

I. Introduction

Mulk Raj Anand: A Novelist

Mulk Raj Anand is one of the most distinguished, committed and prolific writers of Indian English literature. He, who is well known for his writing not only in India but also all over the world, has not only written good, first grade novels but also good essays, short stories and art criticism. He writes about the common and poor people's life, their poverty, miseries and injustice perpetrated on them. His novels clearly show how common people being exploited in different forms like in the name of caste, class, colour, gender, etc. Anand severely criticizes the exploitations. Shreedhar Gautam says, "For him, literature is not merely a mode of personal expression but an instrument of social change. . . . His main contribution to literature has been his realistic depiction of Indian life his novels acted as a bridge between the national independence movement and the literary movement of the time" (qtd. in Gautam 1). In a prospective note on Anand's fiction Saros Cowasjee's view is that Anand writes for the sake of the people. According to him, "Anand wrote the novel of the people, for the people as a man of the people" (33).

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

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

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

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

Anand is the first writer to give the Indian novel in English a definite tone and clear texture. His novels belong to the category of socially conscious and realistic novels. His novels have also been termed as Marxist variant novels because of his deep rooted conviction that working class people can only be set free through the change of social institutions and establishment of socialistic system. Indian progressive or socialist writers like Anand were clearly under the impression of European socialist tradition of Marx and the general literary movement of realism and naturalism. Anand became the pioneer of social realism in the Indian English novel with his first novel *Untouchable* (1935) which seems to be deeply influenced by the social realists of the then Soviet Union and other European countries. (7-8)

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

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

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

Gautam states:

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

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

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

His Life and Background of His Work

Mulk Raj's Life followed almost a stock pattern. He was born in 1905 in a middle class, North Indian, Hindu family of hereditary coppersmith - a Kshatriya sub-caste. A superficially "modern" father and a "traditional" mother brought up Anand on the ancient stories from the epics and Shastras. Cowasjee writes about his birth and family:

Anand was born on 12 December 1905 in Peshawar in a family of Kshatriyas (warriors), the second highest in the four-fold scheme of Hindu caste hierarchy, whose status had been somewhat debased by his ancestors taking up copper and silversmithing. His father, Lal Chand, redeemed the situation somewhat by matriculating and slowly working his way up to become Head Clerk . . . of the British Indian army. Married to Ishwar Kaur, a girl from a traditional peasant background . . . (2)

This circumstance gave him an appreciation of the tragedy of the Indian caste system and possibility of an honorable exist from its conventions. Acting on this insight, Anand committed himself to a process of self-cultivation. His mother, Ishwar Kaur, was an illiterate woman. Cowasjee says:

Ishwar Kaur, on the other hand, was uneducated but well versed in folklore. Though a born revolutionary in her dislike of the English, she was orthodox enough to obey her husband silently as long as he left her alone to pray her brass images of the gods and goddesses of the Hindu pantheon. (2)

She was a Sikh by caste. She was a woman of religious tolerance. Anand's mother deeply believed in every type of legend, mythology, and folktale. Premila Paul writes about her, "She had deep, though incongruous, faith in such diverse gods and goddesses

as Krishna, Christ, Guru Nanak and Aga Khan ..." (2). Besides, she was well versed in traditional songs while he was young. Anand's mother had a profound impact in nourishing his literacy flair. In this regard, Cowasjee writes, "Her recites of songs, tales, myths and epics of the village community created in him an awareness of the richness of Punjabee Literature" (4).

Anand got his early education in cantonment school. The education provided by British rulers could not satisfy him. In his own words:

And, as the education imparted in these schools was imitative, giving very little idea of Indian tradition, but mainly bastardized version of English curricula, in English, with particular emphasis on English history, ideas, forms and intitutions, deliberately calculated to show (33-34)

After his school from cantonment, he went to Khalsa College, Amritsar. He was also not satisfied with the situation of his childhood. For him, his generation of Indians did not get good environment for the preparation of the future. From Amritsar College, he completed B.A. degree in 1924. During the period of Khalsa College, he read the works of great writers like Mazini, Gorky, Marx and Goethe. Besides these personalities, he read the poems of the great Muslim poet Mohammad Iqbal. He frequently met the poet in Lahore on his holidays. So, he was well acquainted with the great poet Iqbal. He also read the Das Capital of Karl Marx in the same period. He participated also in the 1921 Civil Disobedience Movement Campaign and was jailed for a brief time. At the same time, he participated in the students' strike. Here, Cowasjee adds:

Anand's university days were not happy. He had read Gandhi's Hind Swaraj while at school and on joining Khalsa College he participated in

the 1921 Civil Disobedience campaign against the British and was jailed for a brief spell. (8)

Apart from these all, Anand fell in Love with a beautiful Muslim girl, Yasmin, but the love affair could not succeed. He went to England, although his father did not encourage and assist him, with his mother's support for further education. When he went there, he realized the lack of appropriate base for the higher education in India. He also got the support of poet Iqbal and the college principal Lala Man Mohan. His mother pawned her jewellery for the balance of his fare. In England, under the supervision of G. Dwas Hicks he finished PhD in 1929. After getting his doctoral degree in England he did not return to India promptly but remained in England for few more years. Cowasjee writes:

In his twenty years' stay in England, Anand had regular employment only from 1939 to 1942 as lecturer in Philosophy and Literature with the London County Council Adult Education Schools and the Workers Educational Association. (23)

He also worked for BBC Eastern Service from 1941 to 1944. During the same time he was very much influenced by the Marxist Progressive Movement. At home, in India, the freedom movement was going on. In England too, there was no peace. The cloud of the Second World War was going to threaten the whole world. There was Civil War in Spain. Fascist rulers like Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy seemed to paralyze the western democracy. In such situation, Anand took part in several political as well as literary activities in England. He had already taken part in the 1926 Coal Miners' Strike. In the same way, in 1935, he went to Spain to express his commitment and

support against the Spanish Civil War. In England, especially after his PhD, he wrote short notes and articles on the criticism of T.S. Eliot.

When Anand returned to India, he got involved in different activities. He worked for National Congress and Kishan Shava. He played an important role in organizing All Indian Progressive Writers' conference in Calcutta. Cowasjee says:

He supported numerous international and national associations such as the World Peace Council Academy of Literature, etc. He was the member of Sahitya Academy of Letters, the Lalit Kala Academy of Art, the National Book Trust, the Indian Council of Cultural Relations, the UNESCO Dialogues of East and West and several university seminars and conferences in India and abroad. (33)

He received several academic awards for his contribution to the field of literature. His abiding preoccupation with the visual and plastic arts stems from his humanist commitment to the development of the 'whole being of man'. He regarded the arts as a necessity rather than a luxury. Anand also emphasized the role of the individuated self.

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

He was widely identified with the quest for a just, equitable and forward-looking India. Anand was a true revolutionary who wanted social change and dedicated his pen for the cause of the downtrodden. He wrote extensively in areas as diverse as art and sculpture, politics, literature and the history of ideas. His literary achievement comprised not only novels, but also short stories and critical essays on literature and art. He was vocal supporter of the Gandhian non-violence movement for national liberation from British Colonial rules although his socialist sympathies took him considerably beyond the ambit of gradualist reform favoured by the Mahatma. He had gained international reputation before the Second World War. His novels set a generation of educated Indians pondering about their countries social evils perpetuated in the name of caste and religion.

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

He was a politically committed writer of the left. His novels, like those of Prem Chand, attacked social injustice, but unlike the Hindi novelist, to Anand, revolutionary violence was inevitable, even essential, if any meaningful change was to be effected. Suresh Rengen Bald writes about Anand's political revolutionary tone:

He considered the writer's responsibility to help "men (to) take part in the drama of revolt from which emerges the new society" and to "communicate his unique and original vision of life to other people, to intensify their awareness by way of confirming and heightening their own observations ". The revolutionary tone of Mulk Raj Anand's political

commitment provides insights into the politics of the Indian revolutionary elites. His novels highlight the conflicts between the revolutionaries' cultural background and their profession of political faith, their images of themselves and the utopia they seek. The sentiment and morality revealed in Anand's writings, however, are not peculiar to the revolutionary elite to India; they apply whoever members of a self-conscious traditionally privileged minority seek revolutionary change to the end their isolation and guilt, but not necessarily their privileged position. (97)

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

According to Bald:

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

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

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

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

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

And yet how great a force is man in his ability above all animal and material life to adapt himself to the highest point in the evolutionary process under a better dispensation. He can become not only the vehicle of

the most perfect beauty of form and movement, but he can acquire the capacity to assess nature. (138)

As a humanist, he has no belief on any supernatural force, blind belief and religious dogma etc. His supreme belief is in man, progression and future of man, personal freedom, love and co-operation among human beings. His *Untouchable* (1935) *Coolie* (1936) and *The Big Heart* (1945) are full of exploitation of humanism. His early novels took him to the prominence. E.M. Foster wrote the introduction to his widely acclaimed novels: *Untouchable* and *Coolie*. Anand is the true revolutionary who wants social change. He has dedicated his pen for the cause of the downtrodden. He began his career as a writer while in England, entering a glittering circle of literati that included T.S. Eliot, George Orwell, E.M. Foster, Henry Miller and Herbert Read. His geographical distance from India in the 1930s only deepened his anti-colonial and anti-fascist political beliefs. His prolific writing career spanned more than 75 years, a rare achievement of a writer. He wrote extensively in areas as diverse as art and sculpture, politics, literature and the history of ideas.

Most of his books are auto-biographical in nature. He has written nearly 40 books – all regard as serious in literature and art criticism. Anand is a man of multifaceted personality. Apart from being a voracious reader, he is also a man of voluminous works. As a veteran of literature, he received a number of literary and academic awards. In 1952, he was awarded international peace prize of the World Peace Council for his services through literature. The honour of Padam Bhushan was conferred on him in 1967 for art by the then president of India. Likewise, he was awarded Sahitya Academy Award for his *Morning Face* (1968). It shows that Anand is a man of great respect and honour.

