

I. General Introduction to Herman Melville as an American Novelist

The present thesis is a study on Herman Melville's short novellas "Billy Budd" and "Bartleby, the Scrivener". The protagonists in these novellas Bartleby and Billy have been interpellated as subjects because of the capitalist ideology. Both Billy and Bartleby are trapped in the web of capitalist ideology, who face the uncertainty of life that leads to the collapse of their individual life. The ideological state apparatus (ISA) as well as the state apparatus (SA) overrule both of them in the novellas. There is the confrontation between individual and society in which primitive virtues are spoiled by social evils. These novellas are concerned with the rule of law and with the peculiar circumstances of individual life. So, the prime concern of this thesis is to analyze the causes of the interpellation of the individual in Melville's "Billy Budd" and "Bartleby, the Scrivener".

Herman Melville's "Billy Budd" is a story of the sea and about people who sailed by choice or by force, compelled to cope with conditions on board and with the eccentricities, fears and passions with the good and evil of their fellow men. Billy, the protagonist of the novella is one of the representation of those who are interpellated by capitalist ideology. His life in a sailing ship, poor food, hard labor, attack of enemies, and injury show the story of every individual in this novella.

Melville's "Bartleby, the Scrivener" tells a story of a wall street which represents Melville's concept of man's existence. Placed in a world with societal expectations the men who prefer not to conform may retreat into his own death. However, Bartleby the former dead, letter office clerk, chooses not to protect himself from those who level him a threat to their materially- oriented world. Bartleby tells his employer that he "prefers not to" copy any legal documents which lead him to

death. *Bartleby*, in particular, takes its cue from this sense of the tale as a story of everybody, casting it as a realistic story, with an emphasis on working life.

Melville, today considered one of the great American writers, achieved such literary recognition only in the twentieth century. Melville's "Billy Budd" opens by obliquely reopening one of the greatest grievances that post revolutionary America harbored against Britain. Bill's imprisonments story goes on to become unambiguous parable of the rite of passage to cultural maturity, from a comparatively egalitarian "study of nature" community abroad the rights of man to the Bellopotent's more hierarchical and advanced society, dominated by rule of law. Through the figure of Billy the notion of American difference is insinuated only to be preempted and repressed except on a kind of nostalgic after glow. "Billy Budd" is a dramatic instance of American literature dwelling upon the idea of transition to cultural maturity. It provides an image of postcolonial anxiety.

Melville published ten major books in the eleven years between 1846 and 1857. His first two novels *Typee* (1846) and *Omoo* (1847), fictionalized his experiences in the South Pacific and met with some success. They represented the only meaningful success he was to enjoy in his lifetime and led to his rueful prediction that he would be remembered, if at all, as the man who lived among cannibals. Melville's *Mardi* (1849), a strange South Sea romance filled with enigmatic symbols. In *Redburn* (1849) the protagonist's takes the form not of unlettered Adomism but of his internalization of his father's gentle Anglophilia. In *Israel Potter*, it takes the form of Israel's never grasping that the republican establishment is just as self interested, in its own way, as the imperia. His *White Jacket* and *Moby Dick* innocence takes the form of not realizing at first how imperial forms persist in American enterprise.

Melville's one of the most famous books *Moby Dick*, (1851) about the great White Whale and the monomaniacal search for it by Captain Ahab, met with indifference from critics and the reading public. He published three more novels, *Pierre* (1852), a strange and confusing account of incest; *Israel Potter* (1855), a historical novel; *The Confidence Man* (1857), about a trip by a swindler down the Mississippi aboard the steamer *Fidele*; and a distinguished collection of short stories, *The Piazza Tales* (1856) which includes such classics as *Benito Cereno*, *Bartleby the Scrivener* and *The Encantadas*.

Melville was a writer who composed texts relentlessly and we know him by his texts; not just what he printed but what he also wrote in revision. Melville suffered the loss of a parent at an early age, when he was twelve. Children can pass a power to contain suffering in ways that ripen loss into sympathy for all suffering and all lose beyond their infant sphere, he was such. As a writer he pledged allegiance, not to a flag but to a heart. He understood human misery, depressive, more or less from time to time. Melville as a sea writer describes the life of a sea in *Billy Budd* through the protagonist Billy. Because the sea was a current that brought him to a sense of identity beyond himself; and floating in that current he wrote of being and consciousness. In facing up to darkness, he writes about the slaves and labors. Melville did this with "Bartleby, the Scrivener", which tells the story of mid-nineteenth century class struggle in New-York and contemporaneous discourse about those struggles.

Melville's "Bartleby, the Scrivener" is more than just a parable of the heartlessness of capitalism. The story is complex meditation on the structure and working of capitalism and a circulation under capitalism in which this strange apparition of Bartleby allows us to reconsider Marxist analysis of the commodity in terms of the spatiality of capitalism itself.

Though Melville's "Billy Budd" a piece of literature has received some influential reviews and interpretations from certain writers. In the reviews, some attempts have been made but not single approach is picked up to deal with the central character and the theme interpellation of individual through the capitalist ideology. My study is selective to the character of Billy and his situation, position from "Billy Budd". And the character of Bartleby, his position, from "Bartleby, the Scrivener", in terms of capitalist ideology. Some relevant ideas, critical responses and opinions on "Billy Budd" and "Bartleby, the Scrivener" can be drawn here which are in relation to the theories of realism, existentialism, psychoanalysis and so on.

James Gunn has analyzed the novella "Billy Budd" in realistic point of view. He finds the action of the story similar to the Napoleonic wars. He claims:

Melville makes the situation even more compelling by placing the action of the story in 1997, during the Napoleonic wars, when Britain's navy was the chief barrier to an invasion by France, during a time when the British navy still impressed (or placed aboard by France) part of it's crew, and during the year of a famous mutiny in the British fleet.

(x-xi)

Gunn also analyzes the novella to the Christian story by describing Billy's fate, accepts once and crucifixion. He opines, "Billy's acceptance of his fate is as essential to the novel as Christ's acceptance of his crucifixion, to the Christian story" (xii).

Another critic Warner Berthoff examines the novella allegorically. He says:

The ground common to most discussion of Billy Budd is the assumption that the story is allegorical- a narrative representation of some universal truth or law or balance of contraries, a parable of Good

and Evil, a reenactment of the fall, a projected myth of the ritual killing which is also a resurrection, and so on. (334)

Berthoff prefers to show the parable of good and evil, confrontation between innocence and society, question of purity, execution, fatalism as well as legal sense at the same time in this novella.

Richard Harter Fogle emphasizes the novel having a story of a moral and good sailor who is executed showing the insoluble dilemma of loss and achievement. He opines, "Billy Budd is a tragedy, in that it presents an action of great magnitude which develops a dilemma insoluble without loss of one good in the preservation or achievement to another" (190-91).

Melville's "Bartleby, the Scrivener" too has received both hostile and favorable criticism and reviews since its publication. Harold Bloom opines that "Whose Stubbs resistance relates to Melville's own refusal to go on witting what the world expected to his and was willing to purchase. "I would prefer not to" is at once Bartleby's and Melville's stance." (1) For him there does seem to be a strange autobiographical allegory in Bartleby.

Christopher Kendrick comments the novel "Bartleby" as a paradise gain, rewriting on Melton's paradise Regained. He writes:

Melville is rewriting on aspect of the relationship between satan and the son in paradise Regained, in the ambiguous reference of the two simil's that Caps the pinnacle temptation, they are interchangeable somehow, both monsters, both riddles. The logic indicated would seem to go something as follows: satan has tempted Jesus with various worldly means to messiah ship and Jesus, in refusing and putting a distance between himself and satan, has finally taught satan that he

satan himself- precisely insofar as he's made himself out to be the world – is Jesus' means. Bartleby is drawing a similarly portentous moral from and for the real – estate lawyer whose aim is to reduce risk and live comfortably. (111)

Here Kendrick analyzes the novella to the story of Christ's sacrifice and deliverance of humans from this doom of history, of falling again and again.

