

## **I. Rejection of Traditional Representation of Disability**

This thesis endeavors its best to unfold how the novel *The Bone People* by Keri Hulme appears to depart from traditional literary representation of disability that has been exploitative and highly limiting. The novel explores postcolonial situations in New Zealand and presents pivotal characters with disabilities who eventually define the relationships of disability to each of the two cultures. But does the novel really break new ground?

Disability studies keeps a view that disability is one of the most pervasive markers. Anyone in any group could be, could have been, or could become a person with a disability, and everyone will experience some form of disability if he or she lives long enough. Yet critics in this new field find that authors have traditionally used a handy metaphor for otherness or for alternative social disturbance. They argue that alternatives in gender, race and sexual orientation have often been demonized by marking those groups with physical or intellectual abnormalities. They also see no disabled individuals historically defining themselves as normal by using disability as a universal metaphor for abnormality. That is, if people with disabilities did not exist, non disabled people would have to invent them. However, the situation for character with disabilities differs from other frequently marginalized groups in that they have “a plethora of representation in visual and discursive works. Consequently, disabled people’s marginalization has occurred in the midst of a perpetual circulation of their images” (Mitchell and Snyder 6). Although other groups may suffer a lack of literary exposure, people with disabilities get plenty of fictional press, usually of a negative kind.

Not surprisingly, characters in fiction with disability almost always are flat and static because they most often function as symbols, their perspectives are not

developed and unimportant to the development of the plot. Physical aberration in a literary character is indicative of mental, emotional, social or spiritual aberration or any combination of those states. Physical difference marks the outsider or the monster, which rages or is isolated and dying inside unseen.

Keeping these ideas in mind the present researcher, first of all, un.masks how the central characters Kerewin and Joseph behave to a disabled character named Simon. Kerewin, from the very beginning of the novel, doesn't behave satisfactorily to Simon. She unwillingly permits him to enter into her house and treats him as if he is second grade citizen. She blames that Simon specializes in "sneak thievery and vandalism" (34). She unwillingly accepts the gift given to her by Simon. She easily rejects his proposal of her playing the role of substitute mother in the sense that she thinks of her that she is normal one having discursive power. Joseph, in the same fashion, undermines Simon though he is adopted father to him. He beats him so bitterly that Simon gets hospitalized and he himself is imprisoned for such vicious physical abuse. Joseph and Kerewin treat him inhumanly though they themselves are psychologically, culturally and spiritually disabled, if not physically for they themselves are the victims of patriarchy and imperial and settler nationalism.

Amidst these situations, the mute boy Simon succeeds to be a creative boy (though he is only of nine years) in the sense that he becomes successful to make them realize they are exploited and disabled one in front of imperial and settler nationalism so that they should form new unit of family devoid of any hierarchies in the name of class, race and gender materializing the vision of greater cultural inclusiveness and egalitarianism. Simon, the mute boy is the agent of this fruitful evolution, which unfortunately puts him squarely in the tradition that views people with disabilities in the other extreme, as links with divine. As Christ is sacrificial to

the welfare of all humanity, Simon, here in the novel, is sacrificial to the welfare of both cultures either Pakeha or Maori. Though Joseph and Kerewin behave him as if he is no human beings, he recurrently visits Kerewin, provides her signet ring, takes her as substitute mother, silently sings the song of her and takes Joseph as his own father, bears all the abuses received by him, escapes to him when he is shifted to orphanage. His respect and loyalty to them make them melt and be engulfed in the vast ocean of humanity challenging the traditional notion of disability as social burden. Here in the novel, the establishment of multicultural family of non-spousal and non-biological relation based on pure sentiments and freedom devours any sorts of hierarchies in any names. This formation is not a family premised upon heterosexual relations, nor on strictly blood descent for Kere and Joe are not sexual partners or married in the usual sense, and Simon is adopted by Joe and Kere. This is no longer the family in traditional sense. Thus, it results into new unit of family.

*The Bone People*, published in 1984, explores the complexities of human relationships by weaving an intricate, painful web between three self-destructive characters. Each is almost ruined by a tragic flaw but ultimately saved by forgiving personal differences and reuniting to form a multicultural family. Their individual stories, fragmented into dreams, memories, songs, dialogues, and snatches of interior monologue, spiral around each other interdependently. The text, which sometimes reads like a prose poem, is further enhanced by rhythmic Maori phrases, most of which Keri Hulme translates in an index. Together, the four parts of the book form a patchwork. Each part contains three chapters that are divided into numbered segments, and the whole is framed by a prologue and epilogue. As with a difficult piece of music, its secrets are not easily revealed.