He has written so many novels in different times. *Untouchable* is his first novel. It is a chilling expose of a member of India's lowest and most abhorred caste. His second novel is *Coolie*. This is a touching account of a 15 year old boy who dies of T.B. while trapped in servitude as a child labourer. Anand describes clash between traditional art and modern product in his next novel: *The Big Heart* (1945). Apart from these, there are several, which are written and published in different times. His some of the important novels are included *Lament on the Death of a Master of Arts* (1938), *Two Leaves and a Bird* (1939), *The Village* (1939), *Across the Black Waters* (1940), *The Sword and the Sickle* (1942), *The Private Life of an Indian Prince* (1953), *The Old Woman and the Cow* (1960), *The Road* (1961), *Death of a Hero* (1963), *Morning Face* (1968), *Confession of Lover* (1976), and *The Bubble* (1984). He has also written several works of non-fiction, essays and hundreds of articles in different subject matters.

Critics on the Novel *The Big Heart*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some critics do not believe that this novel has taken the proper direction as it should be. To them it is only the heap of tragedy. The Bombay group of the Progressive Writers' Association, dominated by communist writers, declared Anand as a decadent hanger-on, because of the scandals he had occasioned by living in the local bohemia, but

chiefly because he did not portray in his poor all the virtue the party line demanded. Even in the very laudatory article on Anand in *Soviet Literature*(1953), a Russian critic, Y. Tupikova takes him to task obliquely for ‘failings’ in *The Big-Heart*, "The author does not go to the root of the problems he has raised, and indeed the very structure of the novel (the whole action takes place in a day) does not give him enough scope to deal with them thoroughly" (qtd. in Cowasjee 31).

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

Further Berry says, "Like the *Sword and the Sickle* (1942), *The Big-Heart* offers personifications of capitalists, labourers, and respectable compromisers" (65). Many Indian writers attempt to show some sort of interrelation between man and nature. Anand as a realist makes no conscious effort to harmonize nature’s moods with men; he gives to nature an independent existence and reveals her both in her beauty and in her cruel aspects. Central to his theme is man’s struggle in society: the poor are too occupied making a living to communication with nature, the rich too engrossed in becoming richer. Anand's writing style is praised by many writers. Cowasjee says:

The Big Heart, a novel for which the author has a particular liking, has been acclaimed by Margaret Berry, K.N.Singha and M.K.Naik in their respective books on Anand The British critics had unreserved praise

for it: Walter Allen called it ' a most impressive work', and Jack Lindsay wrote: 'If Anand had written nothing else, his place in the history of the novel would be secure - his place profound interpreter of Indian life in a phase of pervasive crisis'. (125)

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

The villainy of capitalism as portrayed in *The Big Heart*, however, is different from the "horrorful" of capitalism sketched by Marx. Nevertheless, Anand's protagonist's way of taking the villain is in keeping with the Marxian tradition. The thathiars (coppersmiths) in *The Big Heart* are deprived of their age old caste right of artisans, and thrown out of business by the competition of the cheaper and more efficiently produced machine goods. The correct response for them Ananta points out, however, is not to destroy the machines as the desperate artisans Ralia . . . but to "make a Revolution" and destroy the illegitimate owners of the worker's labour, the capitalists who use the machine and the worker for profit. (128)

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

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

II. Theoretical Modality

Tradition: Religion and Social Structure

Civilization is the continuous process of human development. On the path of change and development there emerges clash among the civilizations. It is believed that human beings are the most superior brain in the living world. Their developed brain generates a continuous series of thoughts of their past and present experiences. Human are the social and political animals by birth. They need protection, cooperation and brotherhood of each other. Even though they experience constant conflicts and struggles with each other, the ultimate is the good cooperation and fraternity. This is what all human community aspires for. With the nature of their political behaviours, they have not only the class struggle but also the conflict of thoughts. Neither do they possess absolute independence nor the complete anarchy in their periphery. Hence, their struggle is directed towards the freedom of thoughts, speech, labour and decision making attitudes. This conflict is the clash of ruling and this system brings both destruction and construction as well. In the context of tradition S.K. Shrivastava, S. Tripathi and H.C. Shrivastava define, "Tradition means habits, customs, attitudes, ways of life which get embodied in institutions and then tend to get frozen because of the stability, and autonomous existence of these institutions" (23).

They add Jacob Katz's concept that tradition sets pattern, a hierarchy of concepts, accepted norms, and moves which guide the individual in thoughts of action (qtd. in Shrivastava 23). They write:

After regards traditionalism as validation of current behaviour by reference to immemorial prescriptive norms, a 'Traditional society denotes

a type of society which regards its existence as based upon a common body of knowledge and values' handed down from the past. (23)

People can act according to their circumstances with aspiration, communal structure, and certain forms of beliefs. Their actions and deeds act the community structure, certain forms of beliefs. Their actions and deeds act the community level turn to be established habits. And these established habits are in fact, the tradition of that community. Tradition is the unwritten or oral delivery of information, opinions, doctrines, practices, rites and customs, from father to son, or from ancestors to posterity; the transmission of any knowledge, opinion or practice, from forefathers to descendants by oral communication, without written memorials. A tradition is a story or a custom that is memorized and passed down from generation to generation, originally without the need for a writing system. Tools to aid this process include poetic devices such as rhyme and alliteration, or as past of a tradition to have a Christmas tree to celebrate Christmas.

Hans-George Gadamar talks in his work *Truth and Method* (1960) that through memory we can recall the tradition. It is better to be in written form. He adds even the arbitrariness of a faulty tradition can be corrected if the context as the whole is understood. He puts:

A written tradition is not a fragment of a past world, but always raised itself beyond this into the sphere of the meaning that it expresses

Through memory tradition becomes part of our own world, and so what it communicates can be directly expressed, where we have a written tradition, we are not just told an individual thing, but a past humanity itself becomes present to us, in its general relation to the world. (630)

Tradition in the holistic approach is a group activity far away from the individualism. Hypothetically, it aspires to have complete participation of the phone of that community. The basic of tradition is the community and through the dissolution with nation makes national tradition and national to world community makes world tradition. One noteworthy thing is also about the culture: tradition and culture are mere interlinked. The both are the past established values which have been observed in the present society. In other word, tradition is a belief, custom or way of doing something that has existed for a long time among a particular group of people; a set of these beliefs or customs.

Traditionalists accord a high value to the intellectual activities of the pre-modern world and non- western societies, and a good deal of their work lies in the sciences of meta-physics and symbolism, as well as the discussion and elucidation of the various spiritual traditions, where they venture into such realms as social criticism. It is clearly from a traditionalist perspective which turns the progressive evolutionist assumptions of modernist theorists and of post-modernists alike, on their heads.

Tradition covers all sections of the people living in a society. Its origin is linked with the human evolution. From the time humans evolved in the earth, they developed their gatherings, way of fooding and lodging, ceremonial activities all fall under the tradition, for example, using a walking stick. In *Tradition and Modernization* (1976) Sachchidananda defines the tradition as:

The word tradition is derived from ‘tradere’ which means to transmit.

Thus tradition is transmitted value and behaviour patterns of a community.

Traditions are quoted, recalled, esteemed; their age long succession

becomes an assurance of value which has already accrued in the process of its instrumental functioning as a constituent of social cohesion or social

solidarity. Traditions are not static. Old traditions die and new traditions are continually being built up. (41)

Various approaches of human life like art, architecture, ceremony, literature, communication, etc. are the components of the broad approached tradition. In the practical perspective, the basic way of living is the tradition. The human tradition can also be analyzed from two angles. If we go through evolutionary trend of the humankind, we have to consider the Cenozoic era where the human evolution started from. It was the period when flowers and basic forms of life evolved. Human beings in the Stone Age had their own tradition, own customs, own way of living. In this way, humans like *Caro Magnon*, *Homo Erectus*, *Zava*, etc. used to live in the cave, had funeral ceremony, art of wood carving, dieting habits like flesh etc. This trend improved slowly when the modern man called *Homo Sapien* evolved in this world. They were also the cave dwellers and flesh eaters. This habit went on practice until they developed a permanent living behaviour, learned farming and organized into social members. This unified group ultimately improved the common human thoughts, and thus, there started developing great human civilizations like: Roman, Egyptian, Mesopotamian and above all the permanent Hindu civilization.

If we analyze religion in the spiritual perspective, it is a blind engagement with that which is believed to be a spiritual reality. Religion is a worldwide phenomenon that has played a vital role in human cultural and so is a much broader, more complex category than the set of beliefs or practices found in any single religious tradition. In adequate understanding of religion ones must take account its distinctive qualities and patterns as form of human experience as well as the similarities and differences in religions across in human cultures. Tradition is linked with religion because all human

traditions are basically developed from the religious beliefs, religious practices. The theological definition for tradition is different than modern one.

The first, the true love of God and the second is the ignorance, fanaticism or wishful thinking. Religion, in fact, is highly organized institution and its practices are the human traditions which are expressed in the form of art, visual symbols, legendary and imagination skills, formal ceremonies, meditative techniques and detailed rules of ethical conduct and law.