Andre Furloni comments the novella on the basis of Socratic Method. As he writes;

Bartleby exhibits no over debt to Socratic practice, and to assert a meaningful affinity between the withdrawn scrivener and the gregarious philosopher seems only more preposterous than pervious efforts to trace Bartleby's ancestry to Melville's literary contemporaries, to his friends, to Jesus Christ, to Buddha, to various psychiatric patients. (335)

In the novella, the Scrivener who scarcely qualifies as a human being has undergone sufficient comparisons with celebrated authors, the founders of world religions and psychotics.

Bartleby, according to Frank Ientricchia and Jodi Mc Auliffe, is “an orphan without obligation to the social system, the unnourished orphan who owes nothing” (128). Contrary to this statement Lawrence would argue, “Bartley's obligation to the system is enacted precisely through his radical passivity” (89).

Psychoanalytic critics of Melville's “Bartleby” have been remarkably consistent in their diagnoses of the enigmatic scrivener as schizophrenic. Dennis R. Perry opines:

In 'Bartleby' all of the major characters vainly attempt to use ego defense mechanisms to reduce the anxiety produced by the sterile activities of the law office. These mechanisms discernible along to continuum, are most clearly manifested in the characters compulsive behavior, the tale documenting the way they ultimately fail to wall out the natural impulses of the id with the artificial social conventions erected by the ego. (408-9)

With the reference to these critical responses from various critics that reflect their own perceptions; it is worthwhile to explore the interpellation of individual because of capitalist ideology from these novels. This aspect has remained undone which is vehemently different from other responses and perspectives. So my study is directed to deal with it in the chapters to come.

My working methodology on exploring the interpellation of the individual because of capitalist ideology will be primarily text based. Regarding the basic theoretical framework, I will be using the key ideas of the neo-Marxist Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Terry Eagleton and other Marxists also in order to prove my hypothesis.

The present research is divided into four chapters. The first chapter introduces the research's hypothesis, the author and his tendency, the text it's literature review, my point of departure regarding text and the tools. The second chapter focuses on the methodology which is developed to prove the hypothesis. The third chapter is related to textual analysis which is primarily text based. And the final chapter concludes the research.

II. Neo- Marxism and Ideology

Marxist theory is the social, political and economic theory of the German philosopher Karl Marx. Marx, the nineteenth century German Jewish-born atheist, socialist, philosopher, economist, journalist and revolutionary, often in collaboration with Friedrich Engels, developed a critique of society, which he claimed was both scientific and revolutionary. Marx proposes model of history in which economic and political conditions determine social conditions. They were responding capitalism. Appropriately, these theories are formulated specifically to analyze how society functions in a state of upheaval and constant change.

Marx is highly regarded for his theory of socialism best expressed in *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). He is famous for the analysis of history in terms of class struggles, as summed up in the opening line of the introduction of *The Communist Manifesto*: “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (21).

Within Marx’s dialectical account of history is the idea that a given individual’s social being is determined by larger political and economic forces. Simply stated, the social class into which a person is born determines their outlook and viewpoints. For Marx, economic, political and social dimensions are the determinants of human consciousness. In *German Ideology*, he says, “Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life” (625). The economic condition of people determines how they develop language, law, politics, morality, religion and art too. Marx further says:

Men are the producers of there conceptions idea etc - real, active men as they are conditioned by development of their productive forces and of the intercourse to these, up to the furthest forms. Consciousness

can never be anything else than consciousness existence, and existence of man is their actual life process. (625)

Here Marx means that production of ideas; conceptions etc are directly related to the material reality.

Marx addressed a wide range of issues of alienation and exploitation of the workers and individuals, the capitalist mode of production and historical materialism.

Marx believes:

All mental (ideological) systems are the products of real social and existence. The material interests of dominant social class determine how people see human existence, individual and collective. Legal systems are not the pure manifestations of human, divine reason but ultimately reflect the interests of the dominant class in particular historical period. (24-25)

Marxism disapproves the bourgeois economics, political and social mechanism. Using Hegel's theory of dialectic, which suggests that history progresses through the resolution of contradiction within a particular aspect of reality. Marx and Engel posit a materialist account of history that focuses upon the struggles and tensions within society. As society forms more complex modes of production, it becomes increasingly stratified and the resulting tensions necessitate changes in society. Marx then expands this concept of determination into one of the central concept of Marxism, that of base and superstructure. The base is the economic system on which superstructure rests; cultural activities such as philosophy or literature belong to the superstructure. To Marxist critics, a society's economic base determines the interests and style of its literature; it is this relationship between determining base and determined superstructure.

‘Ideology’ is a set of ideas characteristic of particular social group or class. Ideology, a way of looking at and interpreting of living in the world is the process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life. It also conveys something as general as a system of ideas and beliefs either true or false. Nobody has yet come up with a single adequate definition of ideology. The term ‘ideology’ has a rich history, during which it has taken on various meanings. It is a text woven of a whole tissue of different conceptual strand; it is traced through by divergent histories. Some early definitions of it are related with the interest of the dominant social or political class or power as a distorted and illusionary body of ideas. In this regard, it is defined as a body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group or class; ideas or false ideas, which help to legitimate a dominant political power; as forms of thought motivated by social interests; as socially necessary illusion. Some later definitions of ideology see it as a form of discourse related with power, identity and meaning in life.

Ideology has been widely used in the discourse of political theory, particularly in Marxist theory because Marxism always seeks to be not just narrowly political theory but a more comprehensive kind of theory. Ideology, in fact has become the term through which Marxists have been trying to articulate in various ways.

Ideology is applicable in different changing variety of social apparatuses: the family, churches, schools, sports, networks, films, and in courts, news, political systems and so on. However, ideology is well-known expression that was invented by Cabanis, Destutt de Tracy and their friends, who assigned it to be an object the theory of ideas. When Marx took up this term fifty years later, he gave it a quite different meaning and opined, “Ideology is the system of the ideas and representations, which determines the mind of a man or a social group” (120).

Marx believes that the superstructure is determined by the base. Ideologies are the changing ideas, values and feelings through which individuals experience their societies. Marx takes economic forces as the base and define laws, literature and education only as the superstructure because they are highly controlled by the capitalist forces. As Justein Gaarder writes in *Sophie's World*, "The way a society thinks what kind of political institutions there are, which laws it has and not least, what there is of religion, morals, art, philosophy and science Marx called society's superstructure"(393). They present the dominant ideas and values as the belief of society as a whole, thus preventing individuals from seeing how society actually functions, literature as a cultural production is a form of ideology, one that legitimizes the power of the ruling class. It is doubtful that Marx and Engels themselves took such a deterministic approach to literature. In their work literature is not merely a passive reflection of economic base although they conceded that literature cannot change society or base in itself they suggested that literature can be an active element in such change.

Marxist critics have interpreted Marx's theories in different ways. As Marxists they eventually return to a few central Marxist concepts: Marxist literary critics tend to look for tension and contradictions within literary works. This is appropriate because Marxism was originally formulated to analyze just such tensions and contradictions within the society. Marxist literary critics see literature as intimately linked to social power, and thus their analysis of literature is linked to large social questions. Since Marxism is a belief system which can be used to analyze society at the most detected level. Marxist literary criticism is ultimately part of a much larger effort to uncover the inner working of the society. Marxist criticism is materialist, so it has more in common with theories that focus upon how literature functions within

social, political and economic structures then it does with theories that focus only upon the text.

