ram Bahadur Sharki and maternal grandpa Indra Bahadur Sharki and uncle Krishna Bahadur Koirala, who provided me study environment with their tireless agro-business.

September 2015

Dhana Bahadur Mijar

Abstract

Both Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* show the severe casteist discrimination of Indian society by representing the caste subaltern characters Bakha and Velutha respectively. In the former Anand represent Bakha as a servile and submissive character, whereas in the latter Velutha has been represented as a brave and sacrificial character. However, both of them become the victims of superstitious human psychology based on the state-protected Hindu ideology. Being a Marxist writer from the early twentieth century Anand talks about casteism in relation to classism while being a leftist writer in the late twentieth century Roy analyzes casteism in relation to ethnicity, gender, geographical location and psychology.

Therefore, Bakha lives without dignity, cannot speak on his own, whereas, Velutha dies with dignity, revolts against the stereotypical traditional behavior and practices as Roy attempts to represent postmodern and post-colonial human psychology. Baby Kochamma is an antagonist who files FIR in police station by posing Velutha, a blame of abducting and murdering her niece Sophie Mol, who, indeed, dies by drowning in the river in boat accident. Roy portrays Velutha as a rebel who transgresses conventional values by having sexual relationship with Ammu, 'upper caste', divorcee of Baba. In this way, Bakha in *Untouchable* cannot speak, whereas Velutha in *The God of Small Things* can speak.

Content

	Pages
Approval Letter	
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
I. Caste Subalternity in Anand's <i>Untouchable</i> and Roy's <i>The God of Small Things</i>	
<i>The God of Small Things</i>	1-12
II. Critique of Casteist Ideology in Anand's <i>Untouchable</i> and Roy's <i>The God of Small Things</i>	
and Roy's <i>The God of Small Things</i>	13-63
Representation of Caste Subalternity in <i>Untouchable</i>	15-36
Delineation of Caste Subalternity in Roy's <i>The God of Small Things</i>	36-63
III. Voice to the Voiceless in Anand's <i>Untouchable</i> and Roy's <i>The God of Small Things</i>	
and Roy's <i>The God of Small Things</i>	64-66
Works Cited	67-69

Chapter I. Caste Subalternity in Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things*

Both Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* depict the caste-based-discrimination and untouchability of Indian society in the 1930s and 1990s respectively. They raise the issue on caste-subaltern discrimination faced by the *Dalits*, the so-called untouchable, out-cast(e) from the casteist practices of Hinduism. These novels critique casteist discrimination that has been prevalent in India against the Dalits; it has stigmatized, levelised them as second grade citizens, abused as 'pig' or 'dog' and the like.

Though both the novelists believe that Casteist discrimination and untouchability is the burning problem of Hindu caste system in India, in *Untouchable* Mulk Raj Anand opines that casteism is a part of the classism, whereas in *The God of Small Things* Arundhati Roy is of the view that untouchability produces not merely classist problem but also socio-economic, politico-cultural and psychological problems. Anand shows how the despondent protagonist Bakha, who is weak in economic status, sweeps the road and cleans latrine to solve his hand to mouth problem. Anand is of the view that poor economic condition is a major cause of Dalits' casteist discrimination and he raises the voice to promote the economic status of Dalits so that they can have the dignified life.

Similarly, Roy portrays Velutha as a major character from Paravan caste, the so-called untouchable. However, she shows that despite of the better economic and educational background as compared to Bakha of *Untouchable*, he is also compelled to face the casteist discrimination and untouchability for being from paravan, paryan caste. Velutha who is educated is In-charge and operator of the Paradise Pickle and Preserves Factory in Ayemenem, Kerala of India, owned by Mammachi, mother of

Chacko and Ammu and grandmother of Estha, Rahel and Sophie Mol. He has good sense of machinery parts of the factory and he can mend as per the requirement.

Unlike Anand's representation of the untouchable as the poor, she delineates Velutha as educationally and economically sound. Thus, she has different logic, debate on casteist discrimination that it is deeply entrenched in human mind by the Hindu system and thinks of it as guided by the socio-economic and politico-cultural and psychological aspects.

Mulk Raj Anand, being himself a Marxist writer raises the voice of the poor, proletariat, oppressed and subaltern. He questions against the injustice, atrocities and caste-based-discrimination and untouchability deeply embedded in his homeland, India. Mainly, he advocates for the social change, equality and society with better opportunities in terms of caste, class and other standard. Likewise, Roy also raises the voice against casteist discrimination through her novel, *The God of Small Things*. She raises her voice against class suppression, gender discrimination and addresses other psychological problems of the society, which have been deeply embedded in every social structure.

Anand's novel *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things* raise the issue of caste subalternity of Indian society of the 1930s and 1990s respectively. The term 'Casteist' comes from the word 'caste' and whoever picks this term and wants it to make it community and make it as bargaining term that becomes 'casteist'. While it gets the shape of bargaining term it can also be considered as a politico-cultural term. It is a basis of viewing the particular society with the angle of caste, and the inhuman behavior that is practised on the very basis of caste. C.P. Bhambhri explains it as 'caste identities' and 'caste consciousness' as per the hierarchy embedded by Hindu caste system. Bhambhri in his essay, "Dialectics of Caste and Casteism" referring to

Joveed claims, "Oppressed caste have [become] a 'community' in every sense of the term" and expresses his view that "caste hierarchy can't be properly appreciated without situating all castes and sub-castes of Hindu religion . . ." (2619). He is of the view that the caste system as it has hierarchy in Hindu Verna system, is not appreciable but severely condemnable.

Likewise, the term 'subaltern' is made up of 'sub' and 'altern'. This term "subaltern" was used for the first time by Indian Marxist scholar, Antonio Gramsci in the 1930s. Vinayak Chaturvedi in "A Critical Theory of Subalternity: Rethinking Class in Indian Historiography" interprets it as the result of some Marxist scholars including Guha's "dissatisfaction with the interpretation of India's nationalist movement, which had long neglected "the politics of the people or the subaltern classes, in the making of the Indian nation" (9). Chaturvedi illustrates:

In the early 1980s, a small group of Marxist scholars influenced by Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Notebook* introduced "subaltern" as a new analytic category within modern Indian historiography. The scholars, led by Ranajit Guha, were dissatisfied with the interpretation of India's nationalist movement, which had long neglected "the politics of the people", or the subaltern classes . . . For Guha, this historiography had been dominated by an elitism of . . . bourgeois nationalists, and even orthodox Marxists, who . . . failed to take into account "the contributions made by the people on *their own*, that is, *independently of the elite*. (9)

This thought has been raised on the basis of Antonio Gramsci's theory of 'hegemony' on the basis of which 'subaltern' theory has been propounded by Guha in the 1980s. Particularly, the term 'sub' in itself is subordinated term and 'altern' has to do with many options, almost same meaning of 'sub'. The term 'subaltern' is dealt with

oppressed, suppressed, inferiorized, marginalized, and discriminated segment of people, who need to be brought in mainstream in every arena of a nation. It is an academic discourse which believes in deconstruction of binary opposition.

The term subaltern conveys the meaning of 'inferior rank' which refers to those groups in society, who are subject to the hegemony of the ruling class and castes. Subaltern people may include workers, labourer, peasants, Dalits, Adivasi/Janajatis, Women, Lesbians, Gays, Bi-sexual, Transgender, Intersexual, Madhesis in India and/or Nepal who are denied of accessing the 'hegemonic' power.

Chaturvedi says, "'Subaltern', the term has been adapted as the theoretical discourse as the post-colonial studies from the work of the subaltern group of historians aimed at promoting a systematic discussion of the subaltern theme in South Asian Studies" (9). It is used in Subaltern Studies as a name for the general attribute of subordination in South Asian Society whether that is expressed with the view to class, caste, gender, geographical location including among other terms that refer to subordination, and binary and/or multiple opposition.

'Casteist Ideology' generally refers to the idea or thought of the people that suppresses, inferiorizes, dominates other people who have been stigmatized as 'Low Caste' since long in history. Louis Althusser in his essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)" says about ideology that "it is a 'Representation' of the Imaginary Relationship of Individuals to their Real Conditions of Existence." He is of the view that "Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence." He talks about the 'world outlooks' on the dynamics of 'religious ideology, ethical ideology, legal ideology, political ideology et cetera' which help shape one's own ideology. Bakha and Velutha have been victimized from the severe casteist ideology rampant in Indian society.

Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things* raise the issue of casteist discrimination in a way or other. Though they raise the caste subaltern issue in their respective novels, there are some differences on the level, gravity and severity of the discrimination. Anand's novel *Untouchable*, as it was written in 1935 AD, has created Bakha, a subaltern hero, who is a sweeper and is destined to sweep the road, clean latrines nearby of outcasts' colony, where Tommies'—British soldiers are staying with the camp and they use the very latrines and roads, only for the sake of getting food to get their belly full. The novel creates the main subaltern hero Bakha, a sweeper-boy and other subordinate characters such as his father Lakha, a sweeper, Bakha's brother Rakha, sister Sohini including Chota, Leather worker's son, Ram Charan, washer man's son: Among those characters, Bakha has been victimized severely from the casteist discrimination. The writer represents the then Indian society, where the "outcastes", were compelled to reside outside the boundaries of "caste-Hindu" separately as it has been hegemonized on the pretext of caste hierarchy, since long.

Mulk Raj Anand's novel *Untouchable* though mainly highlights the caste-based-discrimination and untouchability but it also digs out the issue of class, and gender as well. Surjit S. Dulai, an Indian critic says, "The tenets of the manifesto were undergirded by a Marxian view of history applied to India" (190). He further illustrates that the novel represents the "plights of the outcastes in the Indian society". In "Practice Before Ideology: Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable*" he claims:

In all of the Anand's fiction, nothing illustrates this better than his first and most spontaneous novel, *Untouchable*. Given its subject, the plights of the outcastes in the Indian society, the book was fraught with the danger of deteriorating into a sociological tract . . . Anand

produced a beautiful work of art, winning from the reader heartfelt sympathy for the casteless wretched of India, who for centuries have been denied the right to be human. (190)

Dulai observes the setting of the novel. He picks the scene of the opening of the novel from the "outcastes' colony". Outcastes' are the lowest stratum of Indian society.

There are five varnas that are: Brahmin, Kshatri, Vaishya, Shudra (and) outcastes. He says:

The novel opens with the description of the outcastes' colony. The outcastes, the lowest stratum of Indian society, suffer strong economic and physical deprivation. Anand doesn't make an abstract statement to this effect or lament the fact of this deprivation. He paints a startling picture of the condition in which these people live. A colony . . . of "a group of mud-walled houses clustered together" in two rows along a single lane. (192)

Dulai, in his criticism of Anand's novel *Untouchable*, infers the issue of much more intensification given to the food: "Food is a very important subject in the novel.

Sweepers and the latrine cleaners depend on the people for whom they work for food.

It is part of their wages . . ." (193). For Dulai, the novel has shown the importance of food for poor and "outcaste" people like Bakha. He goes on to elaborate,

[F]ood is very much important subject. Sweepers and latrine cleaners depend on the people for whom they work for food. It is part of their wages but is given them virtually as alms . . . Bakha goes to the house to get the food that is his due, the woman of the house . . . throws down a chapatti. It falls the street pavement and Bakha picks it up and wraps it in his duster. The outcastes often get the leavings of their employers,

the caste Hindus . . . festive occasions they may get some decent food.

Thus, they are constantly starved for good nourishment. (193)

The author Anand takes us to Bakha, listening to the speech of Mahatma Gandhi at the ending part of the novel. The main character Bakha of *Untouchable*, is touched by the great leader's sentiments about the condition for untouchables and his self-sacrificing dedication to complete abolition of untouchability and caste-based-discrimination. But Bakha denies the opinion of Gandhi that to achieve their liberation, the untouchables must first purify their lives (138). Bakha does not clearly identify the contradiction in Gandhi's position, but realizes that it is the notions of 'purity' and 'pollution' which lie at the root of the untouchables' exclusion from society.

Veena Singh, another critic, in her review "The Slave Rebel: A Closer Look at *Untouchability*" remarks:

Practice of untouchability in the Hindu system arose out of the "ideas of ceremonial purity. First applied to the aboriginal sudras in connection with the sacrificial ritual and expanded and extended to other groups because of the theoretical impurity of certain occupation".

The outcastes Bakha becomes socially segregated. He has to depend on the charity of the caste Hindus for the basic needs of life like food and water. Food is thrown him like a 'cricket ball'. (124)

Sing goes on to elaborate Bakha and his sister Sohini's exploitation in the novel "on some pretext or the other". She takes the 'religion as a means of exploiting the untouchables and of widening the gap between them and the caste Hindus'. The untouchables who are excluded from the village well are "excluded from the temple" (126). She further says:

Religion is another means of exploiting the untouchables and of widening the gap between them and the caste Hindus. Just as they are excluded from village well they are also excluded from the village temple and in Anand's *Untouchable* the priest tries to seduce Bakha's sister (Sohini) within the very precincts of the temple. . . '. (126)

Thus, the untouchables are deprived of some of the most essential needs of human life and through his deprivation made abject and servile. She goes on to claim that the 'problem which they face are economic and social' (128).