Religion is developed on the virtue of God and tradition on the foundation of religion. God should be analyzed in both ethical as well as atheistical perspectives and considering on both perspectives traditions are there in practice. God is an ideal picture which the devotees believe in their spiritual sense. By virtue of their physical eye, they don't feel the existence of God. If we believe in Darwinism, we were evolved and developed from small organism called amoeba. The process of construction and destruction always goes on and there is struggle for existence and only the fittest will have its survival certain. Based on this assumption, people have developed their atheistical and materialistic tradition. V. P. Varma writes:

The word 'tradition' is an inclusive concept. It connotes the initiative character of certain dominant religions, theological, metaphysical and ethical values and beliefs. It also stands for the crystallization of difference and reverence for certain symbols. Tradition also includes folkways, mores and semi-institutionalized patterns of action in a society. At a more extended level tradition may be identified with the totality of the historical heritage of a nation or a community. (Srivastava 35)

However, the tradition has its own ethics based on God and corresponding religion. Most of the traditional values in the past were influenced by the beliefs on God. They were built up in Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Judaism and in other religions which were generated due to the devotion on God and practice of religion. People did have great faith in God. They believed all their sins or hardships were actions that were presumed to be unlikely to the God. God was the source of all power. The whole universe and its living and non-living objects were created by Him. Moreover, the contemporary society or religious philosophy had also created mysterious places: heaven and hell. People who passed their lives with good deeds were supposed to get entry in heaven whereas the so called sinners were punished. This mystery contributed a lot to give birth to various folk practices which in time turned to be traditions.

Walter Benjamin says in his essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1969) the tradition is changeable. Tradition gives meaning according to the time. In the modern ages the traditional art is changed and developed its quality. He puts, "This tradition itself is thoroughly alive and extremely changeable. An ancient statue of Venus, for example, stood in a different traditional context with the Greeks . . . than with the clerics of the Middle Ages. . ." (229).

The social structure of the ancient time was based on religious discipline in most of the parts of the world. The caste based community was created through Hindu religion which still today we can see in the Indian sub-continent. The Holy scriptures were the sources of rules. Priest, Father, Pundit, Guru like persons were the spokesmen of the spiritual powers. Before the invention of metallic tools, people used weapons made out of wood and stone. Raw materials were food for them. Society was divided into different

types of creeds and colours. Animal and land were counted as property whereas women were collected for sexual entertainment and children production. There were very few women who could expose their creativity in the society since it was patriarchal society. In European countries only few people were permitted to read Holy Bible. Popes were all in all. Even the state government was administered by the pope. In Hindu society, Brahmin males were authorized to read the Holy texts. Work was divided according to the caste. Each and every nation has adopted it more or less traditional methods. The Russians, Greeks, Romans, Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus and all types of people have been carrying their old customs till this day. Though most of the nations have adopted scientific reasoning for observing their profession, still some countries are hanging at the duality of modern discoveries and traditional phenomenon. The rural areas of developing nations are neither succeeded to adopt the modern culture nor reject it fully. They are in between. The period of World War I and II the European colonialism was in extremity. It had brought the modernity with its invasion in many countries. Colonialism rewarded the poor countries with nothing but bewilderment where it governed by imposing its own culture and education. S.C. Dube puts the biased thought of Western World in *Tradition and Development (1994)*, "The profile that we get of traditional cultures in the stereotyped portrayals of them is one of non-rationality, inactivity, fatalism and other worldliness" (7).

The British writer Milton Singer divides the tradition into two great sections in his book *When a Great Tradition Modernizes (1972)*:

The early developments probably differentiated as well the cultural tradition into the "higher" levels cultivated in special centers by the

educated and sophisticated (Great Traditions), and the "lower" levels (Little Traditions) familiar to uneducated in the villages and towns. (267)

In these societies people observe their own usual rituals and ceremonies. For them, the sun moves round the earth, there is life after death, the upper caste people or popes are the mediators of Gods and human beings, new and scientific education is a curse, the traditional way of material production is better and so on.

Modernity: Science and Technology

The society where we live, our thoughts, principles, behaviors all get changed according to the time and condition. Changes are both constructive and destructive. Logically or illogically human beings analyze their present conditions be more advanced than their past. In other words, they believe they are more advanced and developed in their thoughts, social analysis, behaviors, civilizations, etc. at present than the past. Modernity is a term used to describe the condition of being "Modern". Since the term "Modern" is used to describe a wide range of periods, modernity must be taken in context. The trend of greater improvement and the broader concepts in thoughts are the signs of modernity. Hence, according to this belief, everyone is modern and advanced. Moreover, the credit of modernity in twentieth century goes to the West. People of the Western world, especially Europeans and Americans, could no longer believe in superstitious beliefs, practices and tradition. Modernity refers to the period extending from the late Sixteenth and early Seventeenth centuries (in the case of Europe) to the mid of late Twentieth century characterized by the growth and strengthening of a specific set of social practices and ways of doing things. It is often associated with capitalism and notions such as progress.

Neil Lazarus has cited Robin Blackburn's view in the context:

Its development was associated with several of those processes which have been held to define development the growth of instrumental rationality, the rise of national sentiment and the nation-state, racialized perceptions of identity, the spread of market relations and wage labour, the development of administrative bureaucracies and modern tax systems, the growing sophistication of commerce and communication, the birth of consumer societies, the publication of newspapers and the beginnings of press advertising, "action at a distance" and as individualist sensibility. (qtd. in Bartolovich 167)

It is the definition of modernity through economics point of view. Modernity came in different fields in the past and present. Marxist modernity contains agriculture. Crystal Bartolovich and Neil Lazarus write:

Modernization discourse is a rearticulation of the nineteenth-century bourgeois ideology of evolutionary progress, the occluded side of which has always been the colonial subordination of the greater part of the world to metropolitan domination. By focusing overwhelmingly upon variables relating to indigenous aspects of social structure, and culture, modernization theories generally have displaced indifference to the whole issue of imperialism and have usually ignored or underdeveloped many important external forces or constraints upon change within given societies. (103)

Dissatisfaction towards the religion became immense. People tried to find logics behind every traditional and religious beliefs and practices. They started explaining the universe and the human beings as well as the whole living scenario in new terms. The

Western scholars could not tolerate going church for spiritual devotion. They did not find logical proofs behind Adam and Eve being the first men. These feelings of disbeliefs affected the whole Western World in general. At the same time, a constructive era called 'Renaissance' evolved in Europe. This was the period of construction, evolution of science and its ideological, psychological and sociological development in Europe. And the trend of modernity evolved from the works of this 'Renaissance' period. In this context of modernity Paul de Man says, "Modernity exists in the form of desire to wipe out whatever came earlier, in the hope of reaching at last a point that could be called a true present, a point of origin that makes a new departure" (148).

The values of modernity still animate much of advanced countries. A commitment to reason is still the operating principle of many intellectuals, especially in the sciences. It is the operating principle in engineering, machine and other professions. It is the source of the extraordinary technological advances in computers, telecommunications, and pharmaceuticals, among many other fields. It is the source of new business techniques for financial management and streaming production. In most areas of our working lives, faith has no voice and tradition is continually overturned.

For Jurgen Habermas modernity has the great concern with the tradition. He writes:

The word "modern" was first employed in the late fifteenth century in order to distinguish the present, now officially Christian, from the Pagan and Roman past. With a different content in each case, the expression "modernity" repeatedly articulates the consciousness of an era that refers back to the past of classical antiquity precisely in order to comprehend itself as the result of a transition from the old to the new. This is not

merely true for the Renaissance, with which "modern age" begins for us; people also considered themselves as "modern" in the age of Charlemagne, in the twelfth century and in the Enlightenment - in short, whenever the consciousness of a new era developed in Europe through a renewed relationship to classical antiquity. (282)

The term 'modern' appeared and reappeared exactly during those periods in Europe when the consciousness of a new epoch formed itself through a renewed relationship to the ancients - whenever, moreover antiquity was considered a model to be recovered through some kind of imitation. Srivastava and Tripathi emphasize on the individual and social development in the definition of modernity:

Modernity from the point of view of individual is a state of personality trait-scientific world view. Modernity from the point of view of a given society as a whole, is a judgment on its level of development in material and ideational aspects. Modernization is a form of development in which value system, social system, personality system are interwoven in such a way that universalistic-secularistic positive values make differentiation in status-role system and create a social personality. (23)

Furthermore, they are not ready to accept the westernization or industrialization as the synonym of modernization. They say, "Modernization as value-concept is not synonymous with westernization or industrialization. Though, both the processes have generated the process of modernization, an industrialized society, in spite of its advanced technological development, may not be modern in the true spirit of the term" (23). They add more, "Idea of 'modernity' grows more slowly than the external condition that is why we find the great dilemma of our age in the so-called highly developed societies" (23).

It points out towards something new, extra and invention. Within the periods of Dark Age or religious dogma there was existence of modernity. People fought for the newness of rules and codes, for their positions the society and rights for art and literary works. William Shakespeare, John Milton, Galileo Galilee and so many others were modern personalities to bring changes in the contemporary status quo. After the 'Renaissance (1500-1560)' there was the Neoclassical Period (1660-1785) which was more modern than the former. Great Britain fought against old beliefs and established a scientific and materialistic trend constructing industries during Victorian period (1832-1901). The same codes of conduct of the nineteenth century became fictitious and traditional concepts in the first half of the twentieth century. Today we are in the age of advanced science and technology. We are more modern than the people of modern period (1914 -1945) themselves. The places of muscle power, animal power, and wind power have been captured by steam engine power and electric power. So, everyday is a new day and every change is the sign of modernity.

Jorgen Habermas takes modernity as an incomplete project. According to his book *Modernity: An Unfinished Project* (1997) modernity was started from the ancient time and still has been running in various fields. His view is that modernity revolts against the normalizing functions of tradition: modernity lives on the experience of rebelling against all that is normative. This revolt is one way to neutralize the standards of both morality and utility. He says:

Individual epochs lose their own distinctive features, and the present now assumes a heroic affinity either with what is most remote or what is closet to it: decadence recognizes itself immediately in the barbaric, the wild and the primitive. The anarchistic intention of exploding the continuum of

history accounts for the subversive force of an aesthetic consciousness which rebels against the norm giving achievements of tradition, which is nourished on the experience of rebellion against everything normative, which neutralizes considerations of moral goodness or practical utility, (284)

Michel Foucault puts the Greek term 'ethos' to describe the attitude of modernity.

