

I. Voice of Subaltern People in *Chhoti Munda and His Arrow*

This research analyzes *Chhoti Munda and His Arrow*, the novel of Mahasweta Devi through subaltern studies. Subalternity is a perspective which attempts hidden historiographies of voiceless and marginalized people into center. More specifically, the hidden are cultural, political, socio-economic activities of exploited people. This tool gives an agency to bring the oppressed people voice into center. The nationalist elitist historiography of India has ignored to include the historiographies of Indian lowcaste, adivasis and other tribal group who have no access to mainstream. *Chhoti Munda and His Arrow* addresses the burning problems of adivasi and the low caste people in the rural area in capitalist society where capital is a main aspect in mode of production. The relationship between capitalist and adivasis is the relationship of domination and exploitation. The dialectical relationship between capitalists and labourers is around the issue of capital. One class belongs to capitalists and other labourers. Lala Baijnath, Pratap Chadha and Tirathnath are capitalists. They own the land, brick kiln and other mechanism of capitalism. Whereas, Chotti Munda, Dukha Munda and all the adivasis and untouchable belong to labourers. The elitist ideology operates to the suppression of the subaltern people in the capitalistic society. Chotti Munda is the central character of the novel. He along with all the untouchables and adivasis are exploited due to their low status in socio-economic point of view. The elitist ideology is inflected upon them in such a way that they are rendered speechless, though they try their best to bring their tribal happiness from the exploitation and happiness.

Under capitalistic umbrella, dominant groups of people maintain their 'Raj'. Part of reason why this unjust social behavior is functioning in a society is that they consistently attack the cultural practices of subaltern people and as a result break their communal solidarity. Culture as the unifying principle, give the clear guideline to the

subaltern people and it is because of their religion they are ready to sacrifice their lives. However, more strategically ruling class people try to subdue their voices as they disconnect their means of communication. It is now notable that Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak has come up with similar ideas. In her essay she clearly asserts that subaltern cannot speak because their cultural language cannot be the means of transforming their voices. In this sense, their voices are restricted systematically. However, in the same essay, she is much conformed to the idea that subaltern people can resist silently. Though the process of resistance might be slow in pace, ultimately it compels the rulers to listen to the voice. In this regard she argues:

For the “true” subaltern group, whose identity is in difference, there is no unrepresentable subaltern subject that can know and speak itself; the intellectual solution is not to abstain from representation... In the slightly dated language of Indian group the question becomes, how can we touch the consciousness of the people, even as we investigate their politics?

With what voice-consciousness can the subaltern speak? (168)

What we must be clear about here is that the problem lies not in the voice of subaltern group but in the intellectual responses to such voices. They have their clear and different identity politics. However, the people who try to get to their resistance might not be able to realize the voice and subaltern consciousness. The silent resistance is much realizable in the following lines:

Yes all's story in Chotti Munda's life. Munda language has no script. So they turn significant events into story, and hold them as saying as song. That's their history as well . . . When lord Birsa was in the je-hell houses, Dhani Munda alone knew that the lord will return. This body will die, but his kernel and his spirit will not perish. (18)

Narration which functions without any script is the resistance to capitalism. The ironical fact and a strong blow to the ruler is that it preserves the rebellious consciousness in their narration. What they think unjust and undesirable, for their identity, they turn them into the story and the oral tradition transmits from generation to generation. This means can be more powerful than the written documents. The written history can be forgotten and people might be indifferent to it but this tradition concurrently strikes the minds of every people and they became unified for the resistance. This is their history- it is their parallel history. Moreover, one body may die but the contribution and spirit never perishes. The following generation also very much conscious of this fact.

The systematic planning of capitalists smoothly goes ahead because of their hidden strategic planning. Their powerful method of keeping their hand upper is that whatever they do, they try to legalize. To legalize and make acceptable their actions, capitalists capture the mind of most respectable and leader of the subaltern group people. They probably do this because it is the easiest way to operate their system and accumulate the money. It is also to control the intellects of the leader of adivasi, is to capture the intellects of all the subalterns. They have profoundly understood that they are unified with the ideas of headman. Moreover, capitalists have clear understanding that subaltern people have communal solidarity. It is evident in the following lines. "It is a huge boar. The Mundas are almost overcome. Boar meat is shared out in the Ganjin, Dusad, Dhobi quarters, and in the coolie lines. Chhoti keeps the two tusks. Says, if t' Daroga lives I'll give these to him. Wife, pickle t' meat. T' meat is ripe" (81). What interests me here is not the happy celebration among the lower class people but is the fact that how they share the single boar among all who have almost equal economic status. The boar meat is shared among the Ganjin, Dusad, Dhobi and all the coolies. They share it means they share same common aspiration and destiny. It clarifies that

they have the common ground and unity. But the ironical fact is that the capitalists who always keep their upper hands in the country's economic structure have clearly understood it and wish to destroy it. They try to achieve this end by using the subaltern people themselves. Chhoti, for example is told to bring the labourers for the factory many times by Harban Chadha. If Chhoti does this, he promises that he would give certain commission. However, Chhoti clearly rejects it because he cannot earn money by selling his people. This rejection is the rejection to the whole capitalist structure.

Similarly, subaltern group of people opposes the mission school and other capitalistic production to be applied to them; they fight for their land against landowner and traders. They reject to give bonded labour, which they have been giving for generation. This is their clear sign they never wish to be assimilated with the system of capitalism but it is the indication that they want to be independent in the domain of land. They are firm in this aspiration. "Chhoti says . . . before his land was very calm, ye know. As a kid, he's shot a lotta yellow-green doves from behind green leaves. Now that land has become his life. His ma says, He loves his land more than his son. His land's his life" (121). This line shows that subaltern people like Munda people are obsessed with the land-owning system. They take land as their mother, as their life partner. Harmu, one of the Mundas, Chhoti explains, has owned small piece of land and he is in deep love with it and wish to spend whole life over there. He kills the doves for satisfying his hunger and he fulfills his basic needs and he is fed by the land. So, he takes it as their mother.

Capitalists forcefully modernize in every field concerned. This directly affects the working class people. It is because the manual worker is replaced by a single machine and consequently there is huge unemployment problem. And, most victims of this problem are none other than the subaltern people because, as Marxists explain, all

the money goes to the hand of capitalists by this system. "Cultivation too must be modern. Dive a tractor, raise your crop threefold. Chhoti thinks the poor will be unemployed if tractor are used" (139). These lines have the idea that the concept of modernization further demarcates the subaltern and capitalists. Initially, it is a beautiful slogan that you can produce three times more than you normally produce by modern technology. However, my question is why do the capitalists and the followers of modernization consider the life-issue of working class people?

If subaltern people create problem in maintaining their Raj in the community, capitalists try to mould the group's leader as their model. Now Chhoti is done in this manner by Harban Chadha when he suggests Chhoti to be a leader contractor. However, he rejects his proposal. This is the resistance to capitalist system.

When the pond-digging starts Harban laughs and says, Now be a labour-contractor Chhoti.

How so?

Ye're giving everybody jobs, take a cut.

No lord.

You can but. Everyone does.

No lord. (153)

It might be pleasing and ideal that Harban Chadha is suggesting easy way of earning money. The capitalists have clearly understood that subaltern people are under the leadership of Chhoti Munda and they feel it a kind of strong threat to further dominate them. So to dismantle this unity they are showing the lollypop to Chhoti. In this Chhoti

responses with two-times negation. "No lord" is very suggestive. To say no to Harban Chadha is to say to say no to capitalism.