P. Rajendra Karmarkar, in "Reality and Realism: An Unorthodox Reading of *Untouchable*" makes the comment like: "If a person is born as an untouchable, it must be concluded that (s)he must have committed a great sin against caste Hindus in a past life. In order to propitiate the gods and to liberate oneself from this untouchable status in the next life, the untouchable must serve and appease the privileged castes" (114). Karmarkar says that the untouchable boy does not have right to love to the girl from the so-called upper caste. If he makes the love, his life gets endangered.

As Anand raises the issue of [voice against] untouchability, caste subalternity, Arundhati Roy also raises the strong voice against untouchability in *The God of Small Things*, through the voice of Velutha, the paravan, from the so-called untouchable caste. Various critics have analyzed Roy's Booker Prize Winning Book, *The God of Small Things* since its publication.

Ramlal Agarwal in Review on *World Literature Today* makes the criticism for *The God of Small Things* as "profane love between an untouchable and a respectable lady" (208). Agarwal goes on to exclaim that as:

The God of Small Things is a story of a large, sprawling Syrian Christian family living in a small village called Ayemenem in Kerala,

the members of which are tossed from Ayemenem to England, then to America, Shillong, Delhi and back to Ayemenem, badly battered, badly bruised. It is also a story of profane love between an untouchable and a respectable lady, as it is a painful story of childhood and broken marriages. (208)

Agarwal looks at it as 'Ammu marries with Shillong based 'labourer' (Baba) and gives birth to twins'. He also raises the issue of gender discrimination and Baba's abuse of his wife Ammu and her revolt against patriarchal atrocities. Agarwal remarks, "[H]er husband hits the bottle, and she leaves him and returns to Ayemenem with her twins Estha and Rahel; there she soon feels drawn toward an untouchable worker called Velutha, who lives across the river" (209).

Likewise, the critic Latika Mangrulkar poses her view on casteism, class, gender, geographical location, post-colonial psyche as well as Velutha's sacrifice for his dignity:

The twins were born to a tragic Ammu, who could mother them only for few years . . . but loveless world of Ayemenem, where the only true love the twins know is their mother's, and the only true love their mothers was from a *paravan*, an "untouchable." The three of them were outcastes in a world with rigid boundaries and now, twenty-three years later, Rahel had come home to Ayemenem, because Estha had been mysteriously "Re-returned" the only homes the twins knew. (255)

Mangrulkar sees Velutha a strong character. From her eyes, Velutha is a bit different because he sacrifices himself for the social change and breaks the system as entrenched in Hindu system.

Another critic Ajay Sekher views this novel in "Older than the Church: Christianity and Caste in *The God of Small Things*", as "derail hegemonic history with fictional counter history, as an attempt to distort and question the logic of the grand narrative of Kerala's historiography" and it "encounters the history of oppression" (3445). He takes it as:

. . . an attempt to distort and question the logic of the grand narrative of Kerala's historiography so on and so forth. The first chapter itself initiates the central theme of the narrative, the caste question as social evil, taboo and engineering. Estha the boy among the two egg twins (the other being Rahel) of Ammu the central woman character in the novel, the Syrian Christian divorcee, whose relationship with Velutha the untouchable, a dalit from paravan community forms the core of the narrative, encounters the history of oppression. (3445)

Though different critics, have studied the issue of casteism in each of the novel, there is not a single study has been made a comparative study of Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things* from the perspective of caste subalternity. This research basically investigates the issue of casteist subalternity, the fueling factor for further making subaltern for the particular group of people. It will consistently analyze the issues, causes and consequences, similarities and dissimilarities of untouchability in two different settings.

The researcher takes the theory of caste subalternity. For this thesis, the researcher applies theory by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak who has written "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in 1985 and the "Subaltern Can Speak" in 1997. The two essays by Spivak show how the subalterns are 'programmed' to make 'silence' and the answers on 'how to make them speak?' have been presented. Another important theory by

Indrani Chatterjee, "Colouring Subalternity: Slaves, Concubines, and Social Orphans in Early Colonial India" which deals with slave and concubines. Mainly it deals with the "issue of ethnicity and gender" and their subordination with the base of very pretext. It is worthwhile to refer here, Vijay Prashad's article "Untouchable Freedom: A Critique of the Bourgeois—Landlord Indian State" from *Subaltern Study Vol. X*. It focuses on the casteist discrimination and untouchability of Indian society and the initiatives of Gandhi and Ambedkar to abolish the caste based atrocities and making the affirmative provisions in the new constitution.

Likewise, the researcher takes the references from "The Mentality of Subalternity: Kantanama and Rajdharma" by Gautam Bhadra. It deals with the issue of subaltern mentality of the people and 'submissiveness' as well as 'struggle and resistance' of Dalits in India. Gautam Bhadra elaborates it as, "It is an account of this combination that the poor and the oppressed have, time and again, and different histories, made voluntary sacrifices in favor of the rich and the dominant" (55). It is also important to infer the "Caste and Subaltern Consciousness" by Partha Chatterjee, because it also raises the question of class as a result of the religious subordination to one particular segment of the people. It also covers the "Discussion: Subaltern as Perspective" by Veena Das from the book *Subaltern Studies Vol. XI*. Besides, the researcher applies the theory of "The Times of the Dalits Conversion" by Gyanendra Pandey which deals with the issue of Indian Dalits and their conversion. It illustrates, 'mass conversion to Buddhism in 1956 and to other religions in subsequent years, 'dalit conversion'.

This research is divided into three chapters. First chapter introduces the issue of caste subalternity in Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things*, objectives, definition of the term subalternity and caste subalternity, review of

literature, and theory of caste subalternity. The second chapter is the textual analysis of Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*, from the perspective of caste subalternity. The analysis focuses mainly on answering the following research questions: What are the similarities and dissimilarities in treatment of untouchability in Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things*?; Why does Anand talk about the casteist problem merely in relation to class while Roy raises the casteist issue in relation to gender, sexuality, post-coloniality and psychological consequences? The third or the last chapter sums up the main points of thesis and includes findings of this research applicable in Nepalese context of Dalits' suffering.

Chapter II. Critique of Casteist Ideology in Anand's

Untouchable and Roy's *The God of Small Things*

Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things* critique caste-based discrimination and untouchability. Both the novelists believe that the casteist discrimination is a major social problem of India. But they present the forms, types and severity of discrimination differently as the authors belong to different eras. So they also present the similar suppression, discrimination and inhuman behavior that the Dalits, so-called untouchables are facing. Though both the novelists believe that untouchability is the burning problem of Hindu caste system, Anand thinks that casteism is the part of classism while Roy is of the view that untouchability is not merely the classist problem but is also affected by socio-economic, politico-cultural and psychological problems.

Anand picks the subaltern protagonist Bakha in *Untouchable* and Roy presents Velutha, as the central character in her novel *The God of Small Things*. Both the novelists pick the main characters from subaltern caste Bakha, a sweeper boy, and Velutha, a Paravan, untouchable respectively in Hindu caste system in Indian society. Though they create the subaltern protagonists in their respective novels, the forms and severity of discrimination are different since the writers are of the different time.

Anand portraying Bakha, the major character, a subaltern in term of caste makes the novel revolve around him. Due to his subaltern state in terms of caste and class, he cannot speak. He can only speak after one advocates for him. Anand, as a communist thinker, advocates for the "classless society" so that his characters like Bakha could get the life of dignity and equality as a human being. Furthermore, he talks for the upliftment of the Dalits, and their freedom. He talks about social problem realistically. He creates Lakha, Bakha's father, Rakha, his brother and Sohini, his

sister, Tommies, Habildar Charat Singh, Pandit Kalinath, Chota, Ram Charan, Gulabo, wife of washerman, Waziro, wife of leatherworker, Colonel Hutchinson, Iqbal Nath Sarshar, the young poet, Bashir including among others.

Anand takes us to Bakha's mimicry of Colonel Hutchinson with the expectation of getting a set of old trousers (but cannot express it) so that he could also be seen like the 'sahib', colonel of British Army. Bakha has been presented as a servile and submissive character who always wants to make the mimicry and cannot revolt against the stereotyped ruling Hindu ideology, take not he can revenge against Kalinath priest who has sexually abused his own sister Sohini. As he does not express his desire, Colonel Hutchinson is apathetic to his desire. He takes him to his house but his wife seems to be angry with Bakha. At the ending part, the writer takes us to Bakha's listening of Gandhi's speech.

Similarly, Roy creates Velutha, son of Vellya Paapen, a paravan, so-called untouchable in the novel. She also portrays Ammu, a daughter of Pappachhi (Benaam Navomi Ipe) and Mammachi, Chacko, their son and brother of Ammu, Baby Kochamma, Pappachi's sister, Estha and Rahel, twins- of Ammu from Baba, Sophie Mol, daughter of Chacko and Margaret Kochamma, Vellya Pappen, a paravan, father of Velutha, Comrade K.N.M. Pillai, Joe, second husband of Margaret Kochamma, Mr. Hollick, Inspector Mathew, including among others and Velutha has been portrayed as severely victimized by the casteist discrimination and untouchability in the novel. Roy creates Velutha in terms of class—Velutha as the Incharge of Paradise Pickles and Preserves factory, owned by Mammachi, has been severely discriminated, and inhumanly behaved, in terms of deep rooted casteist perception in the ground of its hierarchies, as based on Hindu superstition.

Velutha keeps the sexual relationship with Ammu, who returns to Ayemenem, a divorcee of Baba which seems to be cultural encounter, since Ammu represents 'high caste' and Velutha from 'lower caste', so-called untouchable, Paravan. The punishment given by the police to Velutha, in the fake blame of abduction and murder of Sophie Mol, by Baby Kochamma, causes the death of Velutha. Roy portrays Velutha as a revolutionary character while Anand portrays Bakha as a servile.

Representation of Caste Subalternity in *Untouchable*

Anand's *Untouchable* depicts the severe casteist discrimination of the 1930s in Indian society. Bakha, the protagonist of the novel has been a subaltern in terms of caste and the malpractices of untouchability. He has been portrayed as a sweeper boy, who is shown to be cleaning latrines and sweeping the road in the town and cantonment of British Tommies. In *Untouchable*, Anand shows his hero Bakha, facing bitter and inhuman casteist discrimination in every step of his life. The novel presents a Sadhu as he says, "*Bham, bham, bhole Nath*" (63). The lady from inside the house, replies, "I am bringing food Sadhuji". While she brings food to Sadhu, she is about to touch him. She abuses him, "you eater of your masters,' 'may the vessel of your life never float in the sea of existence! May you perish and die! You have defiled by house! Go! Get up, get up!' 'Is this your father's house that you . . . rest here?" (63).

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak in "Can the Subaltern Speak?" expresses her view that the "subaltern cannot speak" because they have "no more representation" (28) and no "networks" to be fighting for. Spivak takes the reference of "small peasant proprietors", 'female' and 'sati' [*suttee*, translated by British], and she concludes that they cannot speak and represent themselves. She remarks:

The small peasant proprietors cannot represent themselves; they must be represented. Their representative must appear simultaneously as

their master, as an authority over them, as unrestricted governmental power that protects them from the other classes and sends them rain and sunshine from above. The political influence [in the place of the class interest since there is no unified class subject] of the small peasant proprietors therefore finds its last expression . . . in the executive force . . . subordinating society to itself. (29-30)

Bakha in *Untouchable* cannot speak on his own. He has been represented by the author Anand an "organic or theorizing intellectual" (28). He poses some queries and represents Bakha as:

. . . Why was I so humble? I could have struck him! . . . Why did not I shout to warn people of my approach . . . I should have begun to sweep the thoroughfare. I should have seen the high-caste people in street. That man! That he should have hit me! My poor jalebis! I should have eaten them. But Why could not I say something? Couldn't I have joint my hands to him and then gone away? The slap on my face! The coward! . . . I was being abused. Non of them spoke for me. The cruel crowd! All of them abused, abused, abused. Why are we always abused? The sentry inspector . . . abused my father . . . abuse us. (43)

The subaltern protagonist Bakha, after buying the *jalebis* from the shopkeeper and facing the misbehaviour from the shopkeeper, he keeps on thinking that everybody is looking at him. Though he is abused nobody protests against such misbehavior. "The cruel crowd," (43) he says. He thinks and accepts himself of being discriminated. In this regard, Bakha says:

. . . Because we are sweepers. Because we touch dung. They hate dung. I hate it too. That's why I came here. I was tired working on latrines every day. That's why they don't touch us, the high-castes . . . For them I am a sweeper, sweeper—untouchable! Untouchable! Untouchable! That's the word. Untouchable! I am an Untouchable!' (43)

An article "Still in the Middle Ages" published in *The Kathmandu Post* on 3 Oct. 2012 claims that "37.8 percent out of 400 sample agree that there is severe level of caste-based-discrimination and untouchability and 74 percent opine for the improvement of such malpractices" (Mijar 6). In the research based article, I identified that 83 percent out of 400 sample survey concluded that the Dalits are made backward by the state agencies and 53.3 percent respondents took 'hatred' as a form of casteist discrimination. Since Nepal is in the verge of drafting new constitution by Constituent Assembly and he suggests: "The new constitution should empower Dalits and break the legacy of discrimination", "We have had enough" (7).