He tries to separate modernity from premodern and postmodern eras. He says:

Modernity is often characterized in terms of consciousness of the discontinuity of time: a break with tradition, feeling of novelty, of vertigo in the face of the passing moment. And this is indeed what Baudelaire seems to be saying when he defines modernity as "the ephemeral, the fleeting, the contingent. But, for him being modern lie in recognizing and accepting this perpetual movement; and this deliberate, difficult attitude consists in recapturing something eternal . . . Modernity is the attitude that makes it possible to grasp the "heroic" aspect of the present moment. (110)

For M.H. Abrams the term modernism is widely used to identify new and distinctive features in the subjects, forms, concepts and styles of literature and other arts in the early decades of the last century, especially after First World War (1914-1918). He explains the specific features signified by "modernism" vary with the usher, but many critics agree that it involves a deliberate and radical break with some if the traditional bases not only of Western art but of Western culture in general (167). Abrams adds:

Important intellectual precursors of modernism, in this sense, are thinkers who had questioned the certainties that had supported traditional modes of

social organization, religion and morality, and also traditional ways of conceiving the human self-thinkers such as Fredric Nietzsche (1844-1900), Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, (167)

The Middle Age (1066-1500) was fully affected by religion and its activities. Before the time of some "Renaissance" Personalities like Newton, Kepler and Galileo the centre of the universe was the earth and the center of the knowledge and authority was Church. People believed God created everything. They had regular routine to visit church and were bound by various superstitious beliefs. Galileo shifted the geocentric concept to heliocentric one, which was the great challenge against the church. Darwin also threatened the traditional view discovering that human being was evolved from unicellular living thing. There aroused very conflicting and contradictory thoughts and principles throughout Europe. Darwinian concepts and theories made prominent effects in the European world and constant fights with Church. Finally, scientific logics succeeded the church logics. This was the scenario of the period where theoretical science contributed to germinate advanced and logical thoughts of the common people. This was the seed of modernity. We should say the industrial revolution in Great Britain spread the waves of technological development in the Western World. The European countries by nature had comparatively less natural resources and markets for their industrial products. When James watt invented steam engine, it brought remarkable changes in the naval transportation. Europeans now could visit all over the world, use the natural resources, exploit the natives and increase the economy. This was the eve of colonization. The Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal started colonizing America, Australia, Africa, Indian subcontinent and many other parts of the world. In his seminar paper A.N. Pandeya cites S.C. Dube's ideas:

Modernity for professor Dube "denotes the common behavioural systems' historically associated with the urban, industrial, literate and participant societies of Western Europe and North America as well as those of the U.S.S.R. and Japan. Modernization is the process through which their standards of performance and achievement can be accomplished by the less developed societies. "Modernization involves the emergence of a new behavioural system with certain distinctive characteristics. (qtd. in Srivastava 3)

With regard to the East, we should say the development of technology via colonization germinated modernity. This was the general trend in all over the world. The pre-colonized era in India was more advanced and improved in their spiritual knowledge, culture and tradition. The great Aryan culture was there in existence. Even there were Muslim empires, Hinduism had been widespread. Their social structure had been running in order and the Hindu literature, culture and practices had been their sources of spiritual prosperity, when the inspiration of technology based on perpetual natural resources available in the Indian-sub-continent enforced people to have a gradual shift from their spiritual path towards modernity.

Modernity, in the recent perspective cannot be defined in a single word. From the Eastern perspective, blind adaptation of Westernization is the so called "modernization". In recent days, replacement of Daura-suruwal by jeans wear is modernity; replacement of pagoda house by RCC building is the modernity. These trends, however, are not the sign of modernity, but only the consequences of traditional concepts. The development in science is immense in this time. Fields of communication, transportation, health, information, etc. have crossed a long highway in their developments. We have access of

email, internet, space-tourism, television, computers, cell phones, etc. These have turned the world into a global village. People have become busier than past. They have to work harder and longer. The globalization has affected all the nations. We have a vast store of information and networking by the facility of communication. Urbanization has changed the physical structure of the world. We have skyscrapers, bullet trains, spacecrafts and others. Thus, this is the phase out stage in the case of human civilization and has made the world narrower, brotherly and materially advanced, but spiritually poor, which we call modernity. S.K. Srivastava, S. Tripathi and H.C. Srivastava write the meaning of modernity as:

Primarily modernity is a state of mind. It creates and grasps such elements in human consciousness which enable the individual to adjust from his inner being to the rapidly changing conditions of modern complex societies. It implies a scientific and rational world view and inculcates universalistic-secular values. Modernization is not an ideology, but it can be the corner stone of any political ideology or policy. It is ideology free in the sense that it indicates the common need of the modern times for an overall growth of individual and society. (22)

Modernity is, in one sense, by product of scientific and technological break through. Scientific and technological development has led to urbanization and urbanization finally germinated individualism. Even if we say world has turned into a global village, people are more concerned to their limited world, needs and desires. No longer are people bound by superficial ideologies. They want to move through the practical aspects of life. Slowly and gradually, they are to give up all sorts of traditional beliefs. People no longer worship moon as god since men have landed on it. When their

eyes could not find any logical proof behind religion, and their disregard emerged, they slowly shifted towards the atheistical path. After they lacked the spiritual knowledge, they started to believe their body as the utmost importance. Their passion for body or the world, and the efforts to feed the world led to emerge materialism. When spirituality ends, materialism evolves. And materialism is prominent characteristic of modernity.

From the psychological perspective modernity or materialism is the consequence of the passion physical needs. *The New Columbia Encyclopedia* (1967) takes 'materialism' as a historically advanced period. It limits tradition as, "Certain periods in history, usually those associated with scientific advance, are marked by strong materialistic tendencies. Democritus, Epicurus and stoicism are the examples of ancient materialism beginners" (1720).

When Sigmund Freud put forward his theory of psychoanalysis, it brought great revolution in Europe and the entire Western world. People started paying more attention to the physical world. They could no longer hide their instincts, sexual desires and material gaining. The prominent consequence of tradition was seen on the sexual behaviours of people. They wanted to be free from the bound of church ideologies regarding their sexual quest. The westerners believed in feeding and fulfilling their body needs by all means.

The external desire towards worldly matters could not make people happy forever. Even if people were seen healthy physically, they had deep mental dissatisfaction. Psychologically, they were the poorest and sickened people. The continuous quest towards world made people psychologically empty. They had poor adjustment in family and society as well. They could not envision their ambition and

destination of life. The Western people of the post World War realized their life in vain as the material gaining could not please them. Hippies were the prominent instance. These hippies, by virtue of dissatisfaction with the materialistic and physical gaining, were disabused with narcotics and drugs. The post Victorian England had led Europe in the industrial path and during the 1800s and 1900s people had almost given up religious faith and they had empty heart with them. These dissatisfactions of 'hippies' and some other revolutionary groups couldn't be held by the Western modernity. Again they had to return back to spirituality since it was only the best solution of materialistic dissatisfaction. In the post independent India, when Osho Rajanis had just evolved, those dissatisfied souls fell under kin. During 60s and 70s world had experienced many more empty souls of West devoted before the Eastern spirituality healing for their salvation.

Marxist view for tradition and modernity is connected with capitalism and industrialization. There is dual relationship in each writing of Marxist thinkers. Earnest Mandel writes:

. . . the relations between the West and the already under-developed countries did not thereby become humane and equal. Plundering was followed by trade; but the latter's effects were often to be more damaging even than those of conquest. The link between the two forms of exploitation, violent form by way of direct seizure and the "peaceful" form by way of exchange on an unequal footing is particularly clear in the case of India. (445)

There is no fixed date since when the 'modernity' started. Even we don't know the fact what the 'modernity' really means. According to the English history, 1914 was the date since when it began. The period between the First and Second World Wars is known

the modernism. But many philosophers like Walter Benjamin say modernity is an incomplete project. Whatever we see new is modern in comparison to the tradition. Change is itself a remarkable sign of modernity. Renaissance introduced many new ideas in the field of science and literature throughout Europe. People diverted from church to search new land for cultivation, the way to abolish feudalism, new subject matter for writing, centre of the universe, the origin of human beings and so many other sources of knowledge. Urbanization was the product of industrialization which appeared in the Victorian period. It introduced modernity replacing the romanticism.

India was colonized by England about a century before the First World War. With the slogan of improving the life standard of poor Indians, the English people entered over there. They chased the Muslim emperors away and held the power of this great land. They established industries, paved roads, replaced some huts by RCC buildings and tried to impose Christianity. Due to the invasion of the British imperialism many Indians could enjoy the advanced British facility. But, still greater part of this land was in shadow of night. Moreover the poor workers and farmers were exploited. Their traditional art was replaced by the modernized industrial products.

Jurgen Habermas emphasizes that modernity is the development of the sciences, law and art. He says:

The project of modernity as it was formulated by the photospheres of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century consists in the relentless development of the objectivating sciences, of the universalistic foundations of morality and law, and of autonomous art, all in accord with their own immanent logic. (291)

Hegel is situated as the foundational legislator of the philosophical discourse of modernity. Jorgen Habermas writes, "Hegel inaugurated the discourse of modernity. He introduced the theme-the self-critical reassurance of modernity. He established the rules within which the theme can be varied - the dialectic of enlightenment" (52).

The pessimistic prognosis for modernity is based on the fact that modern culture is characterized by the increasing dominance of rational discipline and this external process of selection provides the 'optional chances' for the fundamental human type of modernity being the fully adjusted men of bureaucratic age.