Gramsci and Hegemony

Gramsci is a historicist Marxist who believes that truth is historically variable, relative to the consciousness of the most progressive social class of a particular epoch. Objectivity, he writes always means 'humanity objective'. Ideas are true in so far as they serve to cover and promote though forms of consciousness which are in true with the most significant tendencies of an era.

Gramsci believes that revolutions, while they may be facilitated by shifts in the economic structure, are also fought out and their outcome is decided on the level of 'ideologies'. He devotes an enormous amount of attention to conflict between different systems of ideas. The major source for Gramsci's conception of the relationship between ideology and political power is Marx and Engel's *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). It announced that "the ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class" (114). This is the so-called 'dominant ideology' which suggests that the class which is economically dominant will try to impose its own peculiar way of seeing the world on society as a whole. The realm of ideology becomes a field of class conflict and it is this battle which sets out to study using the concept of 'hegemony'.

It means the nexus of material and ideological instruments through which the ruling class maintains its power. Gramsci reserves the term 'ideology' for pure consciousness, and he proposes to distinguish between historically organic ideologies though that is, which are necessary to given structure and ideologies that are arbitrary, rationalistic or 'willed' (114). He claims:

Marxism represents distinct advance and historically is precisely in opposition to ideology. Indeed the meaning which the term 'ideology' has assumed in Marxist philosophy implicitly contains a negative value judgment and excludes the possibility for its founders (i.e. Marx and Engel) the origin of ideas should be sought for in sensations. (114)

Gramsci reacts against the notion of ideology as false consciousness asserting that "all systems have an historical validity, and are necessary" (115). This involves a reaction against the belief that ideology is a mere reflection of material circumstances.

The effect of these advances is to thrust and immense importance on to the sphere of ideas. Gramsci points out:

Material factors are only ever expressed and understood through consciousness, and that developments in the history of consciousness can thus be more significant than economic changes: it may be ruled out that immediate economic crises of themselves produce fundamental historical events; they can simply create a terrain more favorable to the dissemination of certain modes of thought because 'popular beliefs' and similar ideas are themselves material forces, any revolutionary theory must deal with class conflict on the level of ideas at least as much as in the economic arena. (115)

For him, "the material sphere is itself a structure which may be allied with and analogous to, but does not 'support', a 'superstructure' of ideas" (115).

These ideas are institutionalized in 'civil society', the law courts, the bureaucracy, the religious and educational systems and the mass media. In this regard Gramsci opines:

Hegemony arises from the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that its interest is the interest of all. Domination is thus asserted not by force not even the necessarily by active persuasion, but by a mere subtle and inclusive power over the economy, and over state apparatuses such as education and media by which the ruling classes interest is present as the common interest and thus comes to be taken for granted. (44)

Gramsci investigates why the ruling class was so successful in promoting its own interests in society. Gramsci questions the classic Marxist view that a proletarian revolution was the inevitable consequence of the economic division of labor between the worker and the capitalist, and that ideology would disappear once capitalism was overthrown. Gramsci emphasizes that “dominant ideological intuitions such as political parties, the church, education, the media and bureaucracy also play an important role actual to that of capital –labor contact- in maintaining relations of ruling” (197). Gramsci proposes the more complex and flexible term hegemony to emphasize how people’s everyday lives and identities are defined in and through dominant social structures that are relatively autonomous of economic relation.

The crucial difference between classic Marxist accounts of ideology and Gramsci’s definition of hegemony is that classic Marxist account of ideology as ‘false consciousness’ suggests an element of manipulation, deception, even coercion; where as hegemony depends on the consent and agreement of the individual. He remarks:

With the effect that the theoretical analysis of the concept of ideology has been modified and denatured; Ideology has been too often seen as pure appearance or more obtuseness’ where as distinction must in fact

be drawn between ‘historically organic ideology- those necessary to a given social structure- and ideology in the sense of the arbitrary speculations of individuals’. (198-99)

In his *Prison Notebook*, he rejects out of hand purely negative use of the term ideology. This ‘bad’ sense of the term has become widespread. He says:

The consciousness of subordinated groups in society is typically fissured and uneven. Two conflicting conceptions of the world usually exist in such ideologies, the one drawn from the ‘official’ notions of rulers, the other derived from an oppressed people’s practical experience of social reality. Such conflicting might take the form of what we have seen earlier as a ‘performative contradiction’ between what a groups or class says, space what tacitly reveals into behavior. (199)

The capitalist system survives on account of the social division between various groups it exploits. As Gramsci argues, the consciousness of the oppressed is usually a contradictory amalgam of values imbibed from their rulers, and notions which spring more directly from their practical experienced purely technocratic forms of management play central role in the public values to the advanced capitalist societies.

Louis Althusser and Ideology

Louis Althusser, the French Marxist philosopher, has had a major influence on Marxist literary theory. Althusser’s most influential contribution to literary and cultural studies has been his theory of ideology. For Althusser, “Ideology is the imaginary way in which people experience their real lives, the ideal representation of a material process” (121). It means that ideology distorts our view of our true conditions of existence. He represents two theses of ideology; one is negative

concerns with the object which is 'represented' in the imaginary form of ideology: the second one is positive concerns with the materiality of ideology. We find different ideologies: capitalist ideology, religious ideology, ethical ideology, legal ideology, political ideology and so on.

For Althusser, ideology works through so-called 'Ideological State Apparatuses' that include the political system, educational system and all social institutions. Althusser's essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", comprising from a longer work, on the reproduction of production relations, he addresses the question of how societies reproduce the relations of production by which they function. The question arises because production relations have always been relations of exploitation. How is it that the exploited allow themselves to continue to be exploited? In answering this question, Althusser develops the ideological state apparatus. In Marxist theory the state is thought of first and foremost as the state apparatus, that is as the sum of the institutions by which the ruling class maintains its economic dominance--the government, the civil service, the courts, the police, the prisons, the army and so on. Through a symptomatic reading of the history of Marxist political practice- in which he argues, "The state has always been treated as a more complex reality than Marxist theory has made it explicit" (83). Althusser claims that the state apparatus in fact consists of two overlapping but distinct sets of institutions, on the one it consists of all that Marxist theory has so far recognized as part of the state apparatus--the repressive institutions through which the ruling class enforces its rule as such. Althusser calls this the 'Repressive States Apparatus'. He writes:

The State Apparatus (SA) contains: the Government, the Administration, the Courts, the Police, the Prisons, and the Army

which constitute what I shall in future call the Repressive States Apparatus Repressive suggests that the state apparatus in question ‘functions by violence.’ –at least ultimately (since repression) e.g. administrative repression, may take non-physical forms. Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) are apparently distinct and specialized institutions such as; the religious ISA (the system of the different churches), the educational ISA (the system of the different public and private schools), the family ISA, the legal ISA, political ISA, trade union ISA, the communications ISA (press, radio and television etc.), the cultural ISA (literature, arts, sports etc.). (83-84)

The Repressive State Apparatus functions primarily ‘by violence’, and the ideological state apparatus functions primarily ‘by ideology’.