Capitalists have been enjoying their domination over the subaltern people because capitalist ideology functions strongly in their support. Capitalist ideology functions more profoundly through its hegemonic structure. In this line of argument Antonio Gramsci opines that the ideology is a means or tool to hegemonize people. He has made a distinction between two kinds of society and tried to see how they function in order to maintain their hegemony. He says:

What we can do, for moment is to fix two major superstructural 'level': one that can be called 'civil society', that is ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private', and that of 'political society' or 'the state'. These two levels on the one hand to the functions of 'hegemony' which the dominant group exercises through the state and 'juridical government'. (12)

What is clear out here is that ideology of capitalism and more clearly to the elite group in the society can be maintained in two ways: firstly, through direct force and secondly through consensus. The coercive control is practiced through political society which is the sum total of government organizations that use direct force like army, police, bureaucracy, and the like. On the other hand what is hidden and more critical is that people voluntarily accept to be under their ideology. Ideology creates such an environment in which elite group wins the consent of subordinate group and hegemonizes them. This type of ideology functions through subtle government organizations that mould people in the shape of capitalist culture so that they would rule over them.

In this line of philosophical argument, police authority under the control of dominant group try to prove that peasants' work against them is bad and thus this compels the police force to subdue the revolution. They do this to establish their words:

He had bombs and a revolver. He attempted to kill the police with those arms. The police fought him hard and then killed him who knows where the other Naxal went.

Sana says, No, no, he didn' attack t'

polis.

Who said so?

We saw.

Forgot what you saw, boys. Ye won' understand all this with yer jungle brains. Say what t' police say. If ye want to stay safe. (181)

The capitalists can go to the extent that by using the police force they labels an innocent Munda boy named Dika Munda as a Naxal boy, and as having bomb and revolver. In reality the eye witness proves that he had nothing during the killing. The police force creates fear among the adivasi people. So that they hide their heads under the feet: The police say that the subaltern people have jungle mind and don't know anything. This indirectly suggests that capitalists are already enlightened and they know all the sense of civilization and thus it is their due responsibility to teach them the way of life. So, they in the name of enlightenment maintain their raj among the subaltern people. However, it is not to much sustainable. Subaltern people like Chotti Munda have not accepted this fact that they have the jungle mind. They are firm that they have seen the truth that Diku is innocent and didn't have any bomb and revolver.

One of the most striking clues to capitalism, no doubt, is its heavy focus on money. Opening factory, exploiting workers and accumulating huge amount of money have become the daily routine of few bourgeois people. Thus, they cannot consider the human aspects like sympathy, empathy, love, feeling, emotions and so on

. . . River shone and an aluminium factory starts up in Chama, sixteen miles from Thori. Harbans, Tirathnath and others of that ilk become vigilant about the mines and the factory . . . Everyone will live in a hurry for more money so you keep saying, says Tirath, that bonded labour is bad. (140)

Here is one clear fact that all the capitalist are busy to be in a race to capture the money. They are competing to the capitalists to open the factory and mines. It is good for the development of the country. However, my objection is that the sweet fruit is always tasted by few bourgeoisie people not by the majority of the people. Then what good does it do to the common people. This is dangerous to the overall development of the country. Only having all the experience of modern comfort to few capitalist is not justice. It should be encompassing that can include all the subaltern people. But it cannot be unless the capitalist mechanism is controlled by few elite people.

All the parties follow the line of capitalistic nature. Candidates for national election are on the competition to hold the position to accumulate money. “Those low caste folks become member of legislative assembly to get hold of money” (180).

Similarly, killing threatening and murdering are the day-to-day work for the owner of the parties.

The ruling structure is so much intricate that it brings political parties and its leaders, industrialists and the others into a single platform. Industrialists boost the party

leaders and they consequently get hold the political power to rule over the country but they are hooked by those industrialists thus formulate any rule and working strategy not by their own wish but by the will of money lenders.

A couple days later Tirathnath doesn't smiles so much. Says to Harbans,
And took fifty thousand rupees again.

I gave ten thousand rupees as well.

You gave

Sure. And the agreement for supplying the bricks to factory housing contract is also firm. That's it. This will be the party and we'll benefit.

(185)

Before election there is an agreement between the political leaders and the industrialists. The industrialists invest the money in the political party leader and they consequently get huge return. Tirathnath has invested fifty thousand rupees and Harban has invested ten thousand rupees. He is sure to get huge return. He has got the opportunity to supply the bricks to factory housing contract. They will get benefit.

One critical issue regarding capitalist is that the capitalist functioning element just prepare the best to destroy its whole structure. Marx argues that one could expect it not only to exploit the proletariat with increasing intensity but ultimately to create conditions which would make it possible to abolish capitalism itself . . . (Benjamin 248). What we should clearly understand is that capitalism itself is the critique of its own presence. In this novel the capitalistic political nature has made Romeo a hero and used him as the acting principle of the state. He is a real murderer; he sees real fun in killing. It is now very critical that capitalist system has its own critique.

Romeo is the hero of the event . . . he has developed a skill to harass all women from twelve to forty and the named himself 'Romeo'. He became the faithful soldier in the Youth League. He goes to the picnic. He asks one of the women to dance in her birthday suit in blamelessly joy and innocence of mind after imbibing lots of alcohol. She slaps him. As a result he takes her to the woods and rapes and kills her. (223)

These lines point the fact that this is the climax of atrocity of tyranny of capitalism how far they can go in their morality. Making a woman dance, raping her and killing her is the critique of capitalist atrocity.

Calm and intelligent Chotti at the climax of the situation shoot his poisonous arrow and makes three Youth League leaders fall down. One can see Chotti is very calm and working through his intelligent does not take such a terrible action and thus suffer much in the novel. However, at the end cannot help shooting his arrow to show this collective resistance to capitalistic treatment to subaltern people.

. . . Chotti should with steady aim from behind . . .

His arrow pierces the shoulders of the gun- shooting arms of Romeo, Dildar and Pahalwan, all three, and their gun drops. The other young men get nervous to see their leaders fall to their knees, and they stop arrows right and left. (278)

Crossing the limit of tyrannical behavior toward the subaltern people is compelled to shoot arrow on them and them fall to their knees. He shoots arrow and they die means that he now finally is successful to destroy the structure of the capitalism which is true resistance of capitalism.

Similarly, the police quickly disarm the Romeo's group in the second attack to the adivasi people. It seems that police force is doing justice and advocating on the behalf of the adivasi group. But one sensible person can ask: why does not police authority disarm such group before this second incident happen? It is clear that all of them were same cap of capitalism.

The Youth League, dazed by smoke and fire, shoots gun at random . . .

Now Romeo kicks a Youth Leaguer in the back and says, coming.

Put a bullet in that IAD.

Shankar arrives and bends Romeo's left arm behind his back and hits the Youth Leaguer's head with the bolt of the gun. The police quickly disarm the Youth Leaguers and push and shove them into the camp in the heavy downpour. (269)

The interesting fact here is that the capitalist and owner of the parties are all drunk. They all are mad so that they start firing randomly. Any rational human beings cannot dare to do this. First the police are indifferent to the events but finally disarm the Youth Leaguers. It is done for their own protection to protect the right and the justice of the subaltern people.

The novel has raised multiple voices in the critical and philosophical atmosphere since its publication. Most of the critics have focused on the translation and postcolonial issue. In this regard Naazia Banu says:

Written in 1980, this novel is also remarkable for the manner in which it touches on the vital issues that have, in subsequent decades grown into matters of urgent social concerns. It raises question about the place of the

tribal on the map of nation identity, land rights and human rights, and the "muzeumization" of ethnic cultures. This is the first novel where Mahasweta Devi articulates tribal history. (39)

Banu points out the crucial social issue of the tribal people i.e. culture and their space in their national map of India along with their human rights and rights to land. Moreover, she finds the "musemization" of ethnic culture there.