Foucault supports Baudelaire's view of modernity in his philosophical essay *What is Enlightenment?* (1977). His main concern is for the art. This art covers the entire literature. He sees a person modern who performs or is able to accept some heroic works. One must have changed to present something heroic job if he wishes to possess the attitude of modernity. He says:

This heroization is ironical, needless to say. The attitude of modernity does not treat the passing moment as sacred in order to say to maintain or perpetuate it. It certainly does not involve harvesting it as a fleeting and interesting curiosity. . . . As an example of modernity, Baudelaire cites the artist Constantin Guys. (111)

Habermas opposes any attempted distinction between "modernity" and "modernism" because he believes that without the characteristic subjective mentality inspired by new no objective modernity can crystallize at all:

Modernism represents a great seductive force, promoting the dominance of the principle of unrestrained self-realization, the demand for authentic self-experience, the subjectivism of an over stimulated sensibility, and the

release of hedonistic motivations quite incompatible with the discipline required by professional life and with the moral foundations of a purposive-rational mode of life generally. (286)

He defines the characters of modernity as:

Many different occasions for discontent and protest arise wherever a one-sided process of modernization, guided by criteria of economic and administrative rationality, invades domains of life which are centered on the task of cultural transmission, social integration, socialization and education, domains oriented towards quite different criteria, namely towards those of communicative rationality. (289)

The significance of Kant's inauguration of thinking of the present as difference in history for Foucault lies in its status as the locus of emergence of an ethos which Foucault locates as constitutive of our modernity. Modernity, in other words, is not an epochal concept in this instance but rather a specific mode of relating to contemporary reality.

Debates on Tradition and Modernity

For the European context it has already long established that tradition is a modern concept. Rather than transmitting an allegedly unbroken past, genuine efforts to preserve "tradition" do not appear in earlier historical epochs. Modern notions of tradition are different from earlier forms of appreciating the past in the sense that they constitute traditional counter-movements against an otherwise dominating trend. All debates on tradition react at least partly to modernization processes and discourses, which means that they all are intrinsically connected with the programme of modernity. Where in any pre-modern culture there were efforts to return to an idealised past, traditionalism in the modern sense share a spirit of defensiveness or at least reservations about modernity as a

seemingly ubiquitous, all transforming force. We should not reject the past. It may cause our identity lessens. Just it is to transform for the new generation without breaking its originality. S.C. Dube says:

A sudden loss of tradition can lead to anomie, rootlessness, and alienation. Before suggesting value and institutional change, it is necessary to think of value and intuitional replacement. A society in a spiritual void can become a caricature of itself. This danger is to be guarded against. (15)

The complicated history of this relationship of modern and traditional impulses has so far been many studied in local contexts. We know, for example, that earlier socio-cultural patterns and political practices contributed to shaping Maoism, a doctrine that claimed to radically break from the past. And we know equally of the profound socio-economic transformations and historical ruptures caused by fascist regimes that claimed to defend "tradition" and historical roots. Historians should thus be rather cautious not to use the dichotomy of modern and traditional as objective categories that can be applied to the study of the past. The main focus in this panel will thus lie on understanding tradition and modernity as concepts, as discoverers to which a myriad of intellectual and political groupings referred when formulating their own agendas.

Satyendra Tripathi argues on the relationship of tradition and modernity in the context of India in *Tradition and Modernization* (1976) as:

For the society of India, the challenge of modernity to the traditional system occurred between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Comparable traditional periods before the challenge of modernity may be discussed in all other societies, since the challenge of modernity in the

society that modernized earliest was primarily internal. The process of transformation took place gradually over countries. (123)

He adds further:

The relations between the traditional and modern do not necessarily involve displacement conflict or exclusiveness. Modernity does not necessarily weaken tradition. Both tradition and modernity form the bases of ideologies and movements in which the polar opposite (tradition and modernity) are converted into aspirations, but traditional forms may supply support for, as well as against, change. (124)

Around the beginning of the twentieth century one can observe a surge in debates of tradition and modernity in many parts of the world. This can be partly explained by the shared experience of the structural transformations such as the industrialization of the economy or the internationalization of the trade, which large part of the world underwent during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, albeit in localized versions. In many local contexts urbanization and pauperization were among the multifaceted social consequences of these major structural transformations. By the first decades of the twentieth century most of cultures and societies had experienced a set of decisive historical ruptures. Particularly in areas with high international exposure these were rather profound changes in cultural values, social patterns and traditional institutions on a political level these ruptures were often experienced and explained as impositions by western powers and colonizers. In other cases they were understood as national mobilization, as self strengthening movements that would guarantee cultural survival and independence in an ever-accelerating world. Neil Lazarus blames,

"modernity" is the Eurocentric invention and the way of breaking it also is the Euro-centrism:

Within the problematic of "modernity", there is no space or act or utterance which is no Eurocentric. The argument is that it is necessary to break with all the traditions of modern thought in order to break with their Euro-centrism, for modern thought is constitutively Euro-centric. (59)

When discussing the socio-cultural background of notions of tradition and modernity, structural transformations and political processes are not only the important factors to consider. Equally important are the mentalities, fears, and hopes that drove these changes. Here Yogendra Singh's idea is notable:

Modernization is an integrative process Modernization develops through internalization of norms represented by its role structure. This is not easier, as the values of modernity are never a finished product; they are open-ended, mostly instrumental, and non-categorical. These attributes of modernity lead us logically to conclude that society's categorical values are of necessity to be derived from sources co-existent with cultural structure of modernity. (67)

The structural transformations of societies and the shifting tectonics of political order were a common experience shared by thinkers in many world regions in past. Also the discourses that explained and justified these rapid and profound changes were circulating at a global level. Most central in this regard was the belief system in modernity as a new civilization, a belief which in many countries became a major facet of socio-political consciousness. For many European thinkers from the late eighteenth and particularly from the nineteenth century onwards, the transformations of society and

culture during their age were the products of one great unifying force: modernity. This new culture, based on human reason and progress, was supposed to hollow out all other traditions and leave their remnants back on museum shelves on an inter-cultural level, this discourse of modernity constituted the core of colonial rhetoric: the dominant powers posited themselves as representatives of a teaching civilization, and they claimed that by ruling the word they would sow the seeds of modernity. In this rhetoric Europe formed the spearhead of a great development, which eventually would free other cultures from their alleged historical constraints and imbue them with the same dynamism and energy that made the Occidental so powerful.

All revolutions head towards modernism. The industrial development is one of the components that bring change in the society. But the working class people have to suffer most due to this revolution. V.I. Lenin quotes:

The poor workers pose themselves as revolutionaries, but in every serious situation they prove to be counter-revolutionaries because they shrink from the violent destruction of the old state machine; they have no faith in the forces of the working class. (25-26)

It is important to note that this perception of modernity came to be shared by significant parts of the elites in societies outside the West. Depending on the time and the intensity of their encounters with Western powers, many societies saw strong modernity movements beginning to emerge. Most of these movements such as the Chinese May Fourth Movement or Kemalism in Turkey were openly iconoclastic and express a certain disdain for their own cultural heritage. These groups, which in many societies became the dominant intellectual force, tended to assume that modernization dismantling belief systems such as Islam or Confucianism. These Westernizers regarded

traditional institutions and social-cultural mores as impediments to process. In essence this meant that their cultures could no longer follow their own trajectories and that to retain one's cultural root was to remain stagnant in a world in which only dynamism and progressivism would promise social betterment and historical dignity. The timeline of development, which westernizing forces applied to their own societies, implied that their cultures were now the latecomers in an international race for development.

These were certainly variations in the modernization efforts around the world and even antagonisms between them. The most important challenge to the classic liberal programme of development and Westernization emerged in the form of communism or Bolshevism, which particularly after the Russian Revolution in 1917 started to gain a global appeal.

III. Textual Analysis

Clash between Tradition and Modernity in Anand's Novel: *The Big Heart*

In the novel *The Big Heart* Anand sketches a common background of modern Hindu culture of Indian society. It is the transitional period of politics, religions and the whole social conventions. The new generation seeks drastic change in each field of the society where as the old one seems devoted in keeping on the dead habits. So, there emerges the clash between tradition and modernity. It is the cause of poverty. Most of the people are poor here. Those who are poor they are unable to gain the wide knowledge about the contemporary world. On the other hand, it is a mini world itself since these people have not got any facility of the present government. For this notion Anand writes in his note of *The Big Heart*:

The Big Heart was written from the torment of living between two worlds 'one not quite dead and the other refusing to be born'. And it is precious to me for the shelter it gave me as a half way house before facing other storms. (14)

In these two types of cultures, people are seen suffering from what they have to adopt. They are the prisoners of two cultures. One culture seems to endeavoring the society where as the next denies to leave the illiterate villagers. It is the community of coppersmiths in Amritsar. The houses are built up in old art by their craftsmen, called thathiars. These coppersmiths belong to the second highest caste and are degraded for following a dirty profession since the 'age of truth'. Even their village bears the name from tradition, Kucha Billimaran, cat-killer's lane since somebody killed a cat in this village. They believe the earthquake is the effect of moving horn by a bull which is

holding the earth. But at the same time there are some people who have knocked down their old houses and built new ones. Really, the Billimaran is observed a village of two cultures: traditional and modern like a two-headed snake. Anand writes:

With one head it looks towards the ancient market, where the beautiful copper, brass, silver and bronze utensils made in the lane are sold by dealers called Kaseras, hence called Bazar Kaserian. With the other it wriggles . . . where screws and bolts and nails and locks are sold. . . . (17)