Althusser further writes:

Each mass ejected in route is practically provided with the ideology that suits the role it has to fulfill in class society: the role of the exploited (with a highly developed ‘professional’, ‘ethical’, ‘civic’, national and a political consciousness) the role of the agent of exploitation (ability to give the workers orders and speak to them; ‘human relations’) of the agent of repression (ability to give orders and enforce obedience without discussion or ability to manipulate the demagoguery of a political leader’s rhetoric) or of the professional ideologist ability to treat consciousness with the respect, i.e. with the contempt, blackmail and demagoguery. They deserve, adapted to the accents of morality of virtue, of ‘transcendence’, of the Nation. (86)

He argues that each group is educated in terms of the ideology that fits its best to its role in society.

The reflection that the individual subject is only apparently the origin of his ideas and beliefs that leads Althusser to his central thesis on 'ideology' "that hails or interpellates individuals as subject" (88). By this, Althusser means first of all that the most fundamental category of ideology- the category on which is founded all other ideological categories and concepts are that of the 'subject'. The concept of the subject is one in which an individual human being is believed to be the independent origin of his/ her own thoughts action and emotions. He defines, "It is ideology that causes individuals whose lives are in reality determine by their insertion in a complex series of social practices to believe that they are free subject, the origin and source of their thoughts emotions and actions"(89). Althusser writes:

Ideology 'acts' or 'functions' in such a way that it recruits subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or 'transforms' the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by that very precise operation which I have called interpellation or hailing, and which can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing; Hey, you there! (89)

Althusser argues that the 'subject' of the ideology- Christian is addressed or interpellated by the ISA of the church. They are told that God became a human being like them, and that as human beings they will become like God. It is in terms like these that Christian understands themselves and act. Althusser discerns in this system of thought and practice several important aspects of the way in which ideology interpellates individuals as subjects. He writes, "All this procedure to set up Christian religious subjects is dominated by a strange phenomenon: the fact that there only be

such a multitude of possible religious subjects on the absolute condition that there is a Unique Absolute, Other Subject i.e. God” (90).

The Christian Ideology that interpellates, individual as subject firstly insofar as it posits another subject-- a kind of primal and complete subject-- with the concept of God. Within the Christian ISA, individuals learn to think of themselves and act as subjects insofar as they are addressed as much by the great subject who precedes them. Althusser argues that this is a feature of all ideology. Second, Althusser argues that the subjects of ideology are ‘subjects’ within the Christian ISA the subjects are called upon to obey God. The subjects, as Althusser puts it, are ‘subjected to the subject.’ Ideology does not just interpellate the individuals as subjects in the sense that Althusser defines “ a subject as a subjected being one who submits to a higher authority and is therefore stripped of all freedom except that freely accepting his submission” (90). Althusser writes:

The individual is interpellated as a (free) subject in order that he shall submit freely to the commandments of the subject i. e. in order that he shall make the gestures and actions of his subjection ‘all by himself’.

There are no subjects except by and for their subjection. That is why they work all by themselves. (91)

Ideology, for Althusser, is the name of all the discourse in the society that does not, like science, represent the reality of the society. It is the way in which men and women ‘live’ in their relationship to reality; it represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real condition of existence. In this most influential essay, Althusser argues that ideologies exist materially as a set of practices within an institution, an ideological state apparatus or ISA. An ISA, Althusser argues, is an institution that functions primarily by ideology; and primarily by the ruling ideology

in a given society. This social function is secured by the repressive state apparatus, which functions primarily by force. The university the discipline of literary studies, the publishing industry and the various cultural industries such as the cinema and the media are all ISAs. Although a site of oppositional ideologies, they function primarily to perpetuate the ruling ideologies of the capitalist society, most fundamental among which is the humanist ideology of the subject. All ideologies, even before the rise of the bourgeoisie, for Althusser, 'interpellates individuals as subjects'.

Terry Eagleton and Ideology

Terry Eagleton, a British literary critic and one of the most influential Marxist literary intellectuals, was the student of the Marxist literary critic Raymond Williams. He began his career studying the literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and then he switched to Marxist literary theory in the vein of Williams. *Literary Theory: An Introduction* his best work, traces history of the contemporary study of text, from the Romantics of the nineteenth century to the postmodernists of the last few decades.

Eagleton's thought remains firmly rooted in the Marxist tradition, and he has written critically on more recent modes of thought such as *Criticism and Ideology* (1976), *Marxist and Literary Criticism* (1976), *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (1983), and *Ideology: An Introduction* (1991). He is anti-post modernist and anti-structuralist. He vigorously attacks his contemporary Marxist who appears to be liberal towards the detached new developments in the field of culture. He strongly opposes the view point of Machery and Louis Althusser, the Marxist structuralist theoreticians.

In *Criticism and Ideology* (1976) in particular Eagleton works critically within the problematic of Althusser and Machery in order to develop a scientific practice of

literary criticism. For him “ideology has to do not only with belief systems but also with questions Of power, on one of its levels it involves legitimating the power of dominant social group or class”(283). According to Eagleton, this process of legitimation comprises promoting the beliefs and values of that group or class. Naturalizing and universalizing those beliefs and values (i.e. making them seem natural rather than historical, universal rather than contingent), denigrating and excluding rival beliefs and values, and obscuring the class structure of society.

Eagleton defines ideology in six different ways in a progressive sharpening of focus. In *Ideology: An Introduction* he writes:

The general material process of production of ideas, beliefs and values in social life such as a definition is both politically and epistemologically natural, and is close to the boarder meaning of the whole complex of signifying practices and symbolic processes in a particular society. (28)

Through this definition he assumes the social determination of thought, it operates more in the realm of sociological description than in the realm of socialist theory.

A second, slightly less general meaning of ideology “turns on and beliefs (where true or false) which symbolize the conditions and life-experiences of a specific, socially significant group or class” (29). Here the term is akin to ‘world view’ without necessarily having the same philosophical seriousness.

The third definition turns on the relations and conflicts between social groups or classes as they attempt to promote and legitimate their interests in the face of opposing interests. “Ideology appears here as a suasive or rhetorical rather than a veridical kind of speech, concerned less with the situation ‘as it is’ than with the production of certain useful effects for political purposes” (284).

According to Eagleton, a fourth meaning of ideology, “would retain this emphasis on the promotion and legitimation of sectorial interests, but confine it to the activities of a dominant social power” (29). But this term, he goes on to say, “is still epistemologically neutral and can thus be refined into a fifth definition, in which ideology signifies ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interests of ruling group or class specifically by distortion and dissimulation” (30). Yet he is honest enough to admit that, on this last definition it is hard to know what to call a politically oppositional discourse which promotes and seeks to legitimate the interests of a subordinate group or class by such devices as the naturalizing and cloaking of its real interests. Finally, for Eagleton, “There is the possibility of a sixth meaning of ideology, which retains an emphasis on false or deceptive beliefs but regards such belief as arising not from the interests of a dominant class but from the material structure of society as a whole” (30).

Marx’s theory of the fetishism of commodities would be an instance of this, for if social phenomenon ceases to be recognizable as a product of human activity, then it is easy for people to reify them, to perceive them as material things and thus to accept their existence as natural and inevitable. Eagleton argues:

The actual relations between human beings are governed by the apparently autonomous interactions of the commodities they produce [. . .] Men and women fashion products which then come to escape their control and determine the condition of their existence [. . .] society is no longer perceptible as a human construct. (285)

In capitalist society the commodity form permeates every aspect of social life, taking the shape of pervasive mechanization, quantification, and dehumanization of human experience. The wholeness of society is broken up into many discrete, specialized,

technical operations, each which comes to assume a semi-autonomous life of its own and a quasi –natural force. Thus for him, Ideological mystification arises from the material structure of society as a whole. It is built into the system, commodities exercising a tyrannical sway over social relations in general.

Much traditional talk of ideology has been couched in terms of consciousness and ideas which have their appropriate uses in the direction of idealism.