Another critic Dora Sales Salvador opines:

. . . In her afterword to Devi, Spivak emphasizes the role of visibility in her translational project, whose aim is, above all, to convert hegemonic notions while refusing at all moments to be confined by a 'space between' positioning herself, rather, in clear and manifest fashion, in favour of Devi's cultural specificity and the values her work transmits. Those are also the values which she as translator, wishes to transfer to the target system. (55)

Salvador tries to show the attempt of the translator, Spivak, to be away from the hegemonic web of English language so that she can be transparent in her translation by not being irrespective to the cultural location of Mahasweta Devi.

Moreover Nicholas Harrison says:

Between 1975 and 1985 Devi's work focused on the aboriginals and the (post) colonial state. Exposing exploitation and domination in the postcolonial state, Devi's writing are different from the literature of diasporic nostalgia for the place left behind. The wide swiipe of this important novel encompasses many layers. It ranges over decades in the

life of Chotti- the central character- in which India moves from colonial rule to independence and then to the unrest of the 1970s. (35)

In these lines, Harrison tries to show the focused writing of Mahasweta Devi on postcolonial state of India where exploitation and domination was intact like that of colonial one.

Unlike the critical opinions like that of post colonial and translation mentioned above the present researcher aims at exploring the resistance of marginalized rural community which will be the subaltern reading of the text. Subaltern studies basically attempts hidden historiographies of voiceless and marginalized people into center. More specifically, the hidden are cultural, political, socio-economic activities of those people. The officially documented history ignores to include the historiographies of voiceless and marginalized groups because it is elitist and capitalist in nature.

II. Subjugated Condition of the Subaltern and Their Resistance in

Chotto Munda and His Arrow

Capitalism and its intricate structure in a society functions so long as it has its hidden mechanism which is forcefully made applicable in that society. However, when the imposition of capitalistic mode of behavior is realized by the long marginalized people it can be made useless. Those historically forgotten people – peasants – begin to violate the established norms in society when they collectively come into a single platform with the means of subaltern consciousness. Ranjit Guha, in this context, is more emphatic:

The peasant rose into violation with the violation of the series of codes for his subalternity is materialized by the structure of property, institutionalized by law, sanctified by religion and made tolerable – and even desirable – by tradition. To rebel was indeed to destroy many of these familiar signs. (9)

Guha concentrates his argument on the line that capitalistic mode of treatment in the society draws line between the marginal group and the elite. Subalternity of the marginal group of people is materialized by property, the structure and behaviour of law and religion. This behavior in a course of time develops as a tradition under this biased nature of capitalism. Consequently, this climax is brought into the resistance to capitalism by the subaltern violating of series of codes long practiced by the capitalist.

Devi in her masterpiece very tactfully places such incidents that sufficiently and convincingly prove that the subaltern can have the power of resistance. They have resisted against the mainstream capitalist cult which have led the foundation for their subalternity. Moreover, she also indicates, with some strategic incidents included in her text, that clearly visible and violent resistance can be realized if oppression and tyrannical behaviour cross their limits:

After the accident, Romeo and Pahlwan are not seen at the rescue. No

one can recount the subsequent events. In the end an Oraon boy hears the shrill screams of hyenas as he herds cattle. He goes forward curious and sees the corps of Rome and Pahlwan. Both bodies are shot through the heart with arrows. (282)

Romeo and Palhwan were none other than the powerful instruments of capitalism who had been operating the system on the adivasies and low cast people of Munda Oraon. They in their original form define themselves as the leaders of Youth Leagues Party and suck the blood of working people in different factories. When the tyranny and atrocity became unbearable then adivasis resisted violently. Their communal solidarity to fight against the capitalist cult comes into play. This atrocity leads those exploiters on the tip of shooting arrow by Munda and adivasies.

Shooting arrows and archery competition in various fairs are the indexes of adivasi people in India. They express themselves in a real Archery Fair where all adivasi and low casts enjoy in their own custom. However, the capitalists feel it as a threat to their operation and as a result try to obstruct shooting arrow by Chotti Munda, the central character of the novel:

Chotti held his feet

Why grab me feet?

Teach me to shoot an arrer.

Me?

Yes. Te are t' god Haramdeo of archers.

. . . Suddenly Dhani laughed at the sight of Chotti's glowing face.

How shall I teach ye, he said. If I hold an arrer the polis'll again lock me up. (7)

What is clear out here is that police force prohibits the tradition of shooting arrows by Munda community. The politics out here is that police force as an agent of capitalist system intends to change all Mundas and other adivasis into the capitalist structure

where they always remain oppressed. So, police force creates a kind of fear in the mind of subaltern people by force and perpetuates the ruling system. In the conversation, it is clear that Dhani Munda is respected as their god – “ye are t’ god Haradeo of archers” – and he is requested to teach his skill of shooting arrow by Chotti Munda. But the problem for him is that “when the bow's in his hands, Munda society and families are in danger. (5) Thus capitalist have attacked the custom and culture of adivasi people.

But another more convincing story out of this conversation can be realized at the same time – prohibition of shooting arrow for Dhani Munda by police force and teaching of his skill related to archery. If the capitalists block one way of Munda community, they take another way of expressing themselves. In the course of history they never leave their traditional means as they consider it as their identity. In the course of history Chotti Munda continues shooting arrows with his numerous avatars in other Mundas; he teaches other Mundas his spirit of shooting arrows. This shooting arrow is the shooting to the capitalist nature of behaviour in the society. Thus, collective force for teaching arrow play is the resistance to capitalism. On the one hand, it certainly transmits the legacy of Munda culture that their own tradition should be practiced in their upcoming generation where their following generations take it as the guiding principle and keep on fighting against the capitalist cult, while on the other; it blows a fire to the destructive force to capitalistic culture in a unified way. The politics of businessmen like Tirthnath cannot overcome the spirit of being united for their own cost against capitalistic gain. Thus, in a series of generation of Munda community, Dhani Munda teaches to Chotti Munda and Chotti, too, transmits his spirit to other Munda boys in the course of time.

The resistance of subaltern people to capitalism is not because they are violent in their nature as they were regarded uncivilized but because of the destructive and biased capitalist structure that creates a devastating gulf between and among the groups of people in the society. As a result of this lack of proper treatment to the marginal

people they are compelled to expose in the violation of a series of long established codes. Let's analyze the following lines:

A most exacting feat of archery. From the adivasi side the prize is a pig. For a long time now the police Daroga gives five rupees. Tirthnath Lala- the trader gives five rupees, Harban Chadha the owner of the brick kiln gives five rupees, Anware the fruit seller gives five rupees. Every year there is fierce competition around this test. Every year the Daroga thinks, there's sure to be rioting. (3)

On the occasion of Chotti Fair on Bijoya there is a huge mass, adivasis from thirty villages nearby have come, and the heads of the business tycoons like Tirthnathlala, Anwar, and Harban Chadha have come to this fair. Everything is going well. There is a huge donation for the prize of archery competition. Every respectable person in the function present donates five rupees for it. What is questionable for me out here is not the fact that they are contributing huge amount of money to adivasis and their tradition but the fact that how they can be able to give five rupees for the prize. Why only those few countable people can donate that amount of money. It is all because of their own capitalistic system that always prevails them to accumulate handsome amount of money. They only control the means of production and other natural sources. In this connection Marx is remembered. Strengthening this argument M.A.R. Habib argues:

Marx's main objection to capitalism was that one particular class owned the means of economic production: The bourgeoisie . . . has centralized means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands." . . . a class of labours, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increase capital. (528)

Habib with his clear argument concentrates on the issue of means of production. The capitalistic mode of production is under the control of few hands of bourgeoisie. Bourgeoisie exploits the means of production as per their wish. This particular class

with the basis of owning the property rule over rest of the people. The labourers can sustain their life till they find job. Depending upon the mercy of bourgeoisie they have to survive. And this mercy would be given till their work increases more capital for the benefit of owners. That is, the mechanism of capitalism has used the workers mathematically and even more mechanically.