In "Politics of Dalit Identity" P. Muthaiah opines that 'Manudharma as a caste ideology designated communities placing them in a structured caste hierarchy', and 'deprived Dalits of their wealth and social esteem'. He opines that "[outcastes]" have been challenging their designators from the days of *Rig Veda*" (385). He further goes on explaining as:

Dalits have been winning their battle against designator and gaining in form of reservation. By 1980s [British rule] the Dalits included Sudras in their camp and began united fight against casteism with Bahujan identity and demanding proportionate share in various fields . . . Dalits are aborigines of India, designated by the Aryans as Dasa and Chandala . . . and deprive Dalits of their land and human status.

Rigveda, Upanishad, Manusmriti and Mahabharatha gave a degraded picture of Dalits . . . Purushsuktha of Rigveda which was composed around 1500-1000 B.C. provides an evidence to the fact that there existed five castes: Brahmins, Kshatriya, Vaishyas and Sudras including Dasyu . . .' (385)

Muthaiah views that the British government is liberal to the outcastes from caste-Hindu and they make some concessional provision to 'legitimize' their government. He claims, "Politics behind labeling of depressed classes is very significant to understand British politics of identities" (387). The British government 'designated' Dalits as "exterior castes, depressed classes and provided reservations in context of strengthening freedom movement in India and tried to prove the legitimacy of its rule in India" (388). Muthaiah writes about Babasaheb Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's protest against caste-Hindu and opposes the "inclusion of Dalits into Hindu fold". He further writes, "Dr. B. R. Ambedkar suggested that the untouchables should be renamed as protestant Hindus or Non-conformist Hindus" (390).

In the novel *Untouchable*, Sohini, sister of Bakha has been sexually harassed by Kalinath priest in the temple. Though the so-called upper caste—caste-Hindu people hate and behave inhumanly, they harass sexually to the beautiful girl from untouchable caste. Sohini has been harassed by the priest. Having heard the complaints of his sister Sohini, Bakha expresses his serious concern on it –sexual abuse and harassment upon his sister. Sohini confesses the exploitation from priest to her brother after he, time and again appeals her to tell the truth and she responds: "he-e just teased me, when I was bending down to work, he came down and held me by my breasts" (54). Her brother Bakha seems to be expressing the protest voice in this

regards. After all he is also a 'boy', brother and wants his sister be secured. He tells to his sister Sohini that, "Tell me! Tell me! I will kill him" (54).

Sharit K Bhowmik in "Caste and Class in India" talks about the emergence of caste system. He opines, "The emergence of class struggles has not been able to reduce the influence of caste in these struggles (1246)." He talks about the labor relation with caste hierarchies. He claims, "Division of labor became complex, hierarchical and based on exploitation" that "there were tensions between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas [as well] over status but these were set aside as they both combined to exploit the Vaishya and the Shudras" (1246).

Anand's *Untouchable* raises the issue of casteist discrimination and untouchability which has been existing in the Indian society. He goes on exposing the casteist discrimination issue as Habildar Charat Singh, suffered from chronic piles, saying to Bakha "Why aren't the latrines clean, you rouge of Bakhe! There is not one feet to go near! I have walked all round! Do you know you are responsible for my piles? I caught the contagion sitting on one of those unclean latrines!" (7).

Bhowmik claims that the *varna* divides people into the vertical hierarchies by which the 'untouchables' have been misbehaved in the very basis. He infers, "varna splits people into vertical division whereas jati divides them on ethnic lines and to reconcile these two conflicting divisions is a major theoretical problems for all the students of caste" (1248). He thinks that it makes the "interconnection" between caste and politics a complex problem. He adds, "Chaube observed that universal adult franchise had . . . admitted numerous peripheral groups into political power and thereby 'legitimized' the basis of the Indian state" (1248). Anand's novel also speaks the same voice as Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi gives the speech in the novel:

'I have emerged,' he [Gandhi] said slowly, as if he were measuring each word and talking more to himself than to anyone else, 'from the ordeal of the penance, undertaken for a cause which is as dear to me as life itself. The British government sought to pursue a policy of divide and rule in giving to our brethren of the depressed classes separate electorates in the Councils that will be created under the new Constitution . . . a separate legal and political status. (136)

M V Nadkarni in a "Discussion" in EPW with Omvedt Gail, writing *Caste Myths in Hinduism*, says:

Omvedt observes that 'varna by merit is as abominable a conception as varna by birth', if it bars access to education and social mobility.

Ambedkar himself has given several examples of access to education and social mobility in the classical phase . . . The spirit of Gita is only to advise following one's aptitude and inclination and not to legislate. If dharmashastras have barred such access and mobility, do not accept them. In any case Manusmriti itself has observed that rules of dharma including varna dharma can be flouted if they cause discontent and harm people's welfare . . . (3)

Untouchable expresses the deep concern of casteist discrimination and raises the caste-subaltern voices to be addressed from the state mechanism in India.

The novel revolves around Bakha and his suffering. Being from the Sweepers caste, lowest stratum within the "outcastes" faces inhuman behaviors from the so-called upper caste:

Polluted, polluted, polluted!" shouted the Brahmin . . . 'Get off the steps, you scavenger! Off with you! You have defiled our whole service. You

have defiled our temple! Now we will have to pay for the purificatory ceremony. Get down, get away, you dog!' ... 'A temple can be polluted according to Holy Books by a low-caste man coming within sixty-nine yards of it, and here he was actually on the steps, at the door. We will need to have a sacrificial fire in order to purify ourselves and our shrine. (53)

C. P. Bhambhri, in "Reservation and Casteism" opines that the public life in India is conditioned and controlled by "caste identity" (806). He says, "'casteisation' of politics has become the reality because the political class has nurtured and manipulated caste versus caste identities to win an election on the basis of assured caste-based social constituencies". He further claims that the 'emergence of casteism as ideology had been attributed on the technologies of electoral politics . . . has not been the issue of public discourse that . . . reservations . . . have also contributed to the solidification of casteism in India' (806). In this regard Anand writes:

'Well we must destroy caste, we must destroy the inequalities of birth and unalterable vocations. We must recognize an equality of rights, privileges and opportunities for everyone. The Mahatma did not say so, but the legal and sociological basis of caste having been broken down by the British-Indian penal code, which recognizes the rights of every man before a court, caste is not mainly governed by profession. When the sweepers change their profession, they will no longer remain Untouchables. (145-46)

The caste-based-discrimination is not only practiced in private places such as house but also in public places in Hotels, Temples, road et cetera. In the hotel, food shop, sweepers or 'outcastes' receive food by paying the money, there too, the 'low-

caste' people have been discriminated, misbehaved, practiced untouchability in higher superstition. The jalebis wrapped in the paper of old *Daily Mail*, shopkeeper throws the Jalebis like a 'cricket ball'.

The deeply embedded caste-hegemony of Indian society has its characteristic that the people have been discriminated inhumanly but they cannot go against it due to the system which fuels for the 'structural violence' to Dalits, 'outcastes' too.

Shopkeeper . . . throws the sweets (jalebis) into a piece torn off an old Daily Mail, was as amazing as it was baffling to poor Bakha, who knew, who had been cheated, but dared not complain. He caught the jalebis which the confectioner threw at him like a cricket ball, placed four nickel coins on the shoeboard for the confectioner's assistant who stood ready to splash some water on them . . . (37)

Yam Bahadur Kisan in the book *The Nepali Dalit Social Movement* opines, "Manu laid down social rules' saying that 'if people failed to do the work according to their classification, they 'would not remain in their caste'" (29). He remarks;

The Shudras also had particular work, in that they were required to pay respect and give service to the other three castes. However, if the Shudras failed to do their required work, then the state could confiscate all their property and banish them from the land. Those who did not conform to these rules, were regarded as rebels and they were ostracized from society . . . These group of people is sometimes referred to as the fifth varna, and they were treated as social out-castes. This is a sociological classification, not a religious one. (29)

The novel is written with the bases of social realism the then prevalent in India where Britishers were running their reign as their colony. The discrimination against

servile Bakha has been shown in the novel with the bitter evidences of casteist discriminatory attitude. The Brahman and other 'superior' castes do not allow to touch their body and their clothes. The road that the so-called upper castes people use is to be used so much carefully by the Sudras or outcastes, the so-called untouchable, Dalits. The novel exposes the bitter experiences of the people of "outcastes' colony":

Keep to the side of the road, you, low-caste vermin! He (Bakha) suddenly heard ... 'Why don't you call, you swine, and announce your approach! Do you know you have touched me and defiled me, you cockeyed son of a bow-legged scorpion! Now I will have to . . . bath to purify myself . . . 'Dirty dog! Son of a bitch! The offspring of pig' he shouted... 'I...I'll have to go-o-o...and get washed—d—d...I . . . now, on account of *you*, I'll be late.' (38-39)

Kisan goes on to explaining that 'in the Purush Sukta, four parts of the society were related to the four parts of the Biratpurus' body: his head, hands, legs and feet'. Later on Manu, a sage claimed that 'Prajapati had created the Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras from Biratpurus' head, hands, legs and feet respectively'. He says that "what was originally metaphoric became codified as an origin of myth'. Within the social reality of that time, Shudras were considered inferior. He concludes that the "origin myth could be believed as it appeared to reflect social reality" (32).

Kisan claims:

Hindu theology about the origin of *varna* is written in the Purush Sukta of the *Rig Ved*. Here, it is said that, "Brahman came from the head, Kshatri from the arms, Vaishya from the thigh/hip and Shudra from the feet of Bishwarup Birat Purush (Bramha). The Atharva Ved and the Yajur Ved have the same references to caste origination. Later, those

who established the norms for conduct within Hindu society explained the origins of caste on the basis of these references. (7)

Anand's central character Bakha has been taken as caste-subaltern character who is also weak in economic condition. He cleans latrines and sweeps the road of the town and nearby of the cantonment of Tommies –British soldier but he even cannot buy a set of trousers. He is compelled to work day and night merely for the sake of getting food but the food is sometimes 'left meager' in caste-Hindu's house which is served him very inhumanly. Bakha's hand to mouth problem portrays the image of class conflict and class-based-suppression where he and his family cannot even get the food as they required. Bakha seems to be making mimicry as he is a servile and submissive character. For Spivak, he cannot speak and cannot represent himself. He follows Sahib, the [British Army Officer] and desires to get the one trouser. After all, Anand infers him as a subaltern character and on the ground of the very status, he cannot express his will:

Bakha had looked at the Tommies [British Soldiers], stared at them with wonder and amagement when he first went to live at the British regimental barracks with his uncle. He had . . . of the life of the Tommies, lived, sleeping on strage, low canvas beds covered tightly with blankets . . . drinking tea and wine in tin mugs, going to parade and then walking down to the bazaar with cigarettes in their mouths and small silver-mounted canes in their hands. And he had soon become possessed with an overwhelming desire to live their lives. He had been told that they were sahibs, superior people. (3)

The children of the 'outcastes' of the Indian society were not even allowed to go to school in the 1930s, the period of writing the novel *Untouchable*. They did not

have access to education. They were compelled to remain uneducated, deprived of socio-economic and political participation in their own homeland. The schools were built only for the children of 'Sahibs' and if it is built for 'outcastes', it was separated from the schools for the children of caste-Hindu. The novel exposes the bitter reality of the then Indian society. So, it is also called the novel of social realism:

. . . wish to be sahib that he would have to go to school if he wanted to be one. And he had wept and cried to be allowed to go to school. But then his father had told him that schools were meant for the babus, not for the lowly sweepers . . . Later at the British barracks he realized why his father had not sent him to school . . . He was a sweeper's son and never could be a babu . . . Because the parents of the other children would not allow their sons to be contaminated by the touch of the low caste man's sons. (30)

The caste-based-discrimination and untouchability practices have been shown even within the outcastes people severely by following the Hindu caste hierarchies. This evidence is presented within the 'outcastes'. The hierarchies are shown like Washerman, Leather Worker and Sweeper within the outcaste. Chota, leather worker's son, Ram Charan, washerman's son and Bakha, Sweeper's son are young and friends to each other. They play and work together.

The Hindu *varna* system has divided people in four Vernas, has hierarchical order from superior to inferior of ranks that are Brahman, Kshetri, Vaisya and Sudra. The Hindu preachers think that the Brahman has been supposed to be born from the mouth of God Bishnu and has been assigned the role of reading holy books and performing of rituals. Kshetri has been offered the role of protecting the nation's boarder and security related tasks as they have been supposed to be born from

shoulder of God Bishnu. Likewise, Vaisya is supposed to be born from the hip (Kammar) of God Bishnu which assigns the role of providing the service to Brahman and Kshetri with the trade and commercial activities.

The Sudra, lowest stratum of the Hindu society has been considered to be born from the foot of the god Bishnu and has assigned the role of offering the services to the non-Sudras, that are Brahman, Kshetri and Vaisya. Within these Vernas, Brahman has been put in the topmost in Hindu caste system and second Kshetri, Vaisya in third position and Sudra in lowest strata. In this way, the so-called upper caste segment of people used to suppress, discriminate to the various castes and clans of Sudras and "outcaste" people. The then Sudras, now have been recognized as Dalits in South Asian countries mainly India and Nepal, are not allowed to touch the water, well that if they happened to touch, they are punished severely and inhumanly. *Untouchable* presents this evidence as:

When Sohini reached the well there were already about ten other outcastes waiting. But there was no one to give them water . . . full of fear and anxiety that she would have to wait her turn since she could see from a distance that there was already a crowd . . . Now Sohini being of the lowest caste among the outcastes would naturally be looked down upon by Gulabo, washerwoman, Ramcharan's mother . . . Think of it! Think of it ! You bitch! You prostitute! Sohini now realized that the woman [Gulabo] was angry. (15-17)

In Hindu caste system 'lowest castes' also have hierarchy within. Sweeper caste is the 'lowest' among leatherworker and Washermen. Sohini is a sister of Bakha, from Sweeper's family has been severely discriminated from the Leatherworkers and Washerman castes, who all are 'outcastes' in Hindu caste system—caste-Hindus.