Consciousness is a kind of reification, an abstraction from our actual forms of discursive practice. After the linguistic revolution of the twentieth century, there was a shift from thinking of words in terms of concepts to thinking of concepts in terms of words. Instead of holding on empiricist view that words stand for concepts, we now think to see having a concept as the capacity to use words in particular ways.

The term ideology has a whole range of meanings that is related with power, identity, meaning in social life, class, ideas and so on. It is not only limited in such a demarcation but also has a hard mission. An ideology is never a simple reflection of complex phenomenon, which may consist of ambiguous vague, contradictory views of the world.

Gramsci's theory of hegemony is tied to his conception of the capitalist state which he claims rules through force plus consent. He divides the state between 'political society', which is the arena of political institutions and legal constitutional control and 'civil society', which is commonly seen as the private or non state sphere, including the economy. The intermediary institutions in the civil society- school, church, family, newspaper and so on count hegemonic apparatus involves to the ruling power by consent. Coercion is reserved for the state for the legitimating of violence. Thus, Gramsci focuses on the role of civil society in capitalist social formation and on its control. These institutions play a hegemonic role as ruling

hegemony, whereas for Althusser there are ruling ideological state apparatuses in contemporary capitalist social formation. He lists a relatively large number of ideological state apparatus in contemporary capitalist social formation: the educational state apparatus, the family state apparatus, the legal state apparatus, the political state apparatus, the communication state apparatus and so on. Along with Ideological State Apparatuses there are State Apparatuses such as legal, army, court apparatuses.

The present research will forecast the light on Melville's "Bartleby, the Scrivener" and "Billy Budd" to explore the interpellation of individuals by capitalist ideology. This research will be moved forward with the help of Marxist ideology and provides capitalism a baseline to interpret the text in which men are interpellated through capitalist ideology.

III. Interpellation of individuals in Melville's "Bartleby, the Scrivener" and "Billy Budd"

Resistance to Capitalist Ideology in "Bartleby, the Scrivener"

Herman Melville's novellas "Billy Budd" and "Bartleby, the Scrivener" present the dramatic instance of the American literature dwelling upon the Capitalist ideology. The interpellation of the characters especially the protagonists of both of these novellas is forced to suffer even the characters are conscious about their existence as they realize that there is nobody to determine their existence.

Thematically ambiguous, these novellas raise complex issues of the individual human identity, oppressed by social forces, ideological state apparatus as (ISA) and also by state apparatus (SA), the power of capitalism, hegemony and so on. Melville insists on concrete interpellation of individual through the capitalist ideology.

Melville's successful novella "Bartleby, the Scrivener" portrays the relationship between the lawyer-narrator of the story and his employees and especially Bartleby. Having received the office of master in chancery the lawyer-narrator requires additional help. Bartleby's entrance is announced: "In answer to my advertisement, a motionless young man one morning stood upon my office threshold, the door being open, for it was summer'. I can see that figure now--pallidly neat, pitiably respectable, incurably forlorn! It was Bartleby" (913). At the early stage, Bartleby functions without resistance. The lawyer-narrator describes it in this way:

At first, Bartleby did an extraordinarily quantity of writing. As if long famishing for something to copy, he seemed to gorge himself on my documents. There was no pause for digestion. He ran a day and night line, copying by sunlight and by candle-light. I should have been quite

delighted with his application, had he been cheerfully industrious. But he wrote on silently, palely, mechanically. (913)

Three days later, the lawyer calls Bartleby to examine a paper with its original without moving from his privacy, Bartleby, in a singularly mild, firm voice, replied “I would prefer not to” (914). It is here the resistance in the narrative emerges over the first few times Bartleby utters, “I would prefer not to” (914).

The elderly narrator who narrates “Bartleby” depicts himself as a benevolent and prosperous representative of established liberal American values. He says, “I am a rather elderly man” (908). He portrays himself as cautious, admiring wealth, prone to sentimentality, indulgent, conventionally pious and content. The attorney possesses a faith in power and dignity of reason, as he understands these concepts. In his narrative, the lawyer is conducting his own defence saying I am rather ‘safe’. The inner story in “Bartleby” and this relationship is relationship between the two classes of society.

Bartleby, one time clerk in the Dead Letter Office and now the narrator’s copier of legal document, has come at last to the ultimate denial “I would prefer not to” he responds to each request:

“Bartleby! Quick I am waiting”

I heard a slow scrape of his chair legs on the uncarpeted floor, and soon he appeared standing at the entrance of his hermitage.

What is wanted? said, he mildly.

“The copies of the copies,” said I, hurriedly “we are going to examine them there” and I held towards him the forth quadruplicating

“I would prefer not to”, he said and gently disappeared behind the screen. (914)

Bartleby's refusal to copy the documents means his refusal to obey the capitalist order. Bartleby addresses not only the market in labor but also that in land, not only explanation but also homelessness.

As the attorney immediately discovers Bartleby is no more content to fulfill the tedious tasks, this is the movement when Bartleby first refuses to obey an order. He displays a degree of willfulness and a streak of insubordination, carrying the implied forces of challenge, even a threat, to the pragmatic order of the attorney's office.

Bartleby is the only one in the office who obviously will take no encouragement from the lawyer and society for which he stands because he has the clearest perception of the nature of his life under capitalism.

Time and again Bartleby prefers not to carry out the lawyer's order to verify the accuracy of the copy, after hearing his discussion to give up copying for good, the lawyer dismisses him in addition to salary owed, offering twenty dollars as charity.

Bartleby refuses to perform the mechanical, self degrading work the lawyer demands from him. Bartleby's revolt is certainly more obviously antagonistic than anything the lawyer has to contend with other adult characters has their own mild and tolerable means of showing dissatisfaction with their work. They have illusion of a grand future career in law and of indulging in drinking.

Turkey and Nippers are similar characters; each is a useful employee about half the time, the former in the morning and the latter in the afternoon. So, they are practically and symbolically complementary. Each is irritable and does poor work at different times, and each has his own way of seeking solace from this dry husky sort of business, in which they are little more than machines and not very likely to be any more than that. No one actually complains directly about the work load. Bartleby

steadily refuses all favors to simplify or change his labor. Finding a position for him in society is fundamentally a moral concern. However, the labor issues, so to speak, is a significant part of the master worker relationship under which the clerk protests.

The consequence of the competitive system has been selected in the office atmosphere. Nippers suffer from the physical discomforts of hours at his desk doing tedious work, but also from a sense of the lowliness of his position. He is always trying to adjust the height of his desk. It objectifies an antagonist to his ambitions. His 'position' physically and figuratively is powerful to him. It weakens his backbone – as he tries to work his way into the legal system. Nipper's response to the lawyer's order is through unwillingness to copy. This is the real picture of the proletariat in the society as an economic base. As the narrator observes, "While Nipper, twitchily in his chair with a dyspeptic nervousness, ground out, between his set teeth, occasional heaving maledictions against the stubborn of behind the screen" (915-16).

The lawyer, socially secure and economically prosperous, cannot express such a clear distinction because it would contradict his consciously held Wall Street values. The lawyer is careful to keep his clerks physically isolated, as required defensive action from him, Bartleby behind folding screen and, Turkey and Nippers in the office. The lay-out of the lawyer's chamber, reflects the capitalist system, commercial success and subjugation. The profession of law is itself hierarchical. Every legal document is part of an ideal representation system.

Another point is that the lawyer's work is related to 'mortgages' and title deeds and record of testimony in his fight court of chancery. This court often deals with financial claims. The lawyer is a kind of accessory to and an instrumental of society that is essentially corrupt as it places no value on individuals who cannot or it

will not fit into the social system. The lawyer recognizes that his office is completely in charge of life.