He sat down on the sand. He remembers how white men and Biharis jumped at the sight of coal and mica, how instantly they disfigured adivasi areas with slums of tile-roofed dwellings. Who knows what such people will do if they see gold? These hills, these forests, this river once again be spoiled. (2)

From these lines we are not only informed that whenever and whenever something precious and valuable is found that is taken naturally by the dominant groups; time and again they have spoiled these natural resources but to the fact that the governing structure developed under capitalistic umbrella has made them do so. The statement ‘these hills, these forests, this river once again be spoiled’ indicates that only the dominant groups have the authority to consume the natural resources: they use them the way they like.

The consumption of natural resources by a few particular groups has a vast long – lasting effect in the structure of society. It forcefully leads the society into the class division – one having full authority over everything concerned and another remaining always under the exploitation of that authoritative group. At the same time, he does not forget to place the plight of workers that they are yoked together according to their interests. Their livelihood is totally dependent on the labour that increases capital, they are given work and when they are unable to do so they are kicked out and kept in a deplorable condition. This is now much explicit that a human being is treated like a machine: a machine can be used only so long as it is useful for the targeted operation; otherwise it is destroyed or kept aside. There is no human value for the industrialists.

One probable question is pertinent now: How the capitalists are able to sustain this lopsided relationship for maintaining their Raj? The potential but hidden answer for this question is that it is 'ideology' that is mostly responsible for perpetuating this relationship. Ideology, in general, can be defined as a belief system and all belief systems are the products of cultural conditioning. In this connection, Terry Eagleton argues that "it is the general material process of production of ideas, beliefs and values in social life. This formulation alludes to the way individuals lived their social practices. Thus, it provides the useful meaning of ideology as the social determination of thought" (28). The mechanism practiced in the capitalist culture has very complicated structure that cannot be even noticed by the dominant groups in the society. However, it has been functioning very well. Chotti Munda himself is its convincing example. He is well-known among adivasi community as well as the dominant groups in the society. In most of his incidents in his life he cannot make his mind free from respecting the high officials who actually are the oppressors. "Chotti always makes the signs of repeat when he speaks" (138). One can certainly argue that an ideal person has the sense of respecting others, even the enemies. However, how this 'ideal' concept is applied is not well-defined by them. My concern here is to see the hidden effective political structure that is successfully applied in our real experience and consequently the downtrodden people are always kept aside. Can the concept of respecting even the enemies be appreciated and followed by those people who are ruling the nation? Why only have they been teaching this lesson to the people who are already in the deplorable condition? If they cannot respect the adivasis, who are the adivasis? According to their arguments, they are neither their enemies nor their supporter. What is their identity? All these interrogations are unanswered by them. They just keep on dominating by using the tool of ideology.

How is ideology able to hide the authentic reality from us? One very convincing and influential answer was given in the late 1960s by the French Marxist philosopher,

Louis Althusser (1915-90) In course of operating the vested interests of the dominant group of society, dominant ideologies come into play with what Althusser calls Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) and Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs). His ideological state apparatuses include organized religion, the law, the political system, trade unions, educational system, the media, in short, all the institutions through which we are socialized. Ideology then has a material existence in the sense that it is embodied in all sorts of material practices. What is clear is that ideology is waiting for us whenever we go and that everything we do, everything we engage in is pervaded by ideology. This leads Althusser to the conclusion that "it therefore appears that the subject acts insofar as he is acted by the . . . system", while we believe that we are acted out of free will, we are in reality acted by the system with this concept of eternity and pervasiveness of ideology, Althusser aptly comes to the conclusion that " ideology has no history" (240) as it is a structure in which we individuals are played.

Subaltern people are, in large part, in the trap of the pervasiveness and eternity of ideology. Munda and adivasi people keep on believing that Chotti Munda has spell in his arer and he can kill his enemies. This message has been made publicized in a rapid fire way. Not only the Adivasi and low cast people believe on this but also some dominant group of people have fear of it including the police Daroga. Tirthnath Lala lives like a man of psychological disorder. He is ready to give his land which was once seized by him from Koel Munda. This kind of belief and consequent behaviour give a strong support to the subaltern people engaging in the web of spell forgetting the role of practice. This belief has developed a kind of religious doctrine among the Munda people and the others. It is evident that religion always dominates one's process of formation of ideas and activities. Lois Tyson, thus, argues that "Religion, which Karl Marks called ' the opiate of the masses', is an ideology that helps to keep the faithful poor satisfied with their lot in life, or at least tolerant of it, much as a tranquilizer might

do" (59). Tyson, here in a way means to say that ideology is functioning as a tranquilizer in the psychology of those people who have lower social status. They are not faithful to the oppressors; however, they are made so with the successful feeding of ideology as "opiate" to the people to maintain their status quo. Ronaldson, the brother of the secretary to the Governor of Bihar, for example, once, goes to Munda village with Chotti and all the Munda people behave him as a god that has just descended from heaven. They all show high courtesy offering him maize and molasses in a shining brass plate and say that he has come to a shrine. As he eats the Munda women make verse and sing together:

Gormen has come to our place

Gormen has made pictures

Gormen hasn't brought a gun

Hasn't killed us folks

Gormen has eaten holy food. (40)

In the above lines initially we do not see but praise. However, with a critical analysis we have certainly the view that the political interest hidden behind men strong made. My question is: Why do the Munda women praise the oppressor so much even if they are aware of this fact? Indeed, they intentionally do not show this kind of behaviours but they are made to do so psychologically. They are tranquilized in the line of obeying the order of the "respected" people of the society In this song we come across two contradictory elements: one Munda people are so happy with the arrival of "the gormen" thus they offers everything they can do to make him happy and another they are psychologically afraid of him, so they say that he had not brought gun with him. With this line of analysis both ISAs and RSAs function very well to oppress the subaltern people. One the one hand, Munda people are made to believe the custom that the "gormen-people" are respectable ones and thus naturally they possess courtesy and

dominance among the citizenry, while on the other hand the dominant ideology is powerful among common people with the direct force, that is the threat and psychological horror among the Munda people indicated by the lines: "Gormen hasn't brought the gun" and "Hasn't killed us folks." They are horrified with the general belief that the respectable people kill them so they should support them as they wish.

In the vein of argument, to make it clearer, let's analyze the lines "Don't tell Bisra. Tell Pahan" (50). Baijanath says this because, according to the adivasi social system, the pahan or the priest is the chief of the village community. They sit with the pahan and settle any problem that comes up. It is in fact possible that the pahan and the village headman are two separate people. But that's not the case here. Baijanath knows the rules of adivasi society.