Anand raises the issue of casteist discrimination of intra-Dalits in Indian society.

Sohini, by being from the Sweepers caste, 'lowest' among all the 'outcastes', untouchables, has been discriminated by Gulabo, the washerwoman, mother of Ram Charan. She is thought to be jealous with the beauty of Sohini, Lakha's daughter. She goes on abusing Sohini like:

You annoy me with your silence, you illegally begotton! You eater of dung and drinker of urine! You bitch of sweeper women! I will show you how to insult . . . And she rose with upraised arm and rushed at Sohini. Waziro, the Weaver's wife, ran after her and caught her just before she had time to hit the sweeper girl. (17)

The young boy, Bakha does the work nonstop on sweeping the roads and cleaning the latrines. Sometimes he does his own work, sometimes assists for his father's work of cleaning latrines. "The boy was wiping the sweat off his face and neck and breathing hard, for he had been to do another round at the latrines." He has been exploited, suppressed and discriminated in each and every steps of his life. Bakha, Rakha, Sohini, and their father Lakha, though called Jamadar are discriminated inhumanly in the novel *Untouchable*. Lakha abuses his son Bakha by worrying of non-performance of his duty due to his sickness. While his father abuses him as if he is not his own son and he goes on to be thinking monologue like:

He always keeps abusing me. I do all his work for him. He appropriates the pay all right. He is happy when they call him Jamadar. So proud of his izzat! He just goes about getting salaams from everybody. I don't take a moment's rest and yet he abuses me. And if I go to play with the boys he calls me in the middle of the game to come and attend to the latrines. (4)

James P. Hawley, in his review on "Antonio Gramsci's Marxism: Class, State and Work" says, "The transition of a class from 'in itself' to 'for itself' is indicated especially by the development of its own organic intellectual . . . the development of proletarian (and more generally what Gramsci calls "subaltern" class) hegemony depend on the development of intellectuals of a new type. He further illustrates,

Under conditions of self-discipline the state will wither away. The state standing above society thus becomes transformed into the state which individual, much as in traditional Freudian theory authority-the-father becomes superego. Instead of necessity being raised to the level of freedom, freedom is lowered to the necessity: the state withers . . . in proportion to the growth of internal state. (595)

Joseph A. Buttigieg in his *The Exemplary Worldliness of Antonio Gramsci's Literary Criticism* reviews that Gramsci had enjoyed in journalism and 'never veered from his commitment to a philosophy of praxis'. Marxism focuses on the class struggle between haves and have nots, between bourgeois and proletariat. But Anand's Lakha has not the voice of revolt and protest. He obeys all the instructions which has been deeply embedded in the "praxis" of casteism. Here, Anand's Lakha has been hegemonized by the Hindu caste hierarchy that he does not know the suppression of caste-Hindu but abuses his own loving son vehemently.

Bakha seems to be the very responsible boy (man) in the "outcastes" colony and the Tommies cantonments. He performs the duties of his father as he becomes sick. "My father is ill", says Bakha "so I am going to sweep the roads in the town and the temple courtyard in his instead" (28). He also asks his brother Rakha to be more responsible while their father is sick. He further inspires his brother Rakha in this way; "Oh, Rakhia, why did you run away early in the morning? Father is ill and there

is all the work at the latrines to do in my absence. Come, my brother, run back home. Sohini has kept some hot tea for you too" (28).

In the novel, there are many humiliating words, terms, phrases and sentences which have severely been inferiorizing to the Dalits, so-called untouchable in the caste-Hindu. In some cases, novel repeats "posh posh, sweeper coming! Untouchable! Untouchable!" and to some cases, "polluted, polluted". In some pages the reader can find the hymns of the Hinduism like: '*Ram, Ram, Sri, Sri, Hari, Narayan, Sri Krishna*', sometime invocation like "*Om Shanti Deva*" represent the religious phenomena of Hinduism and the Dalits, so-called untouchable, "outcastes" have been discriminated, misbehaved, abused bitterly by the bases of very Hinduism.

The novel unfolds with so many ups and downs of the human psychology that Bakha conceives by being sweeper boy. Habildar Charat Singh, representative character of British colonizers, has positive view to some extent to him that he gives new Hockey sticks to Bakha and he is so much happy too. While he receives new Hockey stick, he tries his best to express his happiness to his friend Chota, Ram Charan and other but later on he thinks that if he show the stick, his friend will also ask for new sticks for them. He has jealousy on the matter and he only want to play the Hockey games with Habildar and other Tommies—British soldiers, babus.

Once the Hockey tournament between the 38 Dogras and 31st Regiment of Punjabis. Chota has attacked to 31st Regiment of Panjabis and Bakha is with him. After the game is finished and winning of the 38 Dogras, 31st Regiment Punjabis players get angry and attacked to 38 Dogras. During the fights between the players of two organizations, stones were thrown to each other. In this condition, one stone hit on the head of a child, who had come to see the Hockey game and he got unconscious. Bakha is the one who tries his best to protect him. But out of his

expectation, the mother of the child came and abused him bitterly. He has no way to listen her abuse like "you are the eater of your masters, you dirty sweeper ... you have defiled my house, besides wounding my child" (106).

Here, it would be worthwhile to mention the conversation between Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. B.R. Ambedkar. Ambedkar remarks, ". . . you work for the so-called national welfare and not for our interests alone. If you devoted yourself entirely to the welfare of the Depressed Classes [outcastes] you would then become our hero." In response of Ambedkar, Gandhi says that he want to serve the untouchables. He says, "That is why I am not at all angry with you. When you use derogatory and angry words for me, I tell myself that I deserved that. I will not get angry even if you spit on my face" (7). Without eradicating untouchability root and branch the honour of Hinduism can't be saved . . . I would like to make a Bhangi [sweeper] the president of the Congress"(8) Gandhi says. Bakha listens the speech of Gandhi. Anand presents the speech of Gandhi that he would like to talk only about so-called "Untouchables":

I shall only speak about the so-called "Untouchables", whom the government tried to alienate from Hinduism by giving them a separate legal and political status . . . I regard untouchability', as the greatest blot on Hinduism . . . While on my way to school I used to touch the Untouchables, and as I never conceal the fact from parents, my mother tell . . . purification after the unholy touch . . . simply out of reverence and regard for my mother, I offer did so but never did it believing it to be a religious obligation. (137)

Anand shows that Gandhi's exposition of practicing the purification work after he happened to touch to the so-called untouchable. He used to do this for only to respect his mother but not believed it as religious obligation in his childhood. Gandhi further

wish to be born as outcaste. He goes on to express, "I prayed that If I should be born again, I should be so, not as a Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra, but as an outcaste, as an Untouchable, so that I may share that sorrows, sufferings and the affronts levelled at them" (138). He loves scavenging, says, "I love scavenging. In my *ashram* an eighteen year old Brahmin lad is doing a scavenger's work, in order to teach the ashram scavenger cleanliness. The lad is no reformer. He was born and bred in orthodoxy . . . regular reader of *Gita*, and faithfully says his prayers" (138).

In the novel, there emerges, Colonel Hutchinson, who is also a padre (the father) of the Christian Missionary Church, has tried to transgress his religion to the Christian. Colonel, persuades him but couldn't be succeeded. Bakha is only following him to get one set of trouser, if he offers him. Bakha merely think of getting trouser but can't expose to his demand for trouser, to be looked like a Sahibs, Tommies. But, Colonel Hutchinson just explains about the *Yessu Massiah, God Jesus Christ*. Hutchinson expresses that the caste system is only in Hinduism and who follows the Yessu Massiah, he would not have to face caste-based discrimination. He says that all human being are equal in the eye of god Jesus. But need to confess the sin, since they have been born with sin. But he, Bakha doesn't ready to confess the sin and he denies the idea of announcing the sinner oneself. The novel exposes the conversation between colonel Hutchinson and Bakha. Colonel Hutchinson pretends to be the same. It utters like:

"Has your father told you who I am?" asked the Colonel, coming to the point in the practical manner of the Englishman. "Yes Huzoor. You are a sahib," said Bakha. 'No, no,' pretended the Colonel, 'I am not a sahib. I am like you. I am padre of the Salvation Army'. 'Yes, Sahib, I know,' said Bakha, without understanding . . . distinction . . . I am padre and

my god is *Yessuh Messih*', Bakha asks, 'Who is *Yessuh Messih* Sahib?',

Sahib responds, 'he is God.' (115-16)

Sahib goes on to explain about God Jesus. He sings the song dedicated to Yessuh

Messih:

Life is found in Jesus

Only there 'tis offered thee;

Offered without price or money

'Tis the gift of God sent free. (116)

Bakha gets confused with the idea of Yessuh Messih. He time and again asks to Sahib that "Who is *Yessuh Messih*?" "He is the Son God my boy.' Sahib Colonel Hutchinson says. ... 'And he died for us sinners': (119). Sahib further goes on to say that Yessuh Messih is Son God and he died for our salvation because we are sinner. He is of the superior rank . . . "Why are we all sinners Sahib?" "We were all born sinners", Sahib replied to the Bakha's question. Anand goes referring to Sahib:

We must confess our sins. Then alone will He forgive us, otherwise we will have to suffer the eternal torment of hell. You confess your sins to me before I convert you to Christianity.' 'But Huzoor, I don't know who Yessuh Messih is. I know Ram. But I don't know Yessuh Messih' . . . Come and confess your sins to me and Yessuh Messih will receive you in Heaven when you die.' . . . Now Bakha was utterly bored . . . He hadn't understood very much what the Salvationist said. He didn't like the idea of being called a sinner. How could he confess sin?. (120-21)

By showing Bakha's denial to confess sins and convert his religion and own Christianity, Anand is showing that Bakha, cannot speak while Velutha can as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak claims in her own essay written in 1997. Bakha, ultimately

neither changes religion nor stops his work of cleaning latrines and sweeping road.

Ultimately he seems to be servile character who has not the spirit of revolt but cannot

live the life with dignity unlike Velutha in *The God of Small Things*. The novel

Untouchable ends with open-ended style. Bakha goes on thinking and concludes:

. . . impulse shot through the transformation of space and time, and gathered all the elements . . . dispersed in the stream of his soul into a tentative decision, "I shall go and tell father all that Gandhi said about us," he whispered to himself, and all that that poet said. Perhaps I can find the poet some day and ask him about his machine." And he proceeded homewards. (148)

In this novel, Bakha is not dead physically but lives with inhumanity without the dignity and social respect. But Velutha, sacrifices his life due to the police brutality.

Anand portrays dozens of characters, mostly from outcastes, who are facing the same casteist problems deeply entrenched in Hindu caste-hierarchy. Bakha has been a subaltern from casteist and classist perspectives.

At the time Bakha has been abused and beaten in the way he happened to touch to the so-called high caste near Tommies barrack. He was very sad while coming back to the home where father Lakha was there. By seeing him pale, Lakha asks his son Bakha that "What is the matter with you to-day?"(69) . . . "Are you tired?". "Nothing" . . . 'there is nothing' he responded for first. "Surely something is the matter. Come, tell me truth" (69). Lakha wants to know what happened to him. In response to his father's regular queries, Bakha says:

They insulted me this morning, they abused me because as I was walking along a man happened to touch me. He gave me a blow. And a crowd gathered round me, abusing and –". He couldn't continue . . .

"My son,' said Lakha with a forced mixture of anger and kindness, 'didn't you give a warning of your approach?' . . . 'But father what is the use?' They would ill-treat us even if we shouted. They think we are mere dirt because we clean their dirt. That pundit in the temple tried to molest Sohini and then came shouting: 'Polluted, polluted.' (70)

This is an example of discrimination and casteist suppression on how they have been compelled to live in. It is also an evidence of servility. They are weak in every aspect. They need to perform dirty work only for the sake of solving hand-to-mouth problem. They can't revolt against their bourgeoisie. They are compelled to accept all misbehaves that so-called upper caste people do.

Lakha, Bakha's father responds, "You didn't abuse or hit back, did you?" . . . "No, but I was sorry afterwards that I didn't", replied Bakha in his father's query "I could have given them a bit of my mind." "No, no, my son, no," (70), Lakha suggests. This means they are living with the servile character in the society where they are badly entrenched in the Hinduism which has caste-hierarchies. Lakha further says to his son: "We can't do that. They are our superiors. One word of theirs is sufficient to overbalance all that we might say before the police. They are our masters. We must respect them and do as they tell us. Some of them are kind . . . he sensed that Bakha hated the high-caste people" (71).