Similarly, *The Bone People* is significant as a first novel by a part-Maori writer, who utilizes Maori phrases, as well as Maori tribal memories and attitudes, to point out the spiritual deficiencies in the culture that has supplanted the ancient Polynesian traditions. In the essay "The Bone People Master plots II: British and Commonwealth Fiction Series" Resemary M. Canfield Reisman excavates, "The sicknesses of Simon, deprived of his family, of Joe, rejecting the wisdom of his family and of Kerewin, altogether repudiating her family, can be cured only by a restoration of community and an establishment of a new family unit"(4). In the same essay Reisman comments upon its publication history. She further says:

The publication history of *The Bone People* reflects the vigor of the Maori tradition. Rejected by numerous publishers, it was finally brought out by a feminist cooperative and later republished in Great Britain by Hodder and Stoughton, winning the Brooker prize in 1985. The novel also received Mobil's Pegasus Prize and was published in the United States by the Louisiana State University Press. Keri Hulme's determination to speak for New Zealand's Polynesians, to voice the wisdom of an ancient culture, to warn arrogant civilization of its loss of the sense of community has thus been justified. (4)

Thus, it becomes clear that though the novel is poorly taken in its initial phase, it establishes itself as a major contribution as it receives two prestigious awards.

Thomas E. Benediktsson examines some ruptures in the realism of Keri Hulme's *The Bone people* which attempts to find alternatives to the western rationalism, pragmatism, and linearity that support realism's codes. The form of the novel involves breaking the codes of realism, not only introducing romance elements and evoking the supernatural but also disrupting the linearity of the narrative and

altering its spatial and psychological geography. The stream of consciousness technique, used in the novel, alters rationalism through the nonrational flow of sensation, perception, and intuition. The introduction of myth layers the text brings by juxtaposing the temporal with the timeless, the diachronic with the synchronic. These textual strategies not only force the western reader to abandon empiricism, but they also create a fictive realm of possibility and power - the possibility of the awakening of the traditional gods, and the power of those reawakened gods to cure the postcolonial malaise. He writes:

Late in the novel, when Joe meets the Kaumatua (old man) who has been guarding the sacred site of the landfall of one of the Great Canoes, he learns that he, Kerewin, and Simon are the foretold new guardians. He also learns that the spiritual power of the place emanates not from the site but from a stone that came on the Canoe, a stone holding a mauriora (life-power) that was not yet departed from the world. After Kaumatua's death, when Joe takes the stone with him, there is hope that Kerewin, Joe and Simon – reunited, and cured of madness, illness, and violence – will create a new "marae" or site of community, inspired by the presence of the awakened mauriora. (126)

The above lines claim that Maori spirituality is the major source of reunion between Kerewin, Simon and Joseph thereby creates a bicultural family and this establishment of supernatural power of Maori tradition ruptures the notion of realism.

Commenting on the issue of liminal spaces and imaginary places in the book *Liminal Spaces and Imaginary Places in the Bone People* by Keri Hulme and the *Folly* by Ivan Vladislavic Marita Wenzel writes, "*The Bone People* illustrates how fictional characters, in an individual and social sense, have to experience" rites of

passage "in order to come to terms with traumatic changes in their lives and cultures"

(79). She further states:

Hulme uses fiction and the imagination to undermine static or conventional perceptions of identity. She proposes to reconcile, link or connect different cultures by means of literature and its close correlatives myth and art... she grapples with the question of liminality in various guises... However, the three people finally reunite as a prototype of a family and so stage their reintegration into society where the family unit functions as a necessary and valuable component whereas Kerewin's tower initially serves as a symbol of separation, her convoluted new house at the end of the novel represents and anticipates the eventual creation of a new social dynamic, thereby indicating that the present can learn from the past. (82-83)

The given lines conclude that fiction and imagination perform as the place of in-between or liminality thus reunites two cultures: Pakeha (European) and Maori.

In *Remolding the Body Politic* Michelle Keown keenly observes the novel from the point of view of body politics. He reveals, "*The Bone People* investigates psycho-social dysfunction as an expression of a broader cross-cultural disharmony within New Zealand society" (102). Hulme's interest in special identities and biographical syncreticity represents one facet of wider preoccupation with the human body as a cultural symbol in her work. Across a range of her writing, Hulme represents damaged, disfigured and diseased bodies as symbols of personal or cultural dysfunction, and in *The Bone People*, in particular, she also explores the healing of damaged bodies as a metaphor for transcending overcoming these personal and social evils. Keown in the same book asserts:

The bodies of the three central characters Kerewin Holmes, Joe Gillayley and Simon Peter Gillayley are initially posited as palimpsests upon which are inscribed the sublimated violence of New Zealand's colonial and pre-colonial past. During the course of the narratives however, these three characters [and their bodies] undergo cathartic experiences of violence and suffering which result in the eventual establishment of a new regenerated collectivity. (103)

These quoted lines, first of all, undermine the concept of body as the store house of violence and uplift the body as a source of resistance and new formation.