Once, Lala Baijanath charges Bisra for being "Mundas' moneylender" and this is a kind of great humiliation for Bisra and that results in conflict between Bisra and the real moneylender Baijanath. To settle this dispute Baijanath calls police Daroga to take help of Pahan, the priest who, according to him, can be the appropriate tool to settle down this issue. While doing so Baijanath would deserve the winning situation. Thus, he very tactfully advises the police officer that he has studied the social system of adivasi people according to which every conflict is dominated by the village priest. With this discussion what is evident is that dominant people impose the subtle ideological interest in the community of common people by using themselves. This strategy has, indeed, two beneficial consequences: one it is easier for them to convince the adivasi people that the moneylenders are to be given respect and it is illegal to go against their will and another, even if it is disclosed that the vested interest of this strategy, again it would be very easy to mould the case as they wish by showing the involvement of their respectable person, the pahan.

For the implementation of ideology efficiently the use of direct force, as Althusser has pointed out, has widely been used. This threatening power possessed by the ruling people compels the subaltern stay under their control of them. In the following lines we see the bad consequence of not obeying the order of the police officer.

. . . on both sides are assembled adivasis. Hi is calling out loud, I am

Dhani Munda! I was kicked out, I've come again. Where is t' station, eh?

. . . Halt, stop! Muneshwar Singh shouts.

. . . Muneshwar Singh shoots him in the head. (180)

Thus, dangerous Dhani Munda dies as a result of ignoring his expulsion order . . . (17-18). Here, Dhani Munda is blamed as dangerous one and spread the news that he has been shot because he disobeys the "expulsion order" of the government police. It seems to be natural that if a dangerous person is disloyal to the order of the police officer, it is the prime duty of him to shoot him for the social protection so as to stop further dire consequences. Dhani Munda was already in the "wanted list" of the police and he could kill the innocent people. This kind of logic comes to be futile when we see this incident from a different view. Can this logic answer the question: What dangerous work has Dhani done against the spirit of the community? Who is the oppressor and who invaded their community? Is it natural to rule over the adivasi as per the wish of the rulers? If these questions are answered objectively, the whole blame of destruction goes to the ruler. By raising slogan of civilizing adivasi people they have started using the weapons so they could control such "dangerous" people and take the situation under control. By this they can establish the system which supports them to maintain their Raj. In the above lines, it is notified that Dhani Munda, most respectable person of the community, has been shot dead not having such special reason. Dhani works in the spirit of his community but it is not digestible for those who are the upper rank of the

social ladder. Thus, this kind of direct force legitimizes the fact that whoever goes against the system should face such fate and concurrently this successfully establishes the ideology at work.

The fact of using the coercive force becomes evident when the police try to alter the white-truth that what the adivasi people have seen into falsity. The writer says:

. . . The police fought him hard and then killed him.

Who knows where the other Naxal went.

Sana says, No, no, he didn' attack t' polis.

Who said so?

We saw.

Forget what ye saw, boys. Yo won' understand all this with yer jungle brains. Say what t' police say. If you want to stay safe. (181)

It is not easy to say that the police brutality has reached its climax. Sana, an adivasi boy, has seen the real incident in which the Naxal boy has been shot dead by the police: the Naxal boy has not attacked the police; the police is threatening Sana to forget the truth and create a truth that the police personnel wanted to save himself. The forceful imposition of the idea that Sana should change the truth is the perversion of police brutality and consequently a clear hidden sign of failure of maintaining their rule as it is for a long period of time. People of lower rank burst into violence if the limit is transgressed.

Another equally convincing reason the subaltern people are blinded by the repressive ideology of capitalism is that they are denied the knowledge about the socio-economic condition of the society. Through this understanding minority people automatically develop a kind of consciousness which ultimately resist against the dominant group. Thus, the Marxist critics Michael Ryan says" . . . locate literature within its social, economic, and historical context . . . " (53). In a clear way, Marxist

critics argue that all human events and productions have specific material/historical causes. Thus, Marxist analysis puts forward its argument that economics is the base on which the superstructure of social/political/ideological realities are built. Socio-economic power always includes social and political power. However, this socio-economic reality is made so subtle that even the privileged group, sometimes, may not understand. It is because of repressive ideology that functions well to hide the authentic reality from the subaltern people. In the connection, Lois Tyson argues:

By posing as natural ways of seeing the world, repressive ideologies prevent us from understanding the material/historical conditions in which we live because they refuse to acknowledge that those conditions have any bearing on the way we see the world. (56-57)

The unproductive repressive ideology prevents from seeing the tress of socio-economic condition in the present situation where class division is apparent: one who controls the natural, material and social sources and the other who is exploited; who does not have authority of ownership over those sources. So, the devastating ideology tries to convince the people to analyze the social structure has no bearing and role of ideology to play. Devi, very clearly portrays her characters and situation where they are satisfied with the condition they are living in: adivasi, Munda, Oreon people have been engaging in their own lot to fulfill their hand- to- mouth problems; they do not have even a minute to think why they are always in deplorable condition. Rather, in a sense, they accept their originality that they are poor and thus honest to the government. They are busy with herding the cattle, and getting married. In other words, they are keen to deal with family affairs.

However, when the perversity transgresses its boundary, they have developed a consciousness that their groups are in oppression. They start to critique the capitalist ideology with different activities. One very powerful critical analysis we can sense here

is that Chotti Munda wants to prove that he has spell bound arrer is false and tries to establish the fact that his "spell is in his arm, not in the arrer." (120) Let's look at the following conversation:

. . . Dukhia, Sukha and Bikhna had come. Chotti sighed. He drew a line on stone. Come back and said, Raise yer bow. Ye say spell, I say practice. It ya try with your whole life, why won' ye get it? Koel said, if we win, ah! we'll lift you on our heads an' dance. Lift yer bows more. he draws a target. First prepare yer eyes. There's t' target, there's ye.

There's no one else, nothing else. (62)

There is a story about Chotti Munda that he is like a god as he possesses spell in his arrer and his skill. That's why, people from various villages have come to him for learning shooting arrows. However, the bitter fact is that all the participants, Dukhia, Sukha, and Bikhna, are preoccupied with this false assumption that Chotti is able to hit the target as the spell comes to play. But while teaching them, Chotti strongly convinces them that the spell is nothing but whole-life practice. He cites his example of spending whole life in the archery discipline. Thus with the spirit of practice he trains them setting the target and devoting their interests and concentration only to the target: "there's t' target; there's ye. There's no one else, nothin' else" (105). This consciousness of Chotti and teaching this to new generation has generated a kind of revolution to resist the capitalist system. This process certainly helps them to engage into the work rather than believing passively in the fate.

Yet another convincing point to be noted, of course in a wider sense, is the lopsided treatment of the history. On the one hand, dominant group in the society does not recognize the history of subaltern people, on the other, the official history writing tradition never accounts for the real feeling, spirit and sentiments of the forgotten people. This hidden contradiction, indeed, leads us easily to the conclusion that history

operates with jaundiced eyes – the treatment of history to its people in a class-division. In this connection what Ranajit Guha in his profound essay "On Some Aspects of Historiography of Colonial India" argues is emphatic: ". . . History . . . written up as a sort of spiritual biography of Indian elite... the bankruptcy of this historiography follows directly from the narrow and partial view of politics to which it is committed by virtue of its class outlook" (2- 3).