Bartleby's passive resistance and his passivity somehow irritate the lawyer and thereby ensures tension, which continues throughout the narrative. The remainder of the narrative serves for the most part to demonstrate the fixed fact of Bartleby's responses and the conditions by which it is given. The lawyer asks, 'you will not' to which Bartleby clarifies, 'I prefer not'.

Bartleby totally gives up copying the legal document though he continues to be at the office ceasing even to fulfill his role as scrivener, he is given notice but he does not leave. At first Bartleby is read, in one way, through the lawyer's consciousness, perceptions and self-deceptions. Just as Bartleby gives up copying, the narrator himself gives up the rhetoric of dispassionate reason and embraces benevolence as his model of framing Bartleby. The lawyer moves to another building on Wall Street, leaving Bartleby behind in the same building. Bartleby is arrested by the landlord of the office. Here truth is derived that the great community of celibates is nothing more than a company which certainly does not keep the rich people from exploiting the poor and pallid workers. In fact, the life of the unlawful nippers and the figure of the Bartleby resist legality and thereby bring justice to appearance.

In social relations, the lawyer occupies the privileged normative position, so he does not accept social change. Similarly, the lawyer's inability to see social relations as constituted by the relations of economic power represents the false ideologies of the contemporaneous capitalist. And, repression works in 'Bartleby' on another level.

In capitalism, suffering simply displays an inability to cope, complete or control one's life – which is why Bartleby is such an affront to the law office.

Suffering moves from an older era's opportunity for salvation to modernity's smarting rebuke. The suffering body moves from the centre of a biblical narrative to the margin of a market order where it represents the unemployable.

Bartleby is unknowable, nothing is ascertainable about him; he never answers. Nevertheless, the narrator insistently describes to the unendurable suffering to Bartleby that is dependent on the narrator's own imagination, interpretation of Bartleby's subjectivity. The narrator is a vastly more available store of cultural capital together with Bartleby's refusal to participate in what might somewhat anachronistically be called his own diagnosis not only to give the narrator the authority to speak for Bartleby but also grant him the privilege of imagination what it is like to be Bartleby. The narrator narrates:

It seemed to me that, while I had been addressing him, he carefully revolved statements that I made; fully comprehended the meaning; could not gainsay the irresistible conclusion; but, at the sometime, some paramount consideration prevailed with him to reply as he did. "You are decided, then not to comply with my request a request made according to common usage and common sense?"

He briefly gave me to understand, that on that point my judgment was second. Yes: his decision was irreversible. (915)

The narrator's claim to commonality and fraternity with Bartleby unleashes streams of sad fancies. When a man is browbeaten in some unprecedented and violently unreasonable way, he begins to stagger in his own plainest faith. Bartleby never drinks beer like Turkey, or tea and coffee even, like other men, nor does he visit any refectory or eating house. The lawyer constructs a narrative not just of Bartleby life. The narrator mentions that he hired Bartleby to help handle the increased workload

accruing to the lawyer's assumptions of the position of master of Chancery'. He complains that he enjoyed the benefits of the, only a few years because of the sudden and violent abrogation of the office by the new constitution.

Bartleby excludes proletarian class consciousness or leaps forth, remaining a mute sit, his own style of protest, against his employer. Turkey and Nippers, while driven to alcoholism and ulcers by low wages and psychologically debilitating work, do not possess the Divine fire of rebellion. Indeed, it has been illustrated that the social relations in lawyer's office are more reflective phase of full blown capitalism.

After Bartleby's first refusal to proof read his own copy, the lawyer complains; "should have violently dismissed him from the premises" (914). Then Bartleby has stopped working altogether, the lawyer tries to remove him from premises. He faces strong resistance when lawyer begins to reason with him: "These are your own copies we are about to examine. It is labor serving to you, because owe examination will answer for your four papers It is common usage. Every copyist is bound to help examine his copy. Is it not so? Will you not speak? Answer!" (915).

Bartleby, being a victim of capitalist ideology, critiques capitalism and the fact is registered through Bartleby's varied refusals. Of course, Bartleby refuses to do his job as a copyist, but his refusal goes far beyond the extreme of his refusal of taking food. Bartleby lives only on ginger nuts. By the end of the story Bartleby has been imprisoned in the prophetic tombs, the grub-man asks of the lawyer;

"His dinner is ready; won't he dine today, either? Or does he live without dining?"

"Lives without dining! said (Lawyer) and closed the eyes"

"Eh! -he's asleep, are not her?"

'With kings and counselors,' murmured I. (934)

There is no denying that Bartleby is alien that he does not belong to the world of the lawyer. Sense of alienation can be seen in Bartleby after his acknowledgement of the Astor Riot act of the United States and cannot perform what the lawyer-narrator demands of him but declines to be thing like object in the office.

Bartleby refuses the wages by lawyer. Bartleby knows that the lawyer's logic is the logic of capitalism that is not as it appears. Bartleby doesnot and cannot make sense within the lawyer's system of reasoning. He also refuses to leave the building he answered nothing:

“Will you, or will you not, quit me?” I now demanded in a sudden passion, advancing close to him.

“I would prefer not to quite you”, he replied, gently emphasizing the not.

“What earthly right have you to stay here? Do you pay any rent?”

“Do you pay my taxes? Or is this property yours?”

He answered nothing. (926)

Bartleby refuses to work, to eat, to leave, and even to handle money, and with each refusal he maintains his motionless, emotionless manner as if reusing as well both movement and effect. Bartleby refuses every form of circulation in which he is pushed to participate, and his incredible stillness is both part and product of these refusals. What he prefers not to do is to check his own copier any copy at all. Bartleby refuses this task because he understands the impossibility of fulfilling the lawyer's demand. For the lawyer, all the copies produced in his office may be reduced to a single purpose that does not change. Every legal document is part of an ideal representational system. In short, the lawyer believes in the idea of an accurate copy, Bartleby, however, seems to think that this ideal representation system' is a dream.

What Bartleby first prefers not to do is to certify relations of equivalence. Indeed, a refusal of circulation is necessarily a refusal of equivalence. For Marx illustrates through that expanded form of value circulation is predicated on the infinite substitutability of one commodity for another. There can be no exchange without equality. In resisting circulation, what Bartleby avoids are these relationships of equality.

It is not law that kills Bartleby, it is his own continued commitment to refuse circulation. The lawyer, by abandoning Bartleby in his vacated law offices, passivity contributes to end subsequently approves of the scrivener being put in prison. This is the ultimate weapon for the lawyer to save his position in the law offices as well in the community.

The narrator gently proposes a number of alternating jobs, including bartender, bill collector and clerk. Bartleby sniffs at every suggestion. Moreover, he replies “There is too much confinement about that. No, I would not like to a clerkship, I am not particular” (930).

The final melancholy exclamation, “Ah Bartleby! Ah humanity!” (934) conveys the unsuccessful adjustment of the lawyer in the conflicting situation. The lawyer takes help from the doctrine of Christianity, i.e. another waved ideology of being moral, to show the community.

Bartleby as a man hired and regards other employs useful for the lawyer. The interrelationship of the narrator with the Trinity church and the economic relationship with Astor seem to port riot the nature of the narrator especially the legal system. This interrelationship seems to implicate Christianity in systematic exploitation. As master in chancery, the lawyer-narrator has been benefiting from condoning and assisting in

the systematic exploiting to the others. It means the nexus of material and ideological instruments through which the ruling class maintains its power for Gramsci.