The city Amritsar means ocean of nectar. The Golden Temple which was built by a Sikh saint lies there. The Shrine of the Goddess Kali stands at the Bazaar Kaserian. There the coppersmiths shape copper pots day and night and sell to the Kaserians. These stand for the tradition. On the other hand, there stands Clock Tower with four faces which represent the modernity. This is the gift of 'Iron Age'. Most of the people of Billimaran have not gone out of the village. They don't know the importance of the progress of the modern age. Some of the children of rich people have gone far away and a few of them have returned being babus. They work under the electronic lamp. But those who have been staying in this society for a long time they think 'darkness is spreading' since they believe modern gadgets are the symbols of darkness and they are being brought in their home place. These traditional people hate the modern equipments. These modern equipments have challenged their arts. Now their job is in extinction. Anand puts in:

Altogether, a spirit of unrest broods over Kucha Billimaran, like the doom promised on the judgment at the end of the 'iron age'. And already the convulsions of the sad lands across the black waters are shaking this old land with the thunder of the machinery implanted in its midst, which is

said to be making tools for the greatest war on earth that is rumored will be in progress at the end of the horizons. The leaping tongues of fire, which were said to have signed the beards of their headman while they were planning with the Devil to start the roaring monsters of machines and to rub the coppersmiths of their living, are supposed to have given warning to the devilry that would spread from a ray of the flaming sun and encircle the earth. (18)

The main character of the novel, Ananta has been to Bombay one of the largest cities in India. So he knows about the changes of the modern era. He has seen different types of vehicles, machines, industrial products and the war between people for religion and native land. He repeats his common phrase: "There is no talk of money; one must have a big heart" (19). However he is too unable to come out of the grip of traditional thinking. He dreams while working on his anvil a goddess, Kali chasing him with bloody hands stepping on corpses. Within his day dream he faces the Black Death. But at the same time, Ananta is imprinting the moon strokes at the right place with his good craftsmanship.

Anand, one of the greatest Indo-English writers, makes his main character, Ananta such a person who tries to bring change in the society. Ananta is suffering from the overburden of his poverty. Though he owns great muscles and experience of visiting up to Bombay, his poverty does not let him reach at his sacred target. He is reputed as a 'flesh-eater and drunkard' among his people. He loves revolution. It is the red flower that he saw in Bombay. Revolution brings drastic change in his primitive society and poverty. To achieve this target, first of all, he must quench the volcano below his stomach.

Anand's mind bears the conflict of tradition and modernism. One side he sees the advantage and the next, bare disadvantage of the machine. He is influenced from Gandhi for humanism but not for religion. His view can be seen from Puran Singh Bhagat:

Though they don't know it, they are torn inside them, even as the whole world is rent today about whether to use the machine or to scrap it and go back to the age of the spinning wheel. And this quarrel in men's minds is going on in spite of the fact that the machine is there and can't be refuted. The bulk of men are rooted in custom and hardly yet born, while there are some like us who are only half alive. As Uncle Viroo invoked Mahatma Gandhi this morning, the truth must be faced that not only have many people listened to the Mahatma's gospel but they themselves feel that machinery is bad. And if one sees the spectacle of those beautiful and ingenious products of science, the modern aeroplanes, dropping thousands of tons of bombs and distributing Death to the poor and rich alike, one has to make up one's mind about the machine. (83)

The English men try to impose their inventions in Indian poor society but it's not easy to implement such things here in short period. These poor people are trapped in a whirlwind of westernization and their traditional culture from where they have lost the proper route. The coppersmiths are suffering from the decreasing rate of their works. They have started giving up their traditional art and seeking jobs in the newly established factory which belongs to the thathiar Murli Dhar and Kaserian Gokul Chand. It is exploiting the traditional jobs of the poor thathiars since it produces the copper utensils faster at low cost. Moreover, the customers have left using these copper utensils in later days. Due to the engraving poverty the poor thathiars request the factory owners to secure

their jobs. There is the feeling of superiority in the same caste people. Murli is richer than others. So he feels he is greater and more respectable in the thatthiar community. He does not pay attention to his kin people. Here is the exploitation of poor people. The lower caste people are oppressed and exploited by some rich people.

Only Ananta knows how to persuade his fellowmen. He tells in the gathering about the legendary city, Bombay. People think it is the city where fruits of gold and silver coins are found hanging in Sheths' garden. Ananta says the horrifying situation of that heavenly city. People are not nice there. With the modernization people have turned to beast. They don't have kind heart. Ananta says:

I have seen children sold for a handful of rice by parents too weak to walk.
And you could buy a young girl and run a brothel for what you and I still
give here for a midday meal. Oh, and as I watched the wailing children
who had been separated from their parents, some really abandoned by
their folk, I tell you a fire swept over my body like ripples of scorching
flames across a forest. (28 - 29)

Most of the characters are seen in against of the machine but support inwardly. Their hatred is seen everywhere. Binde Saran puts, "It is this Amrikan machinery – the toys of the Devils! And the only people who could keep an eye on the Sarkar are in goal . . ." (75).

Machine is the sign of modernization. If machine is brought in India then it will bring modernity with it. Since it makes things new and in different models this displaces the traditional crafts. These poor coppersmiths are threatened by this western gift. Then at the same condition the student Satyapal hammers the west:

. . . they are flooding the country with the instruments of destruction. At first they brought railways, telephones and telegrams; now they are bringing that engine of death the aeroplane. All for profits, and because they are hungry for markets. Big monopolies wanting big contracts. (113)

It is the English people who bring the instruments of destruction for the Indians. Whatever they introduce in this country all things are modern. They displace the old Indian instruments. Therefore the traditional occupation of these thathiars is being snatched. This situation is generalized by most of the people who are leading these uneducated people. They are not less in talking about religion. Ralia says, "Our dharma says that this Vilayati mixture of iron and leather is evil" (114). Mahasha Hans Raj preaches them spiritual ideas. He means to say about the spiritual satisfaction which has lost in the darkness of machines. The ancestors were happy in the past. Ancient civilization shows people were happy with their life. They had enough food. But now due to the criminal grip of the modern west, the east is suffering from their belly problem. Their traditional occupation is being snatched away and they are being jobless. So says Mahasa Hans Raj:

It is a question of good and evil, of the age of truth against the age of falsehood, of the world when there was light against the world of darkness, of the India in which we had a great civilization and everyone was a peasant who ate a bellyful and the machine-ridden India we are threatened with by those who want to reproduce here the conditions of the atheistic west - -. (114)

Among all these people Ananta and Puran Singh Bhagat are different. Although Ananta talks the bad results of the westernization, he does not express his anger to go and

finish the western dowry. He tries to console the leaders and the rest people for making a union. To some extent he is success at his target but ultimately he is lost. He knows how to make them strong and go against the factory like the agitators of the Trade Union Movement. Apart from this all power he has learnt to be generous and abuse that power:

'It is easy to get excited', he said, 'and to turn riot, because the fire of one soul catches another, and can set the whole world ablaze. But look how the firungis have asserted the steam generated by fire in the engine. Their cool brains have controlled their passions so that they are able to imprison us all in a prison without bars. (29)

Ananta sites the example what he saw in Madanpura Chawls that the cool heat which comes from knowledge and which alone will bring about 'Revolution'. He suggests to postpone seeking job from the foreman Channa if he has told 'no'. Better to create a union of the jobless people. But he seems unable to console them. Some of the thathiars like Ralia and Dina oppose him citing the riots of pilgrimage in Haridwar. Probably all the older members of the coppersmith community are hostile to him because of his open liaison with a widow, Janki. Now he cannot influence Ralia. He is only the person who has got job of making copper utensils with the copper piece provided by the Lal Chand – Khusal Chand shop. This creates hostility between Ananta and his fellow people thathiars since no others have got even this type of job. They think he is near to these rich people. On the other hand Satyapal vomits his wrath against the mechanized Russian government:

'Of Bolshevist Russia', cut in Satyapal, ' where the party in power wants to mechanize the very soul of man to produce machine-men with their mass-production and the five year plans! I tell you as I have told Uncle Viroo,

that the white race want bait us with more many and to harness us to the chariot of their wars, which will just smother us under their wheels and consign us into the abysses of hell.' (114)

Mahasha Hans Raj reminds the saying of Mahatma Gandhi. He had told to resist the government and the evils of Vilayat. But he said to accept the good things. He had resolved all his doubts about the loss of spiritual satisfaction portended by machine work to the labourer, by the monotony threatened by civilization. Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward write about the rise of protest:

Most of the people who were thrown out of work suffered quietly, especially at the start of the depression, when officials' denials helped to confuse the unemployed and to make them ashamed the employment offices, walked the streets, line up for every job opening, and doubted themselves for not finding work. Families exhausted their savings, borrowed from relations, sold their belongings, blaming themselves and each other for losing the struggle to remain self-reliant. (48)

But as the depression worsened, as the work forces of entire factories were laid off, as whole neighbourhoods in industrial towns were devastated, and as at least some political leaders began to acknowledge that a disaster had occurred, attitudes toward what had happened and why, and who was to blame, began to change among some of the unemployed. They began to define their personal hardship not just as their own individual misfortune but as misfortune they shared with many of their own kind. And if so many people were in the same trouble, then may be it wasn't they who were to blame, but "the system." Hans Raj says:

The Western ethos had made machinery the New Messiah. The source of all higher life comes to man from his spiritual mind, but they are for abolishing personality. Mahatma Gandhi has said that it is everyman's duty to resist the Sarkar and the evils of Vilayat which are flooding the country. Only the evils, remember, not the good. And the sage knows that our happiness lies in the acceptance of this duty - the mysterious God who is greater than all petty considerations of want and family demands. We are men. (115)

He advocates for the truth and humanity. There are born numerous problems due to the modern gadgets but they are good for the whole humanity at the same time. Our duty is to accept the good side. Serve the humanity. Praise the modernity. He adds, "And men owe to obedience some God, or Higher Power, like Duty. We must submit and sacrifice everything to this higher thing which lives and acts through us, otherwise we are doomed" (115).