Lakha remembers his past. While Bakha was sick, he got the support from one medicine man or Hakimjee—Sarkar. 'You know,' he began to tell. "When you were a little child, I had a nasty experience too. You were ill with fever, and I went to the house of Hakim Bhagawan Das, in this very town. I shouted and shouted but no one heard me' (71). "Still there is little breath left in my child's body, Hakim ji, I shall be your slave all my life. The meaning of my life is my child. Hakim ji, take pity. God

will be kind to you" (72). Anand further goes on to reflect the behavior of so-called high cast to the outcastes the 'untouchable'.

"Bhangi! (Sweeper) Bhangi!" There was an uproar in the medicine house . . . Hakim's feed had become defiled . . . highest pitch of his voice: 'Chandal! (low caste) by whose orders have you come here . . . You have polluted hundreds of rupees worth of medicine. Will you pay for it?' 'I began to shed tears' Lakha continued, 'Maharaj, The Great One, Your shoe on my head. I can only serve you. Will you come and give some medicine to my child? He is on his death-bed.' . . . Hakim ji's heart melted. He wrote prescription and Hakim ji came to our home and gave the medicine and you were saved. (73)

Lakha tries to prove that some high-caste people are kind and good. "He might have killed me", responds Bakha. "No, no, they are really kind. We must realize that it is religion which prevents them from touching us' (74). Anand utters from his various characters that "religion is the only one which prevents high-caste to touch the sweepers, and other outcastes" but he in the last portrays Bakha of not converting the religion which gives the tone of religion do not solve the problem of caste and class, Anand, being himself a Marxist thinker suggests for the necessity of struggle more instead of being static and servile.

As a friend of Chota, Ram Charan, Bakha goes to Ram Charan's house uninvited in the marriage ceremony of his sister, he faces discrimination there as well, which shows the intra-Dalits discrimination, since there is also the caste-hierarchy as the ruling class have the tendency of 'divide and rule' to the Dalit, so-called untouchable caste groups. Within Dalits, so-called untouchable, sweepers are considered the lowest in Hindu-caste system which is connected with class to the

large extent. Anand mainly advocates for becoming the sound from economic perspective for which state need to play the crucial role. Though they are friends, though they live in same outcastes' colony, though they have same kind of suppression, they discriminate to the other outcastes on the ground of caste hierarchy which is major hindrance for integrated movement of Indian Dalit community.

Colonel Hutchinson tries to his best to transgress Bakha into Christianity by religious aspect, but is not able to do so. Instead, Bakha always asks to Hutchinson that "who is Yessuh Messih?', 'why are we sinners?' to the idea of 'all human born sinners and they need to confess the sins that they have committed upon padre and God Yessuh Messih receive them to Heaven after they die" (120). Bakha is not convinced with the idea of confessing the sin since he thinks that he has not committed any sins. He strongly opposes the idea of conversion of religion, by which author might be trying to suggest outcaste to fight against bad provisions of Hinduism and get respect by adopting the Hinduism. The Colonel Hutchinson cannot convert Bakha to follow Christianity, which symbolizes that only religious philosophies do not abolish the caste and class suppression but need to struggle further to get them abolished and freed. Anand has optimistic voice though it ends with open-ended as "and he proceeded homewards" (148).

Delineation of Caste Subalternity in Roy's *The God of Small Things*

Arundhati Roy's novel, *The God of Small Things* (1997) raises post-colonial social issues especially the subaltern people on the different grounds. Roy, in *The God of Small Things*, clearly presents the heart touching plight faced by subaltern people and their consciousness. The novel presents Velutha as the central subaltern character in terms of caste and other sociocultural aspects. Ammu is presented as subaltern in term of gender. She has been the victim of patriarchal society. There are many

characters in the novel who are exercising power to the subordinated characters. The subaltern main characters of the novel like Velutha and Ammu have been extremely subalternized in the multiple ways.

Subalternity usually focuses on the group which is subordinated or effaced from the society. "Subaltern" has to do with –a person without social mobility" (28) Spivak says. She claims in earlier essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" that the group of people who are subordinated from the society cannot speak against the oppressor, rulers and the bourgeois. Servility and submissiveness towards authority is the only way that they live in a society. They are segregated from the society, alienated and suffocated equally. The rich people usually mark themselves as elite and the poor as subaltern. Subaltern people are usually exploited and segregated from the society by elite groups of people. Although the marginal group in the society try to rebel against the domination but they cannot rebel easily because of the power 'network'.

Vinayak Chaturvedi, in "A Critical Theory of Subalternity: Rethinking Class in Indian Historiography" says that 'a small group of Marxist scholars influenced by Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Notebook* (in the early 1980s) introduced "subaltern" as a new analytic category within modern Indian historiography'. He further goes on to illustrate that the 'scholars, led by Ranajit Guha, were dissatisfied with the interpretation of India's nationalist movement, which had long neglected "the politics of the people . . . in making of the Indian nation" (9). Subalternity has various dimensions that may be in terms of caste, class, gender, geographical location, religion, educational aspect, language, culture including among others which dominate, subordinate, humiliate to the people different than themselves.

Arundhati Roy's novel *The God of Small Things* deals with various issues like caste, class, gender, geographical location, postcoloniality and psychological aspects.

Velutha is represented as the subaltern. Roy also presents Ammu as marginal character from gender subaltern perspective. Mammachi, a blind mother of Ammu and Chacko, has been beaten by her husband Benaam Navomi Ipe (used to call Pappachi). Mammachi, though represented as the owner of the Paradise Pickles and Preserves factory, has been subalternized from gender eye. Baby Kochamma, sister to Pappachi lives with Mammachi, sister-in-law, and nephew Chacko.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak by writing second essay in 1997 "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in *Essays on Historiography* making the sense of 'subaltern can speak' says that subaltern people like: Velutha and Ammu in *The God of Small Things* and Bakha in *Untouchable* can speak on some specific ground that they have consciousness and conscience. Spivak opines:

In the guise of post-Marxist description of the scene of power, we thus encounter a much older debate: between representation or rhetoric as tropology and as persuasion. *Darstellen* belongs to the first constellation, *vertreten* –with stronger suggestions of substitution—to the second. Again, they are related, but running them together . . . where oppressed subjects speak, act, and know for themselves, leads to an essentialist . . . single-issue gender rather than class, give unquestioning support . . . which ruthlessly constructs a general will in the credit-baited rural woman . . . much-invoked oppressed subject (as Woman), speaking, acting, and knowing that gender in development is best for her. (259)

Roy speaks the voices of subaltern in terms of caste, gender, class and like creating the major subaltern characters Velutha and Ammu. In first chapter, Velutha is shown to be died and Sophie Mol also dies by drowning in the river. Due to relation

between Ammu and Velutha, the so-called high caste and lower caste in caste-Hindu respectively, Velutha has been blamed of abducting and murdering Sophie Mol, a daughter of Chacko and Margaret Kochamma.

Though Sophie Mol, daughter of Margaret Kochamma and Chacko dies by drowning in the river, the police Inspector Mathew beats him inhumanly. He calls 'Veshyas' to Ammu while she had reached to him and complain about the death of Sophie Mol. But later on, her sister (aunt) filed the case against Velutha of abduction and murder that he tried to save her while boating in the river. The novel presents betrayals, illegitimate relations, exploitation and suppressions, on the ground of caste, gender, class, physical attribute, coloniality and human psychology which are deeply embedded in the Indian society. The novel represents the postcolonial caste subaltern issues which are carved very effectively and nicely.

Caste subaltern issue is burning issue mainly in South Asian Countries especially in India and Nepal. There are many issues under the term "subaltern". Subaltern has to do with mainly the 'subordination' or 'inferior rank'. Subaltern covers many issues like caste, gender, class and the like that the novelists mostly talk about the caste subaltern issue since author Roy creates Velutha as a caste subaltern protagonist. Chaturvedi referring to Hardiman and Chatterjee explains the different tenets in subalternist notion:

Hardiman was the only Subalternist to explicitly engage with the ideas of peasant differentiation to explain agrarian politics. Partha Chatterjee, on the other hand, provided the further break within Subaltern Studies by linking Marxian social theory with Foucaultian notion of power to argue for "community" as the primary . . . principle . . . Chatterjee began by providing a typology of three modes of

power—communal, feudal and bourgeois—to explain the "different evolution" of social relation . . . all three modes of power could have coexisted . . . which impacted . . . agrarian economy *differently*. (12)

Roy taking Velutha as major character raises the issue of untouchability and gender bias. The whole story revolves in Ayemenem house in Kerala. By being from the Paravan caste, Velutha has been discriminated inhumanly in Ayemenem House though he is educated and Incharge of Paradise Pickles and Preserves factory, owned by Mammachi, Chacko's mother. Though every issues are taken as cross-cutting issues, Roy has basically highlighted on casteist issue—more specifically the casteist subaltern issue:

He was called Velutha—which means White in Malayalam—because he was so black. His father Vellya Paapen was a *Paravan* . . . As a young boy, Velutha would come with Vellya Paapen to the back entrance of the Ayemenem House . . . Pappachi would not allow *Paravans* into the house. Nobody would. They were not allowed to touch anything that Touchables touched. Caste Hindus and Caste Christians . . . Mammachi told Estha and Rahel that she could remember a time. . . Paravans were expected to crawl backwards with a broom sweeping away their footprints so that Brahmins . . . not defile themselves by accidentally . . . a *Paravan's* footprint. (73-74)

Mammachi, mother of Chacko and Ammu and grandmother of Estha and Rahel twin and Sophie Mol keeps on remembering that in her time Paravans were not allowed to walk on public road. From this evidence of caste atrocities, one can imagine how the discrimination has been institutionalized and on how they have been victimized from the casteist problem. It further explains as Mammachi remembers:

"In Mammachi's time, Paravans, like other Untouchables, were not allowed to walk on public roads, not allowed to cover their upper bodies, not allowed to carry umbrellas. They had to put hands over their mouths when they spoke, to divert their polluted breath away from those whom they addressed" (74). The Dalits were even not allowed to walk on the public road means to show the severe level of discrimination against 'lower castes' people', like Paravan, which refers the timeframe of colonial period in India.

Chaturvedi refers to Gayatri Chakrabarty Spivak. Spivak further concludes that there was methodological problem within Subaltern Studies as a "historiographical project" in which it was impossible to "retrieve colonized women's subject position" when the subaltern woman had no subject position to begin with in the primary sources used to write the histories by the Subalternists', (16). She further goes on claiming:

Subaltern history was confronted with its own limits. Although Spivak provided a deconstructive approach in her analysis of the project, a spirit of Marx remained embedded in her articulation for the future direction of Subaltern Studies. She argued: 'it is well known that, for reasons of collusion between pre-existing structure of patriarchy and transnational capitalism, it is the urban sub-proletarian female who is the paradigmatic subject of the current configuration of the International Division of Labor'. (16)

Ammu is severely discriminated as she is a female character. She is mostly abused and misbehaved by Baby Kochamma, Mammachi and Chacko who represent the high caste, owner of factory, male by gender. Roy's *The God of Small Things*, does not merely represent the caste subaltern issue, but also of gender subalternity—

sexual harassment to the woman, class—sufferance of proletariat, colonial atrocities and psychological alienation. She mostly raises the issue of casteist discrimination and untouchability and the whole story of the novel in a way or other, revolves around Velutha, as he is taken from the Paravan caste, so-called untouchable for caste-Hindu in Indian society.

Spivak, in her later essay, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1997) says that the ideological construction of gender keeps the male dominant. She had written previously that the "subaltern has no history and cannot speak." She remarks:

Within the effaced itinerary of the subaltern subject, the track of sexual difference is doubly effaced. The question is not of female participation in insurgency, or the ground rules of the sexual division of labor, for both of which there is "evidence." It is, rather, that, both as object of colonialist historiography and as subject of insurgency, the ideology construction of gender keeps the male dominant. If in the contest of colonial production the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow. (274)

Ammu has been the victim of the state brutality that she goes to report of the death of Sophie Mol by drowning in the river but Inspector Mathew calls Ammu "Vesyas" and reject that he won't receive the information from Veshyas. Though, she is abused, misbehaved by police that there is written the good principles of POLICE that is P for politeness, O for obedience, L for loyal, I for intelligent, C for courtesy and E for efficiency. This In first chapter/subtopic Paradise Pickles and Preserves that Sophie Mol, daughter of Chacko and Margaret Kochamma and niece of Ammu dies and Ammu goes to police station for the report where she faces the police's

sexual abuse and harassment. By namely, Mathew may be the officer from British colonizer and it exposes the colonial atrocity to female [subaltern] character Ammu:

He stared at Ammu's breasts as he spoke . . . Kottayam Police didn't take statements from *Veshyas*, or their illegitimate children . . .

Inspector Thomas Mathew came around his desk and approached

Ammu with his baton. 'If I were you,' he said, 'I'd go home quietly.'

Then he tapped her breasts with his baton. Gently *tap, tap*. As though he was choosing mangoes from a basket. (8)

Here, it is worthwhile to mention the opinion of Gyan Prakash. In "Subaltern Studies as Postcolonial Criticism", he says that the term 'Subaltern', drawn from Antonio Gramsci's writings, refers to "subordination" in terms of class, caste, gender, language, and culture and was used to signify the centrality of dominant/ dominated relationships in history," (1477). He refers to Guha and further illustrates like:

Guha suggested . . . Subaltern Studies would not ignore the dominant, because the subalterns are always subject to their activity, its aim was to "rectify the elitist bias characteristic of much research and academic work" in South Asian Studies. The act of rectification sprang from the conviction that the elites had exercised dominance, not hegemony, in Gramsci's sense, over the subalterns. (1477)

Arundhati Roy's novel *The God of Small Things* also depicts the bitter casteist discrimination in a way or other. Anand's Bakha in *Untouchable* and Roy's Velutha, the subaltern of the novel face the similar problem of caste atrocities to the large extent. But, the severity, the gravity of the discrimination, forms and types of discrimination seem to be different. In this connection, there are some similarities and dissimilarities in the novels whom one looks from the caste subaltern perspective.