Capitalist Domination in "Billy Budd"

Melville in the novella "Billy Budd" tries to expose the oppression of the capitalism over upon the poor individuals. He portrays suffering of the sailor by ordinary lawyer: the exploitation of the poor by the rich and powerful; and the capitalism that twists a community into punishing an individual for being the victim of a crime. Billy, the central character of the novel, starts a life of a sailor:

In fact he one those seadogs in whom all the hardship and peril of naval life in the great prolonged wars of his time never impaired the natural instinct for sensuous enjoyment. His duty he always faithfully did; but duty is sometimes a dry obligation, and he was for irrigating its aridity, when so ever possible with fertilizing decoction of strong of strong water. (4)

Even then Billy was down in the forecastle, the Bellipotent's lieutenant burly and bluff, nowise disconcerted by Captain Gravelings omitting to proffer the customary hospitalities on an occasion so unwelcome to him, an omission simply caused by preoccupation of thought, unceremoniously invited himself into the cabin and also to a flask from the sprite locker, a receptacle which his experienced eye instantly discovered.

Aboard the warship Bellipotent, the young orphan Billy Budd was called the handsome sailor. He was young; and despite his all but full develop frame in aspect looked even younger than he really was as the Handsome Sailor; "Billy Budd's position aboard the seventy-four was something analogous to that of rustic beauty

transplanted from the provinces and brought into competition with the highborn dames of the court"(9).

The Bellipotent mustered several individuals who however inferior in grade were of no common natural stamp, sailors more signally susceptible of that air which continuous martial discipline and repeated presence in some degree impact even to the average man.

When Billy at the capstan was being formally mustered into the service asked by the officer, a small, brisk little gentleman as it chanced, among other questions, his place of birth:

He replied, 'please, sir, I don't know.'

'Don't know where you were born? Who was your father?'

'God knows, sir?'

'Do you know anything about your beginning?'

No sir. But I have heard that I was found in a pretty silk-lined basket hanging one morning from the knocker of a good man's door in Bristol.

Found say you? Well, throwing back his head and looking up and down

the new recruit; pretty good find. (11)

He possessed that kind and degree of intelligence going along with the unconventional rectitude of a sound human creature, one to whom not yet has been proffered the questionable apple of knowledge. He was illiterate; he could not read, but he could sing and like the illiterate nightingale was sometime the composer of his own song. The narrator describes, "His simple nature remains unsophisticated by those moral obliquities which are not in every case in compatible with that

manufacturable thing none as respectability” (11). The narrator further describes, “Billy, in many respects, was little more than a sort of upright barbarian, much such perhaps as Adam presumably might have been are the urbane serpent wriggled himself into his company” (11).

As Althusser argues that ideology hails or interpellates concrete individual as concrete subject. Billy is interpellated as a subject by the capitalist ideology, his identity is of a foundling, who is appointed as a subject in and by the specific familial ideological configuration. As Althusser sees ideology is itself a determining force shaping consciousness, embodied in the material signifying practices of ideological state apparatus and enjoying ‘relative autonomy’. When Billy gets trapped by master-at-arms Claggart, Billy’s life becomes miserable and finally he gets death penalty.

Billy becomes the victim of ideological state apparatus through (family, educational sector, church, religious, and as well as the state apparatus, the legal system army, court, lawyer) and so on. Billy is illiterate, he always performs his duty but his own friend Claggart becomes enemy, when fear and jealousy rule, being good can make you killed. Same thing happens where they both get death. The Narrator reminds, "The vowel of such imperfection in the handsome sailor should be evidence not alone that he is not presented as a conventional hero, but also that the story in which he is the main figure is no romance”(13).

John Claggart makes the life of Billy miserable hoping to be popular with the crew. Then, in his mysterious little difficulty going in quest of wrinkled one:

Billy found him off duty in a dogwatch ruminating by himself, seated on a shot box of the upper gun deck, now and then surveying with a somewhat cynical regard certain of the more swaggering pomanders there. Billy recounted his trouble again wondering how it all happened.

The salt seer attentively listened, accompanying the foretopman's recital with queer twitching of his wrinkles and problematical little sparkles of his small ferret eyes. (36)

Claggart was the man of an evil nature not engendered by vicious training or corrupting books or licentious living but born with him and innate, in short 'a depravity according to nature' (43). Claggart playfully tapped him from behind with his rattan, saying in a low musical voice peculiar to him at times, "Handsomely done, my lad! And handsome is as handsome did it too!" (38). He gives the proverb to the sailor "handsome is an handsome dose" (15).

Claggart's passion makes a strong against him Billy was now left more at a loss than before. The narrator narrates, "The ineffectual speculations into which he was led were so disturbingly alien to him that he did his best to smother that. It never entered his mind that here was a matter which from its extreme questionableness, it was duty as a loyal bluejacket to report in the proper quarter" (55). After the unintentional death Claggart and Captain Veer standing motionless vehemently exclaims, "Struck dead by angel of God! Yet the angel most hang!" (73). Captain Veer is no lover of authority for mere authority's sake but a true military officer is in one particular like a true monk. Not with more of self abnegation will the latter keep his vows of monastic obedience than the former his vows of allegiance to martial duty.

Billy is an extremely good natured man, an enjoyer not his dinner, a sound sleeper and inclined to obesity—a man who would always maintain his manhood in battle might not prove altogether reliable in a moral dilemma involving aught of tragic. Concisely Captain narrates all that had led up to catastrophe. While answering the question in a court Billy answers in a following ways:

No there was no malice between us. I never bore malice against the master at arms. I am sorry that he is dead. I did not mean to kill him. Could I have used my tongue, I would not have struck him. But he finally lied to my face and in presence of my Captain, and I had to say something, and I could only say it with a blow, God help me!

Captain Vere's words, "I believe you my man". (80)

Being an innocent sailor Billy was sentenced to be hung, he got the punishment decreed by a drumhead court. Billy was affected by such a mechanical movement in the muscular system of capitalist ideology. He was formally sentenced and convicted to be hung at the Yardem in the early morning. Captain Vere himself plays in bringing about the decision, at the same time revealing his actuating motives. He was old enough to be Bill's father. The austere devotee of military duty letting himself melt back into what remains in formalized humanity.

At the penultimate movement, his words, his only ones, words wholly unobstructed in the utterance, were:

God bless Captain Vere! Syllables so unanticipated coming from one with the ignominious hemp about his neck- a conventional felon's benediction directed aft towards the quarters of honor; Syllables too delivered in the clear melody of a singing bird on the point of launching from the twig—had a phenomenal effect, not unenhanced by the rare personal beauty of young sailor, spiritualized now through late experiences so poignantly profound. (101)

The sympathetic echo, "God bless Captain Vere!" (101) shows, Billy is in their hearts, even as in their eyes. His identity has been limited only in the ballad.

The enormity of the crime and the extreme depravity of the criminal appear the greater in view of the character of the victim a middle – aged man respectable and discreet belonging that of minor official grade, the petty officers, upon whom, as none know better than the commissioned gentleman, the efficiency of His Majesty's navy so largely depends.

In Althusserian notion of ideology, the whole nexus of socio-political, cultural, economic factors has been dominated by the ideologies the ideologies of the ruling class. As these ideologies are reinforced by ISAs, RSAs and SAs they always interpellate people with the promise to confer on them concrete subjectivity. Moreover, they construct reality for people. People cannot define reality on their own, instead, they fallback on the reality constructed by ideologies. The narrator in *Bartleby* and the Captain Vere in "Billy Budd" as well embodies the people hegemonized by ideologies. Where Captain fills that: "innocence was even a better thing than religion where with to go to judgment" (98). Billy Budd was to be effected- any movement following the completed suspension and originating in the body suspended, such movement-indicates mechanical spasm in the muscular.