The history of Indian history, Guha argues, cannot represent the subaltern people with the proper treatment as it is solely the representation of Indian elite and its partial and partial view towards people proves that is committed to the virtue of its class outlook. In other words, it cannot be the true history as it has already divided the society into the classes with some opposite qualities. This argument heavily focuses on the class division and its treatment accordingly. This simply remind us of Marx and his descendents' argument. However, my concern is not to assimilate Guha's ideas with Marxist line, but to analyze the devastating consequences of the misbehaviour of the history. One obvious result we easily realize is that there is the widening gap between the dominant groups and minority people. Thus, an elite class always tries to exploit the subaltern people:

. . . He manufactures hollow bricks. He likes to give the work to the villagers because their rates are extremely low. Chotti's group and Chhagan's group save Tirthanath's labour and work there. . . . Everybody gives the twelve annas daily wage announced by Pratap. Chhagan says, we are now the twelve – anna soldiers. (136)

Clearly notified fact in the quote is that the group of manufacturers and the group of heavy exploitation are on the conflict. Pratap Chadha is a renowned producer of hollow bricks. This company is run by the workers in an extremely low wages but it is controlled by a single man, Chadha. Similarly, Tirthanath Lala also represents the elites

group for whom Chotti's group and Chhagan's group work. He, too, exploits others in his company. It is the owner who decides the labour of the labourers. The whole toil and sweat is represented by few amount of money. And such is recognized by the workers as they find themselves as "twelve – anna soldiers". The instrumental and mechanical use of human beings by capitalism is usual in it but brings alienation and pauperization among the workers. In the above lines, such instrumental use of own self has been recognized by Chhagan but the fact is that he cannot fight against it alone. The antithesis continues until the subaltern group recognizes that it has been exploited.

Similarly, the owners try to make the workers work in low wage so that they could be benefitted more. Let's analyze the following lines:

Lala Baijnath was not pleased with the well-being in Birsa Munda's household. The particular reason was that Baijnath's field and yardwork was generally done by local Oraons and Mundas. And some untouchable castes. Baijnath prefers to have adivasi labour. Adivasis work for incredibly low wages. Don't like bickering. They work as they give word. (25)

What is clearly notified here is that the capitalists do not want the well to do condition of the poor's. They always and all ways try to exploit the workers so that they can save the surplus amount as their additional profit. They presuppose that adivasis are naïve and innocent fellows of their commands and intention. They work as "they give word". This is the sincerity of the workers as they are away from any kind of plot and cheating. They are made to believe the fact that "work is worship" and they are preoccupied with this fact. With this line of argument what we can understand is that the lower class people are forced to remain under the fit of the owners of industries and lands. Equally convincing fact can be realized at the same time it is not the idea that they are

compelled to go along the line of higher class people but it is their solidarity which makes them remain under the web of their own tradition and culture.

Mundas like other adivasi have their own tradition of living and working but the capitalism with its money breeding mechanism has created crisis in their tribal life and culture. Outwardly, it seems that they are facilitated in different fields including the jobs but in fact it is not. The reality is that their condition is intact. Let's analyze the following lines:

Yeah. Take a look how t' place is bigger now, so many typesa folks now. So many differen typesa jobs too. But we remain where we were, us. I see one good thing Before we couldn' eat if Tirathnath didn' give loan. Now we break stones, we shovel earth, we take less loan. And I see that ways are changin'. Harmu wears shirts, and t' girls e'en wear blouses. It's not our old ways. (118)

The tradition is the identity of Mundas. They identify themselves through their tradition of festivals, clothing, housing etc. But capitalism has changed the entire structure of the society including the physical. It has created jobs in different fields so as to facilitate people but in fact it is to facilitate its own mechanism and strengthen its own root through its hidden ideology. Now, the adivasis do not have to depend upon Tirathnath or some other person for their livelihood during famine. They can do diverse types of works. Capitalism offers opportunities from one hand, at the same time it snatches a lot from them which is precious. So, even in such changed situation they feel through their innate heart that they "remain where they were". Though their jobs, clothes and other ways of living have changed they did not find themselves being benefited in reality. And, they long for "old ways" which used to identify them.

Because of the biased attitude and behaviour of the state run by the capitalists, subaltern people cannot raise their head even if the rights are guaranteed by

the law. Now in the following lines, Chotti Munda resists to the capitalistic system of treatment to the subaltern people.

Who'll bring charges agin t' Lala lord? . . . Chotti's voice grows long and high with misery, . . . he grasps law, grasps rights? Who makes this law? Government.

Where does this Gormen live?

In Delhi.

It's far away, nah?

Yes. (239)

In the above lines Chotti tells Harmu that though laws and rights are made but it is the "far away" matter for adivasis. He tells that Lala Baijanath captures laws and rights because he has money. He very ironically tells Harmu that the government makes law for the people but it is applicable only in the city areas like "Delhi" not at the corner of the country. Tirathnath can exploit such laws on his behalf through his capital. So, there is no law made for such groups in reality. Subaltern cannot raise their head demanding their right on the basis of social justice as there is no law made for them. Thus, Chotti Munda very ironically resists the capitalistic system of treatment to the subaltern people.

The perfect capitalistic approach and behavior are easily realized in Harban Chadha when he quarrels with Tirathnath Lalaji so on the other hand reflects the perversity of transition from feudalism to capitalism:

Harbans is a bloodsucker but he's a small industrialist, and his way of thinking is more modern than Tirathnath's. In the coming five-year plans he wants to be middle industrialist from this area. Tirathnath's land – centered mentality is altogether repugnant to him. He strongly wants to

bemore powerful than Tirathnath. He said with some asperity. The time of kings is past Lalaji. You want to remain the master of laws and order, but that's not possible. (143)

Capitalism believes upon the idea of competition while gaining money. Harbans quarrels with Tirathnath as their way of gaining money is different. Tirathnath Lalaji has land centered mentality and wants to maintain bonded labour so as to get perpetual profit which Harbans finds very repugnant. Though both of them are bloodsuckers but Harban Chadha is modern man who owns small indurstry. Chadha as an agent of capitalism wants to perpetuate that, in capitalism you cannot master the law and order which is almost impossible but what we need to do is to create an unwritten ideology – a belief system – which surpasses the written laws. This ideology hegemonies the workers to work in low wage and fulfill the vested interest of owners.

The hidden political strategy of the dominant group to make the subalterns stay under the feet is clear with the dissatisfaction of Tirathnath and Harban Chadha towards the situation when the Chotti's group owns the small bit of land on installment. Let's analyze the following lines:

Both Tirathnath and Harbans remain dissatisfied with Chotti's acquisition of land. It's not correct that Chotti and company should own even stony land. . . . They may get a sense of property rights in land. That is not desirable. They should be kept like specters without any recourse, without any materiality, forever dependent. Like those who are kept apart by earth, by water, by air. Unknown to each other, they both look at the matter of Chotti's land in their own self interest. (148)

Tirathnath and Harban Chadha are the agent of capitalism. Their main motto is to gain maximum interest through the minimum investment. And for this what they need is

the total control over the means of production. Land, in this case, works as the means of production. Capitalists hold the material production and makes workers to increase their interest. Owning the means of production is to make deeper economic gulf between them and the workers. One of the hidden natures of capitalism is to accelerate the gulf between them. So as to perpetuate their interest of keeping the workers in their feet always in their feet they do so. Moreover, it is also a way of ruling over them as workers automatically become weak through this hidden mechanism of capitalism. What Tirathnath and Harban want is to make such adivasis follow them so as to sustain their livelihood.

In a more critical way the biased behavior of history leads the people of subalternity to the identity crisis. They are nothing as they are not recorded in the main official history. The concept of history is increasingly significant not only because it systematically sidelines the subaltern people from generation to generation, but also because it convincingly pushes back its effort to the same complicated society to further dominate the subaltern. With the application to such one-sided history and subsequent consequences in the formation to mindsets of those who already deserve the power, the few self-proclaimed people keep on subjugating the majority in the society. However, it cannot be denied that they have some tools to operate such a lopsided visionary mission among the people. To civilize aboriginals through modernization is the most widely convincing tool. Following lines are worthy to be critiqued:

Chotti returns home but the clouds don't lift from his mind. The day is coming. Munda will not be able to live with their identity. In all national development work they will have to be one with those who are the oppressed of the land, and work . . . as sweated workers for contractor or trader. Then there'll be a shirt on his body, perhaps shoes on his feet. Then the 'Muna' identity will live only at festivals- in social exchange.