J. Maggio, in his work "Can the Subaltern Be Heard?" *Political Theory, Translation, Representation, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak* explains the notion of subaltern. Maggio says, '. . . often employed far too vaguely to denote "oppression", or "otherness". He says, "Spivak resists this definition, though she offers only a description of the subaltern' (421). Maggio further remarks:

Spivak resists this definition, though she offers only a description of the subaltern. Of course, such definition/description is interestingly because it reinforces the notion that the subaltern can be situated only in the context of the imperial power. In this sense, Spivak's (non)definition acts as an aegis against the accusation of her creating a metaphilosophy. (421)

Ammu protests her husband's male chauvinism that he severely beats her. It can also be considered as the "subaltern" "defiance" to Gautam Bhadra. In *The Mentality of Subalternity: Kantanama or Rajdharma*, Bhadra attempts to delineate the features of what he may call the subaltern mentality. He says that the 'defiance is not the only characteristic of the behavior of subaltern class.' 'Submissiveness to authority in one context is as frequent as defiance in another.' For Bhadra, 'these two elements together constitute the subaltern mentality.' He goes on to illustrate that "it is on account of this combination that the poor and the oppressed have, time and again . . . made voluntary sacrifices in favour of the rich and the dominant, at least as often as they have rebelled against the latter" (54).

In second chapter, Pappachi's Mother, Baba, Ammu's husband and Mr. Hollick, employee of the same factory holds conversation very nicely. In a coffee shop, they hold talks. While talking Ammu's husband Baba is very sad and pessimist. Ammu was also present. Mr. Hollick is giving him the relief by saying, 'You are a very lucky

man, you know, wonderful family, beautiful children, such an attractive wife . . . 'An extremely attractive wife...' (41-42). Mr. Hollick keeps on suggesting to Ammu, be sent to his bungalow to be 'looked after'. Ammu, Baba's wife remained silent and Baba grabbed her hair and punched her. It has shown that there has been also the various evidences of gender violence and male chauvinism. Baba hits his wife Ammu and she also hit him back as:

Ammu watched her husband's mouth move as it formed words. She said nothing. He (Baba) grew uncomfortable and then infuriated by her silence. Suddenly he lunged at her, grabbed her hair, punched her and then passed out from the effort. Ammu took down the heaviest book she could find . . . the Reader's Digest World Atlas—and hit him with it as hard as she could. On his head. His legs . . . (42)

The God of Small Things also exposes the Indian tendencies of casteist discrimination of caste-Hindu to Paravan, Paryan, so-called untouchable and due to the casteist discrimination and untouchability bitterly practiced, they have sought the option for deleting the surname as Paravan, Polayan, Paryan and like as demand of communist party. Kerala, as ruled by Marxist Party for long—that Travancore-Cochin Marxist Labour Union, has demanded for increasing the wages of the labor for women, men and other issues as demand. It is the protest of Indian Dalits to the ruling class and elites who discriminate so much inhumanly. Roy speaks like:

That women's wages be increased from one rupee twenty five paise a day, to three rupees, and men's from two rupees fifty paise to four rupees fifty paise a day. They were also demanding that 'Untouchable's no longer be addressed by their caste names. They demanded not to be

addressed as Achoo *Parayan*, or Kelan *Paravan*, or Kuttan *Palayan*, but just as Achoo, or Kelan, or Kuttan. (69)

The setting of *The God of Small Things* takes place in small village of Ayemenem where Roy was raised. After moving to New Delhi to train at the School of Planning and Architecture, she spent years as a screenwriter, production designer and even taught aerobic classes in order to support herself. Roy creates the central female character Ammu and makes her loving to Velutha to show the cultural encounter, and/or deconstructing the conventional center in terms of caste, class and post-coloniality as well as human psychology.

The title *The God of Small Things* is taken as a symbol that the mythic principles as having god as a supernatural power that they manipulate, subvert the idea to be discriminating to the so-called outcastes or lower caste, on the very ground that they do not let Paravan, Bhangi and the like, to enter into the temple, where the stone statue are placed supposing the savior god that she calls the very thing 'small'. It is a post-modern fiction which portrays the socio-economic and politico-cultural reality of the Indian society.

The God of Small Things infers belief of super-natural power of unseen god which they believe to be supernatural and unseen power to which most of the people worship for. The supernatural power and dream signal basically believed in religion and with the base of the very mythological principle, the particular castes, gender, and community people have been made marginalized, subalternized and discriminated inhumanly. The Dalits and the women have been discriminated, practiced untouchability against them with the view to some set standard, which in long run becomes the hegemonic and controlling phenomena. In this text, Ammu is ill and she used to see the dream. Her twin children Estha and Rahel whisper to each other:

Ammu flew through her dream on heavy, shuddering wings, and stopped to rest, just under the skin of it. ...'D' you think she's dying?' she heard Rahel whisper to Estha. 'It's an afternoon-mare,' Estha-the-Accurate replied, 'She dreams a lot.' If he touched her, he could not talk to her, if he loved her he couldn't leave, if he spoke he couldn't listen, if he fought he couldn't win. Who was he, the one-armed man? Who could he have been? The God of Loss? *The God of Small Things*? The God of Goose Bumps and Sudden Smiles?' (217)

In "The God of Small Things" of *The God of Small Things* Ammu keeps on dreaming which symbolizes Roy's dream of society with equality and affirmative action. Ammu's dream symbolizes the dream of Roy, who wish for fair and just society. Roy infers a story of a poor girl which utters:

It was the story of poor girl, who is forced to marry a fisherman from a neighbouring beach, though she loves someone else. When the fisherman finds out about his new wife's old lover, he sets out to sea in his little boat thought he knows that a storm is brewing. It's dark, and the wind rises. A whirlpool spins up from the ocean bed . . . and the fisherman drowns . . . The lovers make the suicide pact, and are found the next morning, washed up on the beach with their arms around each other. So everybody dies. The fisherman, his wife, her lover, and a shark that has no part in the story . . .The sea claims them all. (219)

Here, Roy says that "the sea claims them all" in imagination of casteiest discrimination on the basis of superstitious Hinduism which claim Ammu and Velutha for only being kept the [sexual] relation, which is biological need of every human being and can have relation with the loved one that should not be confined on

the ground of caste, religion, class [economic status], geographical location, and the like. 'Sea' here seems to be symbolizing to the caste based discrimination, untouchability and exploitation, and inhuman suppression that even claim the life of the people [lovers] like sea.

In this chapter "The God of Small Things" Roy, mentions 'he' and the pronoun 'he' might be representing Velutha, by expressing the dreams symbols that 'If he touched her, he couldn't talk her, if he loved her he couldn't leave' since Velutha has been one victimized person that 'if he touched her, he couldnot talk her . . . if he spoke, he couldnot listen. This is a big irony that Velutha is facing actually that he cannot love her freely. He cannot even talk her properly since they are of two caste background that if other know, they would be punished severely. Though they have much more precaution in Kari Saipu's house, all the people know about the relation and Vellya Paapen, representing the old generation conveys to Mammachi who is a mother of Ammu. Then after, Ammu and Velutha have been the victim of caste and gender based violence for only crossing the caste line, conventional caste-boundaries, castes' hierarchies to each other.

In the third subtopic of the book, "Big Man the Laltain, Small Man the Mombatti" stresses on the issues of discrimination in terms of caste, class, gender, coloniality, and the like. Roy, metaphorically expresses the notion of Big Man and Small Man. By mentioning the Big Man, she might have to focus on the so-called upper calste, the caste-Hindu and Syrian Christian, Male, Colonizer, Bourgeois. The Small Man might have the nexus with the so-called untouchable, Paravan, Paryans, Female, Proletariat, Colonized and Ruled persons. Big Man has been compared here as Laltain because it gives light to the big areas and Small Man with the Mombatti, candle—that gives light for small things. Roy says:

There are big dreams and little one. 'Big Man the Laltain sahib, Small Man the Mombatti,' an old Bihari coolie, who met Estha's school excursion party at the railway station (unfailingly, year after year) used to say of dreams. Big Man the Lantern. Small man the Tallow-stick. *Huge man the Strobe Lights*, he omitted to say. And the *Small Man the Subway Station*. (89)

Gyanendra Pandey in his work "The Time of Dalit Conversion" says that ". . . the question of the dalit conversion is tied up with the question of decolonization in the subcontinent" [EPW 2] He further goes on to explain that the "Hindu code was the greatest social reform measure ever undertaken by the legislature in this country." Pandey says, as the luminary *Dalits* leader Ambedkar declared in the statement explaining his resignation from the central government as:

No law passed by the Indian legislature in the past or likely to be passed in the future can be compared to it in point of its significance . . . to leave inequality between class and class between sex and sex which is the soul of Hindu society untouched and to go on passing legislation relating to economic problems is to make a rance of our Constitution and to build a palace on a dung heap . . .(2)

Like Pandey's version, Ammu dies and the caste-Hindu and the Syrian Christian own the same characteristics in regard to the outcaste. The colonialist, the Britishers put themselves on the top of the caste hierarchy in the colonial India. In this very ground, the church refuses to bury Ammu as she dies. The Padre, Bishops think that of having crossed the caste-line because of her keeping the physical relationship with Velutha, untouchable. Ammu, being from 'high caste' that she makes the love

affair and sexual intercourse with Velutha, a Paravan, so-called untouchable; church is not ready to bury her:

The church refuses to bury Ammu. On several counts. So Chacko hired a van to transport the body to the electric crematorium. He has her wrapped in a dirty bed sheet and laid out on a stretcher . . . Over the jarring bumps and potholes in the road, Ammu's body jiggled and slid off the stretcher. Her head hit an iron bolt on the floor. She didn't wince or wake up. (162)

In "Welcome Home, Our Sophie Mol" Ammu remembers the past activities that she had had with Velutha. Ammu remembers, "It was his smile that reminded Ammu of Velutha as a little boy. Helping Vellya Paapen to count the coconuts. Holding out the little gifts he had made for her" (175). She goes on thinking that, 'Boats, boxes and small windmills. Calling her Ammukutty. Little Ammu. The nostalgic remembrance of Ammu to Velutha is quite significant here as it shows the relation, love affair between the so-called "Touchable" and "Untouchable".

The novel also shows the miserable situation of Velutha's family members. Kuttapen, Velutha's brother is sick and lives inside the house of Ayemenem. Velutha's mother Chela had also died with the bitter health condition without her getting the treatment. He shouts from inside the house. He thinks the same that his mother had died in the same corner of the hut. After Velutha and Vellya Paapen, his brother and father respectively, they went for work for whole month, Kuttapen faces difficult health condition –that he was paralyzed from the chest downwards:

The shouts was Kuttapen, Velutha's older brother. He was paralyzed from chest downwards . . . Kuttapen lay flat on his back and watched his youth saunter past without stoppint to say hello . . . He missed his

mother, Chella, who had died in the same corner of the room that he lay in now. She had died a coughing, spitting, aching, phlegmy death. Kuttapen remembered noticing how her feet died long before she had . . . Sometimes, Kuttapen coughed like his mother used to . . . his lower body lay like lead, as though it belonged to someone else. (206-207)

The novel is written with the postmodern concept of literary writing. Sophie Mol and Ammu die in initial part of the novel. But their conversations come in later parts too.