In spite of being a victim of Capitalist ideology Bartleby resists all the time against capitalism, to get justice, liberty and self identity. The very consciousness leads to do whatever he wants but the power, norms and values of capitalist society fails to understand him. He does not get justice but only loses his life. On the contrary, Billy accepts all the trouble without active resistance; his acceptance gives him death penalty. Similarly, both of the novels end with their lives. There is nothing for the subordinate to do but comply in capitalist ideology.

Both of the protagonists in "Billy Budd" and "Bartleby, the Scrivener" have been interpellated and thus suffer from capitalist system. They lose their life in it,

though they are not corrupted and fault, they are compelled to be engaged in scamming just because they find their jobs and their survival at stake. There is the familial ideological state apparatus, which plays a considerable part, incommensurable with its role in its capitalist social reformation. Both of them are alienated from their family, do not have any financial support for their survival, do not have a home for their shelter. They suffer a lot throughout their lives. Billy does know his father's name and no one recognizes Bartleby in his death in street that shows the very condition of protagonist.

Ideology hails an individual as a subject. Individual ideology differs with another through people do not realize they are in ideology. It interpellates them as subject having different roles, identity even their subjectivity. Capitalist society values the role of money to determine the role of an individual. However, Bartleby and Billy Budd never give the importance to money. Thus, they become the victims of capitalist ideology.

Billy Budd a foundling, becomes the victim of ideological state apparatus through family, educational sector, job as well as state apparatus, the legal system but he does not resist whereas Bartleby tries to resist but goes in vain. Ultimately existential character and silent character both of them become the victimization by capitalist ideology through ideological state apparatus and state apparatus.

Billy Budd represents innocent and silent characters, as the victimizations of capitalism and Bartleby represents a resistance to capitalism at the end both of them lose their lives, even the court interpellates them. Following the right path they cannot achieve success, they face more challenges and ultimately become victimized by the unjust, capitalist, materialist system. Billy and Bartleby suffer a lot throughout their lives. They are ruined physically as well as mentally by capitalist ideology.

IV. Conclusion

Herman Melville's "Bartleby, the Scrivener" and "Billy Budd" portray contemporary American Capitalist Society, which nurtures social injustice and thrives on cut-throat competition in the class people. These novellas focus on the hierarchy between workers and owners, between laborers and capitalists, powerful and powerless as the means of production and modes of production. After the civil war, America was ascending towards commercial expansion, urbanization and industrial bloom. Capitalists were discovering a new world in material progress, whereas laborer becomes the victim of capitalist progress. In these novellas the protagonist, laborers, are interpellated, victimized by the capitalist ideology.

The major character in "Bartleby, the Scrivener", Bartleby as an alienated worker, protests as a mute- sit- in and gets fired not only from work but also from his life. Bartleby has neither personal charisma nor worldly authority, he just resists passively. If Bartleby himself is mysterious, the nature of his environment is not for a menial worker like a scrivener. The capitalist business world is dehumanizing, coercive and exploitative.

In the second novella, "Billy Budd", Billy represents the responsible sailor, accepting the different capitalist effect works in Bellipotent, also lose his life. After miserable plot of Claggart Master at Arms, Billy does the unintentional murder, where he gets the death penalty.

Both of the protagonists want to come out from the effect of capitalist ideology they do not like materialist world but compel to be. The dominant ideologies of the society confer several epithets upon Billy and Bartleby. The ideological state apparatus as well as state apparatus interpellates them. They are the representatives of

an alienated proletariat, while struggling to assert radical independence from despotic capitalist practices, fail ultimately to transcend their condition.

Billy as an innocent character performs his duty but on the other, Bartleby prefers not to work to achieve his right. But only they lose their life. Bartleby keeps on insisting on his own position maintaining class distinction. The elderly attorney who narrates 'Bartleby' depicts himself as a benevolent prosperous representative of established liberal American values of capitalist system.

Turkey, Nipper and Ginger in "Bartleby, the scrivener", and John Claggart in "Billy Budd" drudge long hours for the greater wealth. They are infact sub- humans, brutalized by their environment. They are dehumanized, frequently irascible and take their master's part i.e. the part of power and materialism against the Bartleby and Billy.

The lawyer is mentally disturbed, he offers multiple job options yet Bartleby refuses to work, eat, leave the office and even his life itself. Similarly, Billy always respects the Captain Vere, even his execution period, he prays for Captain Vere but Captain cannot do anything for him infront of the capitalist system. This severe alienation of Bartleby and Billy implicitly shakes the varied forms of ideologies. Bartleby and Billy cannot openly oppose the system, nor do they say anything. But only they suffer in the case of failure and go on combating capitalism. They cannot adjust with capitalist ideology because it seeks for material success. They get neither material success nor family integration but only become the subject of capitalist system which only interpellates them. The truth is that failure can be disastrous, whereas success gives only a momentary relief and security in the harsh and brutal society. All the characters get involved in resistance of different kinds but only

become the victims even the state apparatus interpellates them. The lawyer is insecure everywhere like Captain Vere

To conclude the research, it can be said that Herman Melville's novellas "Billy Budd" and "Bartleby, the Scrivener" are practically successful novellas to give the true account of the unjust American Capitalist ideology through the brilliant representation of characters who suffer from capitalist system. They, facing the challenge to succeed at any cost, take on dishonesty as the ultimate alternative which finally condemns them. These stories give a true picture of the American Capitalism in which characters are forced to be alienated by unjust, inequalities, brutality, humiliation and barbaric practices. Money, power and material- oriented system is the main culprit behind the individual interpellation and victimization.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harcourt, 1992.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus." *Mapping Ideology*. Ed. Slavoz Zizek. New York: Verso, 1999.100-40.
- Berthoff, Warner. "Certain Phenomenal Men." *The Example of "Billy Budd"* 27.4 (1960): 334-51.
- Bloom, Harold. "Bloom's Notes: Billy Budd." *Introduction* 10.2 (2010): 1-42.
- Darcus, Howe. "The Deadly Existence of a Quite Man." *The New Statesman* (2006): 1-27.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
- . -. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Ferretter, Luke. *Louis Althusser*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Fogle, Richard Harter. "Billy Budd: The Order of The Fall." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 15.3 (1960): 189-205.
- Furloni, Andrew. "Bartleby the Socratic." *Studies in Short Fiction* 34.1 (1997): 335-56.
- Garder, Jostein. "Karl Marx." *Sophie's World*. New York: Berkley, 1996. 323-24.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Prison Notebook*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1996.
- Hawkes, David. *Ideology*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Marx, Karl. "The German Ideology." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harcourt 1992. 624-26.
- Melville, Herman. "Billy Budd" New York: A Tom Doherty Associates Book, 1924.
- . -. "Bartleby, the Scrivener." *The Story and Its Writer*. Ed. Ann Charters. Vol. II. Boston: Bedford Books 1995. 908-34.

- Miller, Hills J. "The Deconstructive Reading of Bartleby the Scrivener." *The Story and Its Writer*. Ed. Ann Charters. Vol. II. Boston: Bedford Books 1995. 1460-64.
- Miller, James E. "Billy Budd: The Catastrophe of Innocence." *Modern Language Notes* 73.3 (1958): 168-76.
- Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Modern Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Weiner, Susan. "Bartleby: Representation, Reproduction and Law." *Journal of American Culture* 17.2 (1994): 65-74.
- Zizek, Slavoj, ed. *Mapping Ideology*. London: Verso, 1994.