The common but false association of lower-class protest with violence may also be a residue of this tradition and its view of the mob as normless and dangerous. Mass violence is, to be sure, one of many forms of defiance, and perhaps a very elemental form, for it violates the very ground rules of civil society. And lower-class groups do on occasion resort to violence – to the destruction of property and persons – and perhaps this is more likely to be the case when they are deprived by their institutional location of the opportunity to use other forms of defiance. More typically, however, they are not violent, although they may be militant. They are usually not violent simply because the risks are too great; the penalties attached to the use of violence by the poor are too fearsome and too overwhelming. Of course, defiance by the lower class frequently results in violence

when more power groups, discomfited or alarmed by the unruliness of the poor, use force to coerce them into docility. The substantial record of violence associated with protest movements in the United States is a record composed overwhelmingly of the casualties suffered by protestors at the hands of public or private armies. When people feel congested or trapped in a small circle of poverty and joblessness they can turn to social violence.

Hans Raj suggests the people not to hate the persons such as Murli and Gokul who are the merchants, dealers and factory owners but to show them kindness. It is better to blame the wrong arrangement of the English government. He says:

The merchants and dealers who have opened factories have no hand in the arrangement of life in our country under the present dispensation, just as you have no voice in it today. The Angrezi Sarkar arranges life, and it has multiplied infamy and plunder and murder by starvation. . . . You do not know the number of men who were put out of employment in Vilayat . . . and the numbers of those who were condemned to the workhouses. I tell you it is not our Indian brothers who are so much to blame as the devils who deny God and the spirit. (116)

The mock–heroic dance of Ralia's representation of the machinery in Billimaran demolishes the gentle attitude of Mahasha Hans Raj and makes it a joke. Ralia discards the modern engine as, “Cheekh Cheekh . . . Phuff . . . Phuff . . . We are not oxen! . . . Chappar chappar . . . Cheekh . . . Phuff . . . Phuff . . .”(116).

There is a hot argument about soul, religion and western culture. Some leaders say the English people don't believe in spirit and God. They are cruel. But some other leaders believe it is the matter of machine and kindness but not the case of religion. They

are also the brothers of Indian people. Ananta does not believe in any religion. He is not seen as a traditionalist like Ralia. He appeals others to come out of their narrow concept about religion and be prepared for revolution. He can only offer the rule of thumb built on his instinctive knowledge and experience of other people; and what little theory he has picked up at Bombay is not sharp enough to combat the clever Satyapal, who builds all his hopes on a sincere shrill voice and shriller emotions. In spite, however, of the positive aspect of his belief in Revolution as the only cure for the mismanagement of life by capitalists in Vilayat, in Bombay and Ahamedabad, and his belief in the new brotherhood of trade unions which will help to bring about Revolution, in spite of utter faith in the myth of Revolution, his sense of inferiority arising from his non-possession of much book knowledge makes him regard Satyapal as a redoubtable adversary. By heart Ananta is not in against of the machine but the capitalists who exploit the labours. He thinks even poor thathiars can master the machine. He says, "When we thathiars begin to handle the machine . . . we shall soon show them! . . . We need not become slaves to the profiteers or the machines. We are men. We will make a Revolution!" (85).

It is his modern thinking unlike others. Puran Singh Bhagat is also in support of change. He talks with Janki:

Sister, this is not an incident by itself, it is an incident in the Revolution, a new development in which men will have to measure their strength against the new world, and either realize their power or be destroyed And in that story is contained the truth: if you have the controlling switch in your hand, you can make the machine a slave rather than your master. It is that switch or destruction. (90)

While talking with poet, Ananta shows his love towards the western world since its modernity:

I should like to go to Vilayat one day and see what conditions are like there. I should like to see those steps, which walk, and the railways, which run in the bowels of earth. I should also like to go and see the giant of Roos. Comrade Khan told me that they have learnt to grow wheat in the snowfields and to extract power from coal in the earth without anyone having to go into the mine. In all those things the earth is coming to be more and more like heaven. (86)

Janki's feeling is different than Ananta and the poet. She has not positive attitude for the foreign machine because she wishes a safe place for landing. She says:

The trouble with you folk is that you are always talking of Roos and not about your own country. I can understand why the thathiars won't listen to you. They have nothing to eat, and the machine has come and taken their jobs away from them and you talk of Roos to them. (91)

Anand's revolutionary character, Ananta has begun not to accept the world at its face value. He has forsaken the lure of easy victories, and knows that in taking the plunge into the struggle for 'Revolution' he has entered an arena where only the hardest search will yield a way among the thorny paths of the tiger-infested jungle of the world. He puts:

Perhaps one can never get over the fears which mothers put into our minds. Perhaps, also, because we thathiars live in a small world, full of denial and refusal, insults and humiliations, we have begun to feel doomed. With one half of me I too feel I am doomed, and with the other half I feel could fight, to avert the disaster. But it has certainly been a bad

day for me. I have been wondering, for instance, why the Kaseras and Murli have fixed on me as their chief enemy when it is so difficult for me to persuade the thathiars to do one thing or the other? . . . we suffer from the day we are born till the day we die, but this cruelty is unnecessary. . . . And I feel I ought to do something good before I die. The truth is that devotion and sacrifice are the twin brothers of courage and will have nothing to do with cousin cowardice! (142-43)

The poet seems inclined to communism. He talks changes and modernity rather than capitalism. Suppression, capitalism and belief in religion are the weapons of traditional thinkers who always want to dominate the lower class people. Bhagat is not in full support of Gandhi because he was limited to religio-politics. He says:

Because Gandhiji always worshipped the kind of truth which was orthodox! . . . in this country only an overturning of the old will bring the healing balm of love among men. Only a revolution will complete the information of Guru Nanak . . . Gandhiji may have been innocent, but he certainly never realized the meaning of Revolution for our country and went on believing in an unplanned, individualist, competitive profit making the like of which has thrown these brothers out of their jobs. (150)

Hans Raj does not courage to blame the merchants and dealers for these miserable days to come. He puts neither Birla nor Tata nor does Sarabhai have a voice to dominate the working class people. These rich people would do well if they had a hand. It must be the cause of English people. They introduced machines, established factories, captured many poor countries, produced cheap – artificial materials and displaced the traditional arts from their colonies. Thus local people became jobless and the nation loses

identity. But the poet is against Hans Raj in the cause of foreigners. He means to say that although foreigners have brought Christianity they have also brought development in this land. They do not dominate the lower caste, marginalized and poor people. Not every English man is an oppressor. It is not the question of accepting or rejecting the machine at this late hour when it is already there, it is the question of the heart. The modern people think all castes people are same. Even Mahatma Gandhi never believed in untouchables. No one should hate others according to their race, caste, job and property. And he cites one example:

Because out there at the grain-shop of Mohkam Chand, in Misri Bazar . . . the conflagration lit by hunger in men's hearts is raging. When I went shopping there before noon at least a hundred men were waiting for Mohkam to open the shop. And it is not the question of what caste your employer belongs to, it is a question of who he aspires to be. (153-54)

The voice of the author of this novel is heard from his spokesperson, Ananta. But sometimes it is not clear what he means to say to his people. Even his voice becomes traditional to some scholars. It can be the cause of his innocent feeling. He thinks for all whereas some others think for their caste, race or politics. He says, "I say that we will form a union to ensure their right to a proper wage until they are strong enough to displace their exploiters and seize the factory, which by all the rights in theirs" (155).

The student leader Satyapal debates:

And then we will begin the era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in India! And the Dictatorship of the State Machine! Sate capitalism and all the old tricks of propaganda and advertisement. And the betrayal of the Revolution! (155)

The dealer Gokul Chand also believes in changing the time. He is the Chaudhary of his caste. He says with Murli to work according to the time. The thathiars need a strong unity. Their traditional job is snatched away with the establishment of the factory. If all the leaders and supporters of all parties and poor thathiars unite they will certainly break the factory and kill its owners. People are aware at this time. He says, "Times have changed. They know that a single soul will rot in hell but a hundred or two hundred can storm the heavens!" (166).

It is the time to think of modernity. The narrator's view is that the old days are gone. If you want to progress in your life make your heart broad. Narrow concept makes one blind and invites the destruction. Modernism means behave other people equally, feel everybody has equal rights, see with the eyes of humanity and let marginalized people get the opportunities of their livelihood easily. Even the capitalist Murli Dhar has understood the mistake he has committed in his brotherhood. Time compels one to be changed. When Murli realizes he is really in trouble during his grandson's betrothal ceremony he bows his head and vomits his corruption:

Listen, brothers, I have put my turban at the feet of all of you. Save this ceremony. I have sinned. I have erred. You can beat my old head with your shoes. But let us have this betrothal. Those boys of the brotherhood are my dear ones and near ones. If I did not invite them it was because they felt bitter with me about the factory and the loss of their trade. A crow tries to feel like a peacock, but seeing his feet weeps and cries. That is my condition. Forgive me and let us go through with the ceremony.

(168)

Murli Dhar's factory partner Chaudhari Gokul Chand is a modern thinker in all cases. He suggests Murli Dhar to provide job for poor thathiars and behave all castes equally. He participates at the Murli Dhar's grandson's betrothal ceremony where Kaseras are not allowed to visit and eat at low thathiars' house. He says to another dealer Gansham Das:

We ought to make the best of a bad job. The world has changed. Why, we sit together with people of high caste and low caste in the trains. We draw water from the pump which is supplied from a tank controlled by a Mussalman engineer. We walk on roads swept by bhangis. (187)

Many people of this region believe in religion and caste discrimination. Gansham Das is one of them. He is a pure conservative Hindu. He does not support the humanity but religion. Golul Chand and his nephew Lal Chand went at Murli Dhar's house. So they have fallen from their caste according to Ghanshan Das. He hates lower caste people strongly. He is the holder of tradition. He scolds Lal Chand, "Thief! Carrion! Traitor! . . . Have you no shame since you joined there Arya Samajis, drunkards, whoremongers and kababis!" (188).