(110)

The distinctive identity for subaltern is just the imagination if they follow the rules of the capitalists. Capitalists strategically operate the ideal concept of modernization whose surgical glittering is overwhelming for all including the long deceived ones. A Munda will have a shirt on his body and shoes on his feet only when they become one "as the sweated workers for contractor or trader." In other words, they in no way have the hope to be united with the contractors and traders because they always believes that they are the breadwinner and are proud of the activities that they have kept them alive giving them work. Similarly, subalterns are creditors for being civilized from the capitalists. They spread the wave of modernization and Mundas have understood how to wear shirt and shoes.

With this explanation, the obvious but left to be analyzed fact is that Mundas as subaltern will not have their cultural identity as their culture is attacked and is slowly being destroyed. To put it in another way, communal solidarity as the identity of subaltern people will only live at festivals – in social exchange – because capitalism will modernize and mould all of them according to the interest of ruling class and capitalists. Now it can be understood that the destruction of culture is the destruction of their unity. The destruction will occur also because the mindsets of the poor people will be diverted to participate in the race of capitalism where they run a huge race for their hunger and their vision is limited within the boundary because in this case the rulers are so many cleavers. They show the 'lollypop' of golden mission where everything would be fine- Mundas will have money, and buy their happiness – and they are only the capitalists who grab money. As to see how they systematically destroy their cultures lets analyze following lines:

. . . A certain pre-retirement army doctor says, peaceful? Do you know that twenty-two years ago, sitting in this clubroom we English trembled

for fear of Birsa Munda? Of course we were able to defeat him later.

But don't call them peaceful. Playing the tulia, dancing the group dance and then shooting arrows. A most complicated people. (43)

The words of pre-retirement army can solely prove the fact that the Mundas are "most complicated people" and they are not worthy to be called the peaceful people even in their peaceful work at any cost. He is so firm in their peaceful work at any cost. He is so firm in his argument that it is historical fact that twenty-two years ago English, the capitalists "trembled for fear of Birsa Munda" and finally they were able to defeat him later. What is obvious is that the rulers have some kind of logic that they use and try to convince the mass that the rioting and violence is inevitable in the subalterns.

The official history of the complicated society is biased. In this connection what Gyanendra Pandey is logical:

The historiography treats the violence of the state in class apart.

Generally . . . ruling-class narrative argues that the state violence can not be counted violence at all. Reason, progress, organization, discipline, (history itself), belongs to the state and the ruling classes; violence belongs to the other, those left behind by history. (49)

Pandey clearly analyzes that the history proceeds ahead having two visible categories. One the state identified by the ruling-classes who possess all positive attributions- reason, progress, organization and so on – and another majority of the society but bitterly left behind by history. His conclusion surfaces the fact that the official narrative with jaundiced eyes sees the violence naturally embedded with the people with low social status. However, the lopsided history cannot visualize the crystal-clear fact that the violence enumerates from the state authority because it is the government who has controlled the arms and ammunition and uses it against the subalterns.

The hollowness of their argument and futile base of their feet of which they are standing resurfaces itself when "every year the Daroga thinks, there's sure to be rioting in adivasi fair" (123). What they mean by this is that the violence is inborn in the Munda community. But the notable fact is that the violence is not within but against the destructors who attack their culture and destroy their happiness. Can anyone compromise one's cultural identity at any cost? Can he/she forget and disbelieve his/her values and assumption in some enforcement without any logical ground? Can they deceive their linguistic origin? Can anyone falsify his/her originator, the festivals where his/her upbringing was possible? The unitary answer of any sensible person is always "no". The encroachment of the traders and contractors has infuriated the adivasi and subalterns of their origins and in a contradictory way they are blaming that they are incessantly and inherently violent. To be further convinced and visualize the sentiment of the capitalists against subalterns, following lines are helpful:

Dhani Munda, accused and convicted in the Munda riot case headed by Birsa Munda. . . . After his release, he was sent to Murudi village under Tahar police station in Palamau with the order of staying out of Chaibasha. There was a police prescient in Murudi. Dhani was a dangerous criminal. The prescient was altered about him. It was desirable that he stay under cover. (17)

The rumor spreads all over the connection of authority that Dhani Munda is a dangerous criminal can be quite antithetical to their own moral ground. One-sidedly, Dhani is convicted for having nothing like that of conviction – he just has participated in the archery competition and performed his art just like a sure-shooter – and removed even from Chaibasha and altered that he is a criminal. If he is a criminal, what is the definition that assesses the criminality? What has he done like that for which he has been convicted as a dangerous criminal. To perform the cultural artifact in an occasion

is surely not the criminality, rather it can be understood that to attack and destroy the peaceful cultural performance is a criminal if we can be more objective in the judgment. If the cultural performance of Mundas is not desirable for the authority, it is democratic fact that the rulers do not have the right to inflict into it and snatch their happiness.

The contradiction does not only stay in their behaviours, it also smashes their historical narratives that, as I argued already, reinforce the legality of the authority to further perpetuate their atrocity in their practice. "The tendency of historiography", Gyanendra Pandey argues, "represent the 'native' as the primitive other, and violence, and at the contrary, it argues for the passiveness of the peasants. They are ill-educated and insufficiently enlightened." (353). This clearly shows the perversity of their contradictory assumption and behaviours. The whole political cultural, behavioural, industrial, and economical power rest on the authoritative people and on this legal ground they define the subaltern "as the primitive other" and at the same time, having no shame at all, they go for saying so far that they are passive, "ill-educated and insufficiently enlightened". If they are pushed to the margin and not given any opportunity and treated as if they are animals, can anyone expect that they can be educated? Can we believe that a passive man can be violent and dangerous at the same moment?

What is interesting to be noted down here for me is that they assume the education and its founding principle with the western concept of enlightenment. And thus, they take the "violence" what Gyanendra Pandey explains, "is the product of absence of goodness, of the enlightenment of western education" (355). What should be very consciously understood here is that the western project of enlightenment has a particular shape that has no history of liberating the ignorant people who are under shadows. Rather it always tries to mould the mindsets of the common people to support the western model of capitalism. However, their deep-rooted inherent contradiction is

rampant in their logics if we go beneath the ideal version of enlightenment for even a while. This hidden anomaly becomes evident in their mission of enlightening the subaltern people in India when we analyze the following lines:

Readin' and writin's not f'r us.

By law it's f'r ever'one, but not in fact.

Oh let t' Brahmans', and t' Lalas' , and t' caste-Hindu kids go to school.