Elizabeth M. DeLoughrey in her *National Beginnings: Keri Hulme's The Bone People* addresses issues of national belonging by unevenly incorporating the multiple ethnic settlements of Aotearoa\New Zealand under a loose rubric of Whakapapa (Maori genealogy). He opines that Hulme attempts to reconcile competing cultural epistemologies by incorporating Pakeha into Maori tradition based on a layering Diaspora that positions Maori as the authoritative first-nation people. She further says:

Kerewin resists the maternal role expected of her and refuses to join into a sexual relationship with Joe suggesting an alternative to the heterosexual family... as these three characters (Kere, Joe and Simon) also draw upon diverse ethnic and epistemic genealogies. They struggle to create a new definition of family\nation... layer by layer; the novel discards gender and ethnic hierarchies in its construction of family. (188)

The above given lines make it clear that the novel tries to form a multicultural family devoid of any hierarchies in any name.

In this regard, it becomes clear that the text has been analyzed from various perspectives like biographical\contextual, realistic, postcolonial, body politics and nationalism. The novel's sketching of muteness, emotional and psychological deformity, spiritual and cultural wound, physical and intellectual abnormality, physical mutilation and abuse, Simon's breaking of Kerewin's modernist alienation, his motivation of her to perform social role and involve in the act of forming multicultural family via a negotiation of relation between Pakeha and Maori that creates bridges across lines of race, gender and class demands another approach to deal. Without proper study of these issues, the meaning of the text will remain incomplete. Having this fact into consideration, the present researcher proposes to carry out research from the perspective of disability studies.



## II. Disability and Stigma

Disability studies is an emerging field, still defining its theories and parameters and borrowing much of its methodology from gender, racial, postcolonial, and queer studies, which often derive from theorists such as Foucault and Derrida. It, thus, is a new field of study that claims its space as a form of discipline. Theoretically, it proposes two fundamental ideas: firstly, the concept of disability is a social construction and secondly, disabled ones are not social burden but they can do something creative to society and family. Disability as such is a very inclusive term to the entire largest minority groups of global scenario. It centers neither to the western field or non-western but all. So, it is a new discourse with universal applications.

Disability is a cultural and historical construction fabricated by the socio-historical factors. It is, therefore, a broad term that cluster ideological categories as sick, deformed ,ugly, odd, afflicted, abnormal which disadvantages people by devaluating bodies that do not confirm to certain cultural standards. Disability therefore refocuses to be normalized, and neutralized. In this sense, disability functions to preserve and validate such privileged designations as beautiful, healthy, normal, fit, competent and intelligent all of which can claim such status within these social identities. It is, then, the various intersections between bodies and world that create disability from the human variation and instability.

Disability is human reality. People of all ages and from all walks of life undergo difficulties in one way or the other. These difficulties are worsened by the society. While some disabilities are congenital, it is that reality that every person stands the risk of being disabled in the course of life. For instance with the increase in age, all human beings are subjected to disability. But people forget this reality of life. Though the term “impairment” is often exchanged with “disability”, their meanings

are different. "Impairment" has been mechanism of the body. But "disability experience is different which simply means a lack of ability relative to personal or group standard or spectrum. It may include physical, sensory, cognitive or intellectual impairment, mental disorder, or various types of chronic diseases.

The sad reality is that people with disabilities have been isolated, observed, and marginalized from mainstream society. This study looks for the space of such people relating it with the issues of the basic formation of disability. The concept, outcome and reality are rebelling and they interfere the groups of other studies in diverse ways. It is a questioning tendency towards the marginalized group of people. It questions whether there is anything to be gained by all people from exploring the ways that the body in this variations is metaphorized, disbursed. It requires a base of knowledge and familiarity with discursive terms and methodologies. The very first and essential aspect under disability study is the study of normalcy and its socio-cultural construction. Disability studies questions the social formation of normalcy and the way of taking somebody or something as disabled. The critics of disability studies go very far from "pity "or " empathy" and seek the social, political, individual and intellectual space for the so- called abnormal people in the society. So, the construction of normalcy and the issues of stigma are the most striking aspect under the field of disability studies.

To understand the abnormal one, one must return to the norm. We live in a world of norms. Each of us endeavors to be normal or else deliberately tries to avoid that state. We consider what the average person does, thinks or earns or consumes. We rank our intelligence, our cholesterol level, our weight, height, sex drive, bodily dimensions along some conceptual line from subnormal to above average. We consume a minimum daily balance of vitamins and nutrients based on what an average

human should consume. Our children are ranked in school and tested to determine where they fit into a normal curve of learning of intelligence. Doctor measures and weighs them to see if they are above or below average on the height and weight curves. There are probably no areas of contemporary life in which some idea of a norm, mean, average has not been calculated.