Here is seen a real clash between tradition and modernity. Ghanasham like people never like to give up the old system and accept the modernism. Equality and humanity are the curse of modern era for the conservatives.

It is the transitional period where some people want and accept drastic change, some adopt it willingly or unwilling and still there are some people who have hatred in change. At this moment, we find, everybody is influenced with superstition. So many crows are cawing above these people where they are playing cards. Viroo, Manu and

Ananta surprise to see the flying crows above them. Ananta tries to give the message of the crows in detail with the explanation of tradition and modernism:

For two thousand years our ancestors had been maturing with the magic of their hands beautiful utensils, which were part of the dowry of every bride, the decoration for every new house. Then, like the machine made cloth from Vilayat which ruined our weavers, come the machine and the readymade aluminum pots and pans, and our wages fell. . . . But times have changed, brothers, times have changed. And we have to change with times. . . . That are why the crows are cawing . . . (198)

In this modern age it is not necessary to believe in superstitions. Modernity has gifted a lot of profitable things than the past ages. He adds further:

It is a good thing that we are not like wax in the hands of Destiny, but we can choose to do this thing or that. Just as we once deliberately gave up the earthen saucer lamp which burnt a dim little cotton wick in mustard oil and took up the kerosene oil tin lamp instead because it gave more light, and then accepted electricity with its broad glare, so we can now make a choice in this world of evil and destruction, if we have heads and hearts. And, because there is change, and because there is choice, we have the opportunity of saving ourselves through this very Revolution. (198-99)

Even though Ananta is an uneducated thatthiar he is far sighted .He possesses great knowledge .His request is to form a union of the workers group and march a rally against the government .He puts in, "We can't cure our headaches by merely changing the pillow. Slight changes can't bring about a new life" (200).

The poet is not as confident as Ananta, however, he follows the same path. Though Mahatma Gandhi was against the English, he accepted their modern gifts. Ananta wants to console the thathiars. These coppersmiths are distorted into many slashes where Ananta suggests them for unity and not to become jealous of others. He says:

Ohe, come to your senses and have faith in yourself and others. To have friends you must be one. And what stops us from achieving the heaven on earth is your jealousy, distrust and envy of those who are your fellows and feel for us. . . . No, we shall give a push to events with our strong shoulders, as they did in Roos, for only thus can we feed the mouths of the hungry peasants in Hindustan. Well, if such pushing and shoving brings a certain amount of blood letting we shall have to steel our hearts and take consolation from the fact that the wars which the greed and selfishness of the rich have caused, took many more lives. Out of such a Revolution, brothers, we shall create love and the many new things which we need. . . . We shall not lose our hearts in the love of gold or the worship of money, as did the others. (202-03)

He does not support to wreck the machine or kill any person. Destruction of the machine and killing people do not bring ultimate change. It doesn't support for the change of system. Therefore, revolution is the most. There are many types of people. They believe in different political systems and the ways that bring changes. There are communists, Capitalists, atheists, revolutionaries and others. Although all want change but their ways to reach at the target are different. They hate each other and perform their egos. Ananta and Khusal Chand speak for forming a union and start work for revolution whereas student Satyapal, Professor Mejid and some others are against of the union

formation. Anand is not in favour of Satyapal. Satyapal makes the thathiars start fight on the spot. It is a bloody war. Everything has become their enemies. For Ralia, Satyapal, professor Mejid and Viroo, even the government is their opponent because it has accepted the western dowry. And those who have sympathy to the modern machines they are too their enemies. Satyapal says, "We will have some blood-letting soon, and shoot all the traitors who have joined hands with the Sarkar" (153).

Undoubtedly, Satyapal is against the modernism. He hates the machines and all activities of the West. He incites people according to his will. He is a leader. He, sometimes, encourages them for revolution. He says to Bhagat, "You are ashamed of inciting men to hatred, but I am not . . . And I am really for the Revolution now while you prate about it and really believe in compromise. I am for a clean sweep of all the filthy scum now" (153). Violence breeds violence. Satyapal inspires the uneducated thathiars for violence. Ralia breaks the factory gate and begins to smash the machine. His mind is occupied with the destruction of this modern object. He shouts, "This is the Kali Yug, they say, han, the Kali Yug! . . . I am the destroyer of this madar chod age, Shiva! . . . Come, brothers, I am Shiva" (214).

Ralia is the antagonist on the stage of modernism here but Satyapal and professor Mejid are the main leaders of the destruction. Their momentary ego destroys the modern machine. Here, again we find the clash of tradition and modernity. Actually, Ralia is not the person motivated to finish the factory by heart; it is the capitalists who have snatched away the wage of his work:

'Now tell how you feel', he said, addressing a machine before him. 'I didn't want big money, only a wage with the work of my hand, and you deprived

me of it; now talk, may I rape the mother of your mother! I can talk better than you'. (215)

It is clearly visible that the factory has grabbed the jobs of these ordinary people. It is the object that has made them suffer from starvation and fight with each other. No doubt, it has destroyed the traditional craftsmanship of the society. So the agony of Ralia has been emerged by curtail of his wage and job which is the result of the factory. This leads him to finish over the western gift. He has become mad. He expresses his bitter agony towards modernity wrecking the machine:

I want blood! I want bones! I want bodies and sinews! Hoon . . . I want them in a stream so that I can crush them and break them! . . . I drink blood! I drink oil! I drink urine! . . . I want to be raped! I am a bitch, see! So I want young blood! Let them come and I will embrace them! . . . I am the bitch goddess machine, han, the Kali of the iron age, the age of machines! (215-16)

The mentioned dialogue is an instance of the author's ambivalent nature towards the modern products. He is torn as his characters. Since Ralia is out of his temper, it is vain to advice him gently. Sarcastically, Ananta, at last, encourages him to go and break the machines according to heart's desire. This suggestion becomes poison to Ralia and he kills Ananta with the hammer he is using to break the machine. Then, everything is silence with the death of Ananta. Thus, the entire scenario of this novel is oriented to show the vivid picture of the clash between tradition and modernity.

IV. Conclusion

Evidently, Anand wants us to draw the conclusion that Ananta has become the scapegoat of the clash of tradition and modernity. No doubt Anand is a versatile writer of Indo - Anglican literature, his novel *The Big Heart* (1945) portrays merits and demerits of the colonialism. He does not only show the horrific situation of a village but also criticizes the ambivalent nature of human beings towards social change. Critics like Saroj Cowasjee, Margaret Berry, P.K. Rajan and Pramila Paul have taken Anand as a humanistic writer who deals with the lower and working class people. His feelings are the influence of communism to some extent. Anand shows the problems which are existing in the society. His most of the novels are concluded with tragic theme. Life is far too rich, subtle and comprehensive a business to preclude everything else but bread and butter questions. The revolutionary tone of Mulk Raj Anand's political commitment provides insights into the politics of the Indian revolutionary elite. His novel highlights the conflicts between the revolutionaries' cultural background and their profession of political faith. Saros Cowasjee writes, in the introduction of *The Big Heart*, "The basic conflict in *The Big Heart* is between the forces of tradition and modernity . . ." (8).

The author's view of life has become more comprehensive and that he can now include in his circle of sympathy, things for which he formerly had no tolerance. British rule was evil, but there was much good in British institutions; Capitalism is another name for exploitation, but there are Capitalists who have the welfare of the workers at heart. Anand as a writer shows his concerns to the poor, suppressed and oppressed section of the society. Colonialism is not bad for the Indian people. It has developed the places with new inventions and discoveries. But it snatches the tradition of the colonized people. It brings conflicts in peaceful society. Though capitalism is bad but all capitalists are not

the same. They work for the sake of working class people. They fight for the human rights.

This research has proved that in every work there are two poles: action and reaction, good and bad. Anand is the supporter of the colonialism. But he is not in favor of the exploitation of the poor people. The western world has modernized the east. It has showed the power of human Knowledge. Factory can produce many items in large quantity in cheap price. At the same time it exploits the poor and marginalized people. The British colonizers have brought machines as well as Christianity with them. From one side they provide jobs for few people and next side impose their religion. This breaks the social norms and values. In *The Big Heart* the factory has become enemy of the thathiars. Their jobs are snatched by it, wage is lowered. They have to run for bread. Anand's protagonist is not free from this situation. Ananta is in support of his coppersmith brotherhood but he can not be against of the modern machine. Most of the characters talk about their religion and civilization where as Ananta seems neutral. Here is the conflict between East and West, tradition and modernity, Hinduism and Christianity, Ananta and Ralia, ignorance and knowledge, working class people and capitalism.

The researcher expects that this research helps the readers to know about conflict between cultures, religions, classes and eastern and western world. It will be advantageous to learn the inclination of Anand towards modernism and lower class people. This also assists the researchers to grasp the knowledge of conflict within a person. One may probe as: Do people forget their status and fight against the inanimate thing? This research helps to investigate Anand's mind for his own people.

Finally, one can say that Mulk Raj Anand's novel *The Big Heart* is really an example of the big heart of a great writer. We can not avoid the western inventions. However it is very difficult to accept the truth. Truth appears after a great loss. It is better to form a union and march for revolution rather than to expose the agony in front of an inanimate object. Anand does not hate the machine at all but the narrow concept of few people. He praises the modern science and technology by heart but he has the repulsion towards the colonial ethos of domination and exploitation of the native.