Roy shows many ebbs and flows of the characters she creates. Margaret Kochamma first has love affair with Chacko, Ammu's brother. Then she gets married with Chacko. Since Chacko has no earning well, she wants to leave him. For the sake of her own and her daughter Sophie Mol, she wanted to divorce with Chacko and marry with Joe. Margaret Kochamma, Ammu, Rahel have their very bad fate that they can't maintain the family durable. By showing these ebbs and flows of the characters, she wants to adopt post-modernist approach in *The God of Small Things*. She utters:

As for the Chako, Margaret Kochamma was the first female friend he had ever had. Not just the first female that he had slept with, but his first real companion. . . Perhaps it wasn't remarkable in the average English woman, but it was remarkable to Chacko . . . He [Chacko] loved the way she would sit up naked in his bed, her long white back swiveled away from him, look at her watch and say in her practical way –'Oops I must be off.' He loved the way she wobbled to work every morning on her bicycle . . . He encouraged their differences . . . He grew to depend on Margaret Kochamma for not depending on him. He adored her for not adoring him. (245-246)

Roy also presents the ironical appeal of Comrade K.N.M. Pillai to Chacko for sacking Velutha from the job as the incharge of Paradise Pickles and Preserves factory. He tells that he is a card-holder party cadre and suggest Chacko, better to 'send him away' from the job. Though, he is referred here as Marxist, a communist leader, he goes on to convince Chacko to terminate him from the job for fulfilling his petty personal interest. But till the moment, Velutha relation with his sister Ammu was not exposed and Chacko defended strongly for him. Chacko says that had he not been a paravan, he would have become an Engineer because he has that level of knowledge on machinery parts as Incharge of the factory, owned by his mother Mammahi. The text goes on to present as:

'That Paravan is going to cause trouble for you' he [K.N.M Pillai] said.
 'Take it from me . . . get him a job somewhere else. Send him off.' . . .
 'Send him away? But why? I have no objections to him being a card-holder. . . I thought perhaps you are speaking for him' Chacko said . . .
 I trust him . . . 'Not like that,' Comrade Pillai said. 'He may be very well okay as a person. But other workers are not happy with him . . . they are coming to me with complaints . . . 'You see, from local standpoint, these caste issues are very deep-rooted.' . . . frankly speaking, Change is one thing. Acceptance is another . . 'My dear fellow' Chacko said. 'That's impossible. He's invaluable. (278-79)

Sharit K Bhowmik in "Caste and Class in India", in an article published in *Economic and Political Weekly* says the "Division of labour became complex, hierarchical and based on exploitation' (2). He further says, "It was now possible for groups of people who were not directly connected with production to appropriate. Indrani Chatterjee in her writing says that "The prior separation of monogamous wives from slave-

concubines in the patriarchal family influenced historians to represent the female slaves' (51). She further clarifies her idea of colouring subalternity as 'Outside' the lineage and "household' and slavery in general as the embodiment of anti-kinship of non-belonging, of permanent alienation, while function of constituting the legitimate lineage was preserved to wives" (51).

Margaret Kochamma first divorces with Chacko and marries with Joe. After he dies in car accident, she also happens to be closer with Chacko since they have one daughter Sophie Mol. Then they again lives together in Ayemenem. Likewise, Ammu first marries Baba from him she gives birth to the twin Estha and Rahel. Rahel also has American husband Larry McCaslin who has come to Delhi for collecting the materials for conducting the doctoral thesis. After she gets divorced with him and comes back to Ayemenem, she use to stay with her brother Estha. One day they happens to commit incest, sexual relationship between brother and sister which is very unsocial relation that society cannot accept. The subtopic "The Pessimist and The Optimist" gives the evidence. The caste-based-discrimination and untouchability is shown to Vellya Paapen in Mammachi's house. The text writes:

Perhaps it was the rain that drove Vellya Paapen to the kitchen door.

To a superstitious man, the relentlessness of that unseasonal downpour could have seemed like an omen from an angry god. To a drunk superstitious man, it could have seemed like the beginning of the end of the world . . . 'Are you drunk? Mammachi said angrily to the sound of rain. How dare you come here in this condition? . . . and said nothing when he stood on the topmost step, almost inside her Touchable kitchen. (254-255)

Andre Beteille, a professor of Dehli University, writes in his *Caste and Family* in representation of Indian society published in *Anthropology Today*. He claims that "preoccupation with caste has dominated accounts of Indian society and culture to an unusual degree" (12). He is of the view that "Caste has fascinated observers by its distinctive, not to say peculiar, characteristics, and many have taken the position, implicitly or explicitly, if there is a single key to the understanding of Indian society as a whole, it is to be found in the caste system" (13). The subaltern characters are to some extent unnecessarily honest since Vellya Paapen thinks his duty to tell the relation of his son Velutha and his Master's daughter Ammu. Since he feels himself the inferiority complex, he has confessed the relation that Hindu caste society term it as "illegitimate relation", "crossing the caste lines."

Gautam Bhadra says that "'defiance' is not only the character of subaltern but they also have 'submissiveness to authority'" (54). Vellya Paapen is seen as a submissive and servile character unlike his son Velutha. He protest, he revolts, he challenges, he crosses the conventional boundaries set under Hinduism. As a good example of Vellya Paapen's submissiveness is his telling the [sexual] relation of his son Velutha with Ammu to her mother Mammachi. Bhadra keeps on expressing that referring the subject of father's relation with son which he calls the features of

Rajdharm:

The crucial feature of rajdharm is this relationship of father and son . . . The father punishes and also looks after his son. This duality of chastisement and protection is the basis of rajdharm. The authority of the father and the submission of the son are matched by the helplessness of the son in the absence of the father . . . In this notion [of rajdharm] there was a fusion of two opposing ideas of

dominance/and subordination . . . The authority of the father in a family is taken as 'given' or 'natural'; so the lord's authority over his domain, by this analogy, becomes 'natural' and 'everlasting'. This analogy from family to society . . . various levels of authority and submission . . .' (82-83)

It is worthwhile to take the reference here the issue of the book *Caste in India: The Facts and the System* by Emile Senart too, which was translated by Sir E. Denison Ross. Senart says that the marriage in India that was only legal when the marriage between the particular groups that they could eat the food together by following conventional Hindu rules. He remarks:

Speaking generally, we may take it that only those may eat together who are allowed to intermarry . . . The twelve sections of the Kayasths of Bengal may no more eat in company than they may permit alliances with one another . . . Many sections of castes between which marriage is unlawful do not refrain from sharing meals together. Moreover, customs in this respect varies one part of the country to another. Still more than do the marriage laws . . . (39)

Roy shows the inferiority complex of Vellya Paapen, a Paravan, the so-called untouchable and after knowing the love affair and sexual intercourse between his son Velutha and Mammachi's daughter Ammu, he goes to the house of Mammachi and he tell the truth that he thinks his duty to confess the fact before Mammachi knows the issue from other first. Ammu is a divorcee of Baba who labors in the west. After the divorce and alienation in America, she returns back to Ayemenem. Velutha and Ammu are not married couple since they are from different caste hierarchy. In the very pretext of alienated Ammu, Velutha can attract her very soon and has sexual

intercourse. She meets Velutha by night. Vellya Paapen requests Mammachi's family to kill his son for crossing the caste-line that Paapen feels himself inferior. The inferiority complex can be seen in the people "outcastes" which is also hindering factor for the human civilization to be treated equally from the state:

They went to Kari Saipu's House, Vellya Paapen said. The white man's demon had entered them. It was Kari Saipu's revenge for what he, Vellya Paapan, had done to him . . . Vellya Paapan had seen them with his own eye. Others had seen them too. The whole village knew. It was only the matter of time before Mammachi found out. So Vellya Paapen had come to tell Mammachi himself. As Paravan and a man with mortgaged body parts, he considered it his duty. The lovers. Sprung from his loins and her. His son and her daughter. They had made the unthinkable thinkable and the impossible really happen. Vellya Paapen kept talking. Weeping. Retching. Moving his mouth. (255-6)

Mammachi could not hear the issue of her daughter being loved and sexed by Paravan's son, Velutha. Then blind old woman came near and she pushed him. The story exposes her brutality as an owner of the Paradise Pickles and Preserves factory, from bourgeois class as;

Suddenly the blind old woman in her rickrack dressing gown and her thin grey hair plaited into a rat's tail stepped forward and pushed Vellya Paapen with all her strength. He stumble backwards, down the kitchen steps and lay sprawled in the wet mud . . .part the taboo of being an Untouchable was expecting not to be touched. At least not in these circumstances . . . Baby Kochamma found Mammachi spitting

into the rain, THOO! THOO! THOO! And Vellya Paapen lying in the slush, wet, weeping, groveling. Offering to kill his son. (256)

Baby Kochamma, aunt of the Ammu and sister-in-law of the Mammachi 'misrepresented the relationship between Ammu and Velutha, not for Ammu's sake, but to contain the scandal and salvage the family reputation in Inspector Thomas Mathew's eyes.' Caste-based-discrimination and untouchability issue is a burning problem while Roy was writing the novel. Though it was burning, it was not as equal as of the time of Anand's time of writing *Untouchable* in 1935.

Once after the rumor was spread out the relation of Ammu and Velutha, they go to the Mammachi's house. Mammahi murmurs for their behavior and she abused them in so much anger. She even spits to Velutha's mouth. After her inhuman behavior, Velutha leaves the job from the factory. Mammachi screams, 'Out!' she had screamed, eventually. "If I find you on my property tomorrow I'll have you castrated like the pariah dog that you are! I'll have you killed!" We'll see about that,' Velutha said quietly . . . Mammachi spat into the Velutha's face. Thick spit. It splattered across his skin. His mouth and eyes (284).

Ranjit Guha in his book *History at the Limit of World History* says that "no writing no history" and "no state no history" (10). He writes that if history has to be written, there must be a state with its basic features. History has been mostly written for and by the West and Westerners in his opinion. He further remarks:

Writing was still regarded as a necessary condition, but not sufficient. A people had to have statehood to qualify fully. Since writing to be historical needed the state to write about, it was subsumed in the latter. The Renaissance formula, "No writing, no history," so popular with the conquistadors was updated by 1830—the year of the second draft—to

read, "No state, no history." The revision followed inexorably from the logic of historical developments in the west. The formative energies and expansionist drives of its new nations . . . modern and dynamics of inventions called World-history. (10)

The history is written under the shade of power that the philosopher say. The novel also depicts the police brutality to the 'untouchable' Velutha that has been the history of long exploitation, discrimination and inhuman behavior of the state or the ruling class. Louis Althusser talks about RSA and ISA of the ruling elite. RSA means Repressive State Apparatus and ISA means Ideological State Apparatus—Althusser claims. Velutha in *The God of Small Things* by Arundhati Roy has been victimized by both the apparatuses as explained by Althusser. Police brutality shows the RSA that state keeps on repressing to the subaltern class like Velutha, the paravan to protect the ideology of the Hinduism. As Ammu and Velutha committed the sexual relation, they have love affair, Baby Kochamma on behalf of Mammachi, has filled the FIR to police station. Inspector Thomas Mathew, as per the report, beats him very inhumanly. Due to the severely beating of police, Velutha has torture in every parts of his body, later on he dies due to the cause of police torture. It explores the police inhuman act as:

[Velutha]'s lower intestine was ruptured and hemorrhaged, the blood collected in his abdominal cavity. His spine was damaged in two places, the concussion had paralyzed his right arm and resulted in a loss of control over his bladder and rectum. Both his knee caps were shattered . . . One of them flicked at his penis with his stick. 'Come on, show us your special secret. Show us how big it gets when you blow it up.' . . . They locked his arms across his back. (310-311)

Velutha is portrayed as subaltern protagonist who is, though economically sound and skillful person, he has been discriminated inhumanly and beaten to death. If he was born to other caste or caste, "he would become the engineer" the novelist declares. He is educated, handsome enough and Ammu, the divorcee from Baba, easily attracted to him and they are deeply entrenched into the affair. Ammu use to meet Velutha by night and her twins from Baba, Estha and Rahel meet him in day, the novel exposes their very nice relationship crossing the caste-line since Velutha born in untouchable caste, paravan and Ammu born in "high-caste" that is caste-Hindu.

Guha says that the world present itself in the aspect of individuality and to allow self-consciousness to emerge in freedom. He thinks that the freedom or work, freedom of love and freedom of exposing the biological needs of the human beings are the inalienable rights that needed to be bestowed to all the human equally. He further says:

This makes for the most interesting world identified usually by two of its great philosophical landmarks—the unhappy consciousness and the dialects of master and slave. But there are some passages less known because buried in the massive tome of the *Aesthetics* where the concreteness of that world is presented in a broad outline with Hegel saying, "Here is revealed the whole breadth of prose in human existence." (18)

Again he remarks referring to the renowned poet and writer Rabindranath Tagore that the bitter disappointment about poverty of historiography. Guha goes on claiming that "it was, he [Tagore] thought exclusively concerned with empires and rulers and their public affairs" (72). He says:

"Off with your history," he said . . . All he intended was perhaps to leave behind him a testament about the pathos of historicity. For it is the latter that has lost out, generating a pathos in every sense of the term as used by Northrop Frye. Weak, inarticulate and excluded, the prose of the world –historicality's discourse—displays all the symptoms of a low-mimetic tragedy. (72-73)

Roy presents not only the police brutality but also the state's apatheticness to offer them with the dignity. Due to Velutha's resisting characteristics, he revolts and question against the conservatism and "superstitions as practiced under the shade of state-protected-ruling Hindu ideology" (Mijar 58). Roy presents Baby Kochamma as a villainous character for fair and just society. She cannot see the relation of Velutha, the paravan with her niece Ammu. Kochamma, in consultation with Mammachi files the FIR blaming him of abduction and murder of Sophie Mol, who is daughter to Chacko and Margart Kochamma. Roy writes:

The Kottayam police had acted on the basis of an FIR filed by *her* [Baby Kochamma]. The Paravan had been caught. Unfortunately he had been badly injured in the encounter and in all likelihood would not live through the night. Their boat had capsized and the English child [Sophie Mol] was drowned by accident. Which left the police saddled with the Death in Custody of a technically innocent man . . . 'True, he was a Paravan . . .' (314)

Roy furthermore writes that due to the death of Velutha by Kottayam Police brutality and atrocity, Ammu is victimized from the very state's suppression that her lover caused to death. Roy writes opposite/negative connotation of the word *police* symbolizing the gun or non-sensual brutality:

'ssenetiloP', he [Estha] said. 'ssenetiloP, ecneidebO,'

'ytlayoL, ecnegilletnI,' Rahel said

'ysetruoC.'

'ycneiciffE.'