Chotti lauchs and says, T'm not in pain, Sana's sister's son has seen that Ranchi, Munda girls and Oraon girls go to Mission schools and still don' get jobs. Work construction, go to cut coal. (119)

The subsequent response of Chotti Munda regarding the mission school after he realized that this project was just playing a strategic game, has a very significant meaning for understanding. Initially, it can be realized from the lines that he is just dissatisfied by this school just because it cannot earn money and he seems to suggest all of his followers to "work on construction, go to cut coal" as he might have thought that it was an immediate reward of work that was very essential to fulfill their immediate necessity of joining hand to mouth. However, at the same time, the parallel story, as we visualize in those lines that systematically has made the Munda people to believe that reading and writings is not their business because it takes a long time to get its reward and does not provide any job after its completion – "Munda girls and Oraon girls go to Mission schools and still don' get jobs" (96). To put it another way, the ruling class, with the support and spirit of western enlightenment, has set the mission school to civilize the subaltern people as they believe that those uncivilized people are barbaric and have no sense of enlightenment. At the same time, they have created the ideology that initiates the subaltern people to disbelieve on this; the Munda people have developed the ideology that reading and writing is not supportive for them as the spirit of education and its ideal enlightening vision has never been materialized in their lives: it was a

vision in the beginning and it always remain just as their imagination. Now, this makes us to conclude that the dominant group of people has done this to further subjugate the subaltern people. They again, after being failed to educate them, blame the subaltern people they are so barbaric that even the education cannot change them so easily. It, for them, becomes the tool to legitimize their reign over the lives of them. By this they themselves believe that it is the natural rights and prime duty to rule because the Munda, and Adivasi people have 'jungle minds.

However, it does not mean that their presence in the history is excluded; their position is clear but the main objection is to give equal emphasis. It may be assumed that their identity in the history is identified at the margin as they are the people of margin in the society. To get rid of this intricate complexity subaltern people have, indeed, developed a counter-history that can be parallel to the main stream history. Their original history is unwritten thus recorded in songs and customs and this history is transmitted from generation to generation:

Yes all's a story in Chotti Munda's life, Munda language has no script. So they turn significant events into story, hold them as saying, as song. That's their history as well. . . . This body will die, but his kernel and his spirit will not perish. He is the Earth father. (18)

Munda people believe that Chotti Munda is the Earth father. He is all pervasive and omnipresent that nobody extinguishes his existence from the Munda culture and costume. Of course, his body can physically be destroyed but "his spirit will not perish" (212) – his ideology will be the guiding principle for all subsequent generation. They don't have their own script but it cannot forsake their existence and the existence of their history. In an alternative way they inscribe all the significant events into the song that becomes always alive and ready whenever they are pushed. The more the rulers show their tyrannical behaviours the more their history in the form of song become

intensive and alive as that struck their mind. Thus, the rampant repetition of the lines in this novel "everything turns into story in Chotti Munda's life"(12) shows the fact that whatever Chotti Munda does that becomes a form of history and he automatically becomes the history book. Chotti Munda, too, is a symbolic model figure for all the subaltern in India where he stands in the frontier to fight against the oppression.

III. Subaltern Motif In *Chotti Munda and His Arrow*

The present research analyzes Devi's *Chotti Munda and His Arrow* from subaltern. It digs out many issues from the depth of the novel which are hidden by the canonical history which is written from the perspective of power. It represents the voice of Indian tribals who have no agency of mainstream culture. It also depicts the subjugated condition of the marginalized rural community and their struggle in the post colonial state of India. More specifically, this research analyzes the justification of violent resistance as the resort of a desperate people against the capitalist cult.

This historical novel portrays the pathetic socio-economic condition of the tribal and untouchable groups during the late twentieth century in north-east state of Bihar, India. The struggle of the adivasis and the untouchables during the British rule, the lack of compassion and understanding of the government pre independence, the unremitting exploitation by the landlords and contractors seeking cheap labour and the cruelty of the Indian government and its agents post independence is beautifully depicted here. Chotti Munda – a central character- as a representative of the adivasis suffers many atrocities like seeing his father hang himself after being humiliated by the landlords, his son going to jail for petty crime and he being linked to the Naxalite struggle.

The wide sweep of this important historical novel encompasses many layers. It ranges over decades in the life of Chhoti – the central character – in which India moves from colonial rule to independence and then to the unrest of the 1970s. It probes and uncovers the complex web of social and economic exchange based on power relations. It traces the changes, some forced, some welcome, in the daily lives of a marginalized rural community. And at its core, it celebrates Chotti, legendary archer; wise and farsighted leader; proud role model to his young brethren. Written in 1980, this novel is also remarkable for the manner in which it touches on vital issues that have, in subsequent decades, grown into matter of urgent social concern. It raises questions

about the place of the tribal on the map of national identity, land right and human right, the 'musemization' of 'ethnic' cultures, and the justification of violent resistance as the last resort of a desperate people, amongst others.

Capitalist mechanism always longs for the production of the capital at any cost even crushing the toil and labour of the poor by its symbolic feet. In the novel Lala Baijnath, Tirathnath and Chadha as a landlords and capitalists continues bonded labour and makes the adivasi's to work in low wage. The presence of government in the form of police force is not there to maintain social justice but functioning as a working hand of capitalism to facilitate its tyranny. Such vulnerable condition is made worse when members of Youth League Party – Romeo, Dildar and Pahlwan – started mistreating people and even cutting the wage of the workers which was already low. They mistreated the helpless adivasis by raping, killing, looting and setting fire on their houses. When the tyranny became unbearable then the subaltern group resisted them violently. Chotti Munda along with Somachar, Disha, Upa and Lal wounds the members of Youth League Party. Shooting arrow is the tradition of Mundas. And, shooting arrow to them was to shoot arrow towards capitalism through the communal solidarity. Dildar dies of tetanus, Romeo's right arm has to be cut off from the shoulder and Pahalwan right arm is cut off from elbow. So, their death and cutting off their arms was the act of cutting off the feathers of capitalism that used to exploit them always and all ways.

The research has borrowed the ideas from different and Marxist scholars to prove it logically how it is relevant in subaltern studies. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Ranjit Guha, M.A.R. Habib, Terry Eagleton, Louis Althusser, Lois Tyson, Gyanendra Pandey have been applied in it.

In summing up, this research has projected the issues from the marginal perspective which are available in *Chotti Munda and His Arrow*. It advocates Indian subaltern group. It also tries an attempt to bring the valorization of subaltern culture on the basis of socio-economic status. It gives the voice to the voiceless. Adivasis and untouchables who are suppressed through the net of elitist ideology have been put in the foreground of it. By deriving the ideas from different subaltern scholars, the research has brought the particular and marginal issues which are quite remarkable.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8th Ed. New Delhi: Harcourt, 2000.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus." *Literary Theory : An Anthology*. Eds. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Malden:Blackwell Publisher, 1998. 19151-990.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Eds. Hazard Adams, and Leroy Searle. Florida: University Press of Florida, 1968. 248-267.
- Banu, Nazia. "Moving away from the Margins." Rev. of *Chotti Munda and His Arrow*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 11 Feb. 1990: 26-27.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. New York: Routledge, 2002 . . .
Ideology: An Introduction. London: Verso, 1991.
- Guha, Ranjit. " On Some Aspects of Historiography of Colonial India" *Subaltern Studies*. Ed. Ranjit Guha. New Delhi: OUP, 1996. 1-8.
- Guha, Ranjit. " The Prose of Counter Insurgency." *Subaltern Studies II*. Ed. Ranjit Guha. Delhi: OUP, 1983. 210-284.
- Habib, M.A.R." Marxism." *A History of Literary Criticism from Plata to the Present*. Blackwell, 2005. 528.
- Nicholas, Harrison. "Excremental Post-Colonialism." *New York Times* 3.21(Summer 1985):17-27
- Pandey, Gyanendra. "Tendency of Historiography." *Subaltern Studies VI* Ed. Gyanendra Pandey. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1926. 346-379.

Salvador, Dora Sales. "Documentation on Ethics in Post-colonial Translation."

Washington Post 4.31 (1995): 45-55.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can Subaltern Speak?" *The Postcolonial Studies*

Reader. 4th ed. New York: Routledge, 2006.45-66.

Tyson, Louis. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge,

1990.