To this credit, Inspector Thomas Mathew remained calm. He sensed the growing incoherence in the children . . . He had seen it all before . . . the human mind's escape valve. Its way of managing trauma. He [Inspector Mathew] says 'When is your birthday, Mon?' and 'What's your favourite colour, Mol?' (313)

The main female character Ammu's feeling and relation with Velutha has been nicely presented here in the last of the novel. "The Cost of Living" chapter exposes good love and relation with the so-called untouchable boy from Paravan, Velutha and touchable Ammu. Roy nicely presents the affair and intercourse scene at the end of the novel. She gives the live presentation "She [Ammu] went to him [Velutha] and laid the length of her body against his. He just stood there . . . partly with cold. Partly terror. Partly aching desire. Despite his fear his body was prepared to take the bait. It wanted her . . . His wetness wet her. She put her arms around him . . . She unbuttoned her shirt . . . Skin to skin" (334). Roy presents the sexual relation between Velutha, Paravan, a so-called untouchable, a black and Ammu, from so-called high caste or Brown lady which symbolizes the crossing the limits of traditional norms as per the Hinduism in India. She further remarks:

Her brownness against his blackness. Her softness against his hardness. Her nut-brown breasts . . . against his smooth ebony chest. She smelled the river in him . . . Ammu put out her tongue and tasted it on the hollow of his throat . . . She pulled his head down towards her

and kissed his mouth. A cloudy kiss. A kiss that demanded the kiss back. He kissed her back. First cautiously. Then urgently . . . She felt him shudder against her . . . pulling her hips against his, to let her know how much he wanted her. (335)

At the ending parts Ammu has "a dry rose in her hair" (340). The 'dry rose' has been metaphorically expressed for the bad fate of Ammu after Velutha's death, whom Ammu heartily loved. The ending of the novel presents the love story, having sexual intercourse between 'touchable' Ammu and 'untouchable' Velutha. The text is not written in chronological order since Roy wants to present the content in post-modernist manner where there is no hierarchy and rules to follow that also symbolizes the strong blow against the hierarchy-based Indian society in many accounts by which the subaltern groups of people have been suffered, alienated.

Both Mulk Raj Anand's novel *Untouchable* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* depict the casteist discrimination and untouchability as the burning social problem of India of the 1930s and the 1990s respectively. Their novels present the casteism under Hinduism as a severe problem of society which has been hindering for the social development. Both the novels, though, dig the untouchability issue of India in their respective times, have dissimilarities in some issues. Both the novelists come from the leftist background and they strongly raise the voice of subaltern—especially the casteist subaltern issue in the novels. Novels present the central subaltern characters Bakha in *Untouchable* and Velutha in *The God of Small Things* and whole text revolves around those respective characters. Bakha has been presented as a servile and submissive character including Lakha, his father, a Sweeper, the so-called untouchable, Sohini, his daughter, Rakha, his brother. Anand being as a Marxist thinker presents the casteist subaltern character Bakha and opines for keeping

the spirit of struggle for emancipation of caste based suppression and present the optimistic tone. Though, the author is Marxist, he does not present the character of struggling nature. Bakha, as a subaltern cannot speak himself, cannot represent himself but has optimistic tone.

But, Roy's *The God of Small Things* presents the major subaltern character Velutha, in term of caste and Ammu, in terms of gender, who become the victims of the conventional values that depend on state-protected Hindu ideology. Roy presents Vellya Paapen, Velutha's father as a weak and servile character like Bakha in *Untouchable* since they represent almost the same period, the time that Vellya Paapen and Bakha belong to the same and due to the generation gap. However, Velutha, Paapen's son is shown to be having questioning spirit, wants to challenge the existing social norms, traditional human psyche, behavior and conventional social stratum for his dignity.

Chapter III. Voice to the Voiceless in Anand's *Untouchable* and Roy's *The God of Small Things*

The casteist discrimination and untouchability, in both the novels *Untouchable* and *The God of Small Things* is deep-rooted social problem of India. This problem not only remains in India but also in Nepal where Dalits have been discriminated, misbehaved, abused, inferiorized, levelized as second grade citizen based on the state-protected-Hindu principles. As such, the caste-based-atrocity is the most crucial issue that the authors present with high emphasis since the casteist problem is directly or indirectly related to the classist issue.

Anand, being himself the Marxist focuses on issue of caste in relation to class because the Dalits are exploited, stigmatized, discriminated in a severe manner—that they are compelled to bow their heads in every sphere of their lives due to the deeply entrenched Hindu superstition. The level of sufferance and the atrocities that Velutha encounters is to the large extent similar to Bakha. But there are some differences as well. Bakha cannot speak himself, does not have ability to question, cannot revolt against the casteist ideology but lives without dignity whereas Velutha can speak himself, does have ability to question and revolt against lord. In other words, so-called untouchable, Paravan, dies with dignity in police custody.

Anand's *Untouchable* entirely revolves around its central character Bakha and Roy's *The God of Small Things* also revolves around Velutha and Ammu who are subaltern in terms of caste and gender. He performs the duty with loyalty and diligently—that he cannot pose the question, cannot challenge the existing norms that make hierarchies in each and every sphere of lives, instead he makes mimicry upon the Sahib [Officer of British Soldiers] to be like him by wearing his old trousers if he

offered. Bakha cannot express himself, cannot represent himself, but Anand gives his own voice to Bakha because he cannot speak on his own.

But Velutha, though subaltern in term of caste is sound in economic status because he is educated and Incharge of Paradise Pickles and Preserves factory owned by Mammachi, Ammu's mother, who also is a blind and seem to be the subaltern in terms of physical status. In Roy's postmodern novel, Mammachi has been affected with colonial mentality as well. She is a villainous character that she poses blame to Velutha, of abducting and murdering her niece [sister] Sophie Mol, whereas she dies by drowning in the river in boat accident where Estha and Rahel cross the river safely.

Bakha, as a subaltern central character has been discriminated everywhere. Though, he works hard from dawn to dusk, he still suffers from hand to mouth problem. After he finishes his duty, he goes to search for food but sometimes he gets few food left hours and gets that with some abuse from the people of the so-called upper caste. He accepts the abuse and misbehave from 'high caste'—caste-Hindu right. He thinks that the so-called untouchables are abused, misbehaved and practiced untouchability due to their dirty works. In this connection, he has been presented as a servile and submissive character by which Anand shows the social realism in the novel.

The forms of casteist discrimination found to be more severe in Anand's time of 1930s, where he presents Bakha's suffering. The subaltern person are not allowed to bring the water from well in absence of the so-called upper caste people. He, his father, his sister have been abused inhumanly by caste-Hindus in the British cantonment, priest and other people from caste-Hindu. Bakha, though tries his best to save a child, who has come to watch the Hockey game and injured, he is abused

inhumanly by a woman, mother to the child. His father Lakha also abuses him inhumanly causing the same incident.

Velutha dies of police brutality in account of the FIR filed by Baby Kochamma. Vellya Paapen conveys the relation of his son Velutha, a paravan, the so-called untouchable with Ammu, the so-called upper caste, daughter of Mammachi. Vellya Paapen has been shown as the servile and submissive character that he thinks his duty to inform her before she knows the fact from other that Velutha makes sexual intercourse with Ammu. By showing Velutha's sexual relationship with Ammu, Roy intends to show Velutha's resistance spirit in terms of caste and for equality.

Due to Roy's writing of the novel from postmodern perspective, she advocates for equality, wants to break the hierarchy between the so-called upper caste and lower caste, male and female, poor and rich, owner and the labour, bourgeois and the proletariat, colonizer and colonized. Though it keeps the pessimistic tone, Velutha dies with dignity because he encounters, questions against the stereotypical caste-confinement and caste-based-hegemony, exploitation and discrimination.

Bakha of Anand's *Untouchable* and Velutha of Roy's *The God of Small Things* suffer from the same problem of casteist atrocities but Bakha represents first generation and Velutha represents second generation in which Bakha has been represented by Anand himself, since he cannot speak, represent on his own and Velutha, being an educated man, sound in economic status than Bakha by being an Incharge of Paradise Pickles and Preserve factory he can speak and represent on his own, he revolts against the conventional tendency of superiority and inferiority complexes of superstitious Indian society.

Velutha's father Vellya Paapen seem to be servile and submissive which can be compared with Bakha but he is different with Velutha while Vellya Paapen

represents the early twentieth century where Bakha also belongs to the same era. Velutha has been a sacrificial and brave character; and he has dignified life. As a paravan, so-called untouchable dies by the police brutality in account of having sexual relation with Ammu, who represent so-called upper caste, crossing the caste line as a rebellious character. But Bakha seems to be servile and submissive character who always endures the discrimination and misbehave of the so-called upper caste that he sweeps roads and cleans latrines for the sake of only getting food to eat. Bakha, though lives, has no meaning of life since he live with servility whereas Velutha dies with dignity by challenging the traditional caste lines.

Now, Nepal has just promulgated the new constitution. The status of the Dalits in Nepal is as equal as of Anand's Bakha and Roy's Velutha. In this way, Nepali Dalits also need to be educated, united, and should struggle for their own rights in the days to come as Anand and Roy suggest through their respective novels.

Works Cited

- Agarwal, Ramlal. Review of *World Literature Today*, 72.1 (Winter 1998): 208-209.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus" Eds. Slavoj Zizek.
Mapping Ideology. London and New York. Verso, 1994. 100-123.
- Ambedkar, Dr. Bhimrao. *The History of Indian Caste System and its Encounter*.
New Delhi: Penguin group, 1954.
- Anand, Mulk Raj. *Untouchable*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1935.
- Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony." *Journal of History of Ideas* 36.2 (1975): 351-366.
- Betelle, Andre. "Caste and Family: In Representations in Indian Society."
Anthropology Today, 8.1 (1992): 13-18.
- Bhambhri, C P. "Reservation and Casteism." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40.9
(2005): 806-808.
- - -. "Dialectics of Caste and Casteism." *Economic and Political Weekly* 34.36
(1999): 2619-2620.
- Brians, Paul. "Critique on Roy's *The God of Small Things*." *Modern South Asian Literature in English*. Connecticut, London: Greenwood Press, 1997.
- Chakravorty, Dipesh. "Habitations of Modernity." *Essays on the Subaltern Studies*.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Chaturvedi, Vinayak. "A Critical Theory of Subalternity: Rethinking Class in Indian
Historiography." *Left History* (2007): 9-28.
- Deshpandey, Anirudh. "Casteism, Communalism and Politics." *Economic and Political Weekly* 32.41 (1997): 2578-2579.
- Dulai, Surjit S. "Practice Before Ideology: Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable*". *Journal of South Asian Literature* 27.21 (1992): 187-207.

- Guha, Ranajit. *History of the Limit of the World History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Hawley, James P. "Antonio Gramsci's Marxism: Class, State and Work." *Social Problems* 127.5 (1980): 584-600.
- Karmarkar, P. Rajendra. "Reality and Realism: An Orthodox Reading of Anand's *Untouchable*." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 31/32.1/2 (1996): 113-128.
- Khanal, Krishna, Frits Sollewijn Gelpke and Uddhab Prasad Pyakurel. *Dalit Representation in National Politics of Nepal*. Kathmandu: NNDSWO, 2012.
- Maggio, J. "Can the Subaltern be Heard?" "Political Theory, Translation, Representations, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak." Gainesville (2007): 419-443.
- Mangrulkar, Latika. "Review of The God of Small Things by Arundhati Roy" *Journal of South Asian Literature*, 31/32.1/2 (1996/97): 254-259.
- Muthaiah, P. "Politics of Dalit Identity." *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 65.3 (Jul-Sep. 2004): 385-402.
- Mijar, Dhana Bahadur. "De-humanizing Praxis Within and Against Dalits: A Comparative Study of Nuwakot District." *A Research Report as a MMRA, Submitted to SNV/SIRF*, 2012.
- - -. "Still in the Middle Ages." *The Kathmandu Post*. 3 Oct. 2012. 6.
- - -. "Still There." *Republica English Daily*. 17 July 2013. 08.
- - -. "We've had enough." *The Kathmandu Post*. 26 July 2015. 7.
- Nadkarni, M. V. "Caste Myths in Hinduism." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39.2 (2004): 207-208.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. "The Time of the Dalit Conversion." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41.18 (2006): 1779-1788.

- Prakash, Gyan. "Subaltern Studies as the Postcolonial Criticism." *The American History Review*. 99.5 (Dec. 1994): 1475-1490.
- Roy, Arundhati. *The God of Small Things*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1997.
- Scott, David. *The Aftermath of the Sovereignty: Postcolonial Criticism and the Claims of Political Modernity*. Duke: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Sekhar, Ajaya. "Older than the Church, Christianity and Caste in The God of Small Things." *Economic and Political Weekly* 38.33 (2003): 3445-3448.
- Senart, Emile. *Caste in India: The Facts and the System*. Trans. E. Denison Ross. Delhi: Ess Ess Publications Delhi, 1975.
- Singh, Veena. "The Slave Rebel: A Closer Look at Untouchability". *Indian Literature*, 25.5 (1982): 123-133.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1997), *Essays on Historiography*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- - -. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1935). *The Post-Colonial Studies: Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. 2nd Edition. London and New York. Routledge, 1995.
- Srinivas, M N. "Future of the Indian Caste." *EPW* 14.7/8 (1979): 237-240.