The matter of “able” and “disable” thus, moves around the concept of construction of normalcy. Disability studies have emerged as new phenomenon or a new form of study among various discursive practices. People with disabilities are treated as the “other” and sometimes as a non-human. Though they are the largest minority throughout the world, Lennard J. Davis in his introduction to *The Disability Studies Reader* states that the people with disabilities have been subjected to the discrimination and prejudice "leading finally to their marginalization as well as the marginalization of the study on disability".

The so-called "normal" is always in power because they are discourse creators with hierarchy between themselves and the people with disability putting them on the crest and using the other category of this binarism to define and describe them. It appears that the problem disability studies foregrounds is not the person with disabilities but the way normality is constructed to create the problems of the disabled person. So, what are the actual norms and who and how they are constructed has a discursive aspect. Davis further says:

A common assumption would be that some concept of the norm must have always existed. After all, people seem to have an inherent desire to compare themselves to other. But, the ideas of a norm is less a condition of human nature than it is a feature of a certain kind of society .(9)

Thus, some concept of norm must have existed in every society. By making the demarcation line with the privileged norms or any specific society people are categorized into the groups of “able” and “disable”. People try to compare with other and form an idea about it. The role is played by the society other than an individual in the formation of norms.

In this regard disability is shaped by history, defined by particularity, and negates the stable physical state of being. In short, the concept of disability writes a heterogeneous group of people whose commonality is being considered as abnormal. It is a social reality than a biological reality.

Society thus exhibits a structural amnesia about a particular category of people, who, because they don't fit into the hegemonic discourse of normality are excluded, separated and socially disempowered. The social and cultural apartheid, is sustained by the existence of a build environment which lacks amenities for the disabled and solely caters the needs of the more complete and able- bodies “other”. The social disregard coupled with experiences of social, economic and political subjection deny the disabled a voice, a space, even power to disrupt these deeply entranced normative leads that deprive them their social presence and any semblance of identity. (16)

The above quoted lines conclude that disability studies centers on the concept of the normal aspect of life. A person with disability is rejected from the social discourse because they are considered in some way “defective”. Somehow disability relates to the majority of population as perfect: “to be perfect was being seen as a social necessity ...”( 45). Perfection is thus always desired by the society in terms of physical, emotional, and intellectual states.

Another concept related to disability is the concept of stigma. It is a kind of mark of disgrace associated with a particular circumstance, quality or person. Stigma represents a view of life, a set of personal and social constructs, a set of social relations and social relationships, a form of social reality. Stigma has been a difficult concept to conceptualize because it reflects a property, a process, a form of social categorization, and an affective state. "Nature caused us all to be born equal, if fate is pleased to disturb this plan of the general law it is our responsibility to correct its caprice, and to repair by our attention the usurpation of the stronger." (Blanchot, 216)

Stigma is a social, cultural and psychological construct which is understood as a kind of negative value and attribute created by the society. Stigma is any condition, attribute or behavior that symbolically marks off the bearer as culturally unacceptable or inferior with the consequent feeling of shame, guilt and disgrace. In other words, it is a social process related to personal experience characterized by exclusion, rejection, blame, or devaluation that results from experience of anticipation of an adverse social judgment about a person or a group. In any society, stigma has negative connotation and its discrediting effects are very adverse. Erving Goffman in his essay "Stigma" defines stigma as:

Such an attribute is a stigma, especially when its discrediting effect is very extensive; sometimes it is also called a failing, a shortcoming, and a handicap. It constitutes a special discrepancy between vital and actual social identity ... The kind that causes us to reclassify an individual from one socially anticipated category to a different but equally well-anticipated one, and the kind that causes us to alter our estimation of the individual upward. Note, too, that both all

undesirable attributes are at issue but only those which are incongruous with our stereotype of what a given type of individual should be. (204)

Individuals with disabilities may experience an existential crisis that may be triggered by the stigma related to having a disability, as well as by conditions created by disability itself. It is a social categorization that legitimates the negative attributes because difference is highlighted than similarity.

The stigmatized people are fundamentally inferior to the so-called normal beings. They were even regarded as less than humans – the “other”. They are not treated on equal grounds. Consequently, stigmatized people accept themselves as “other” in the society. They accept their derogatory, self-hate and devalued status as the puppets of the social system. This kind of social and psychological death is given to them.

Stigmatized people, thus, become depended, passive, helpless and childlike because that is what is expected from them. In fact, they internalize what theoretical norm desires them to be and “to agree that he does indeed fall sort of what he really thought to be” (206). Social rejection or avoidance affects not only the stigmatized individual but also everyone who is socially involved with them as family, friends, and relatives. A kind of permanent social rejection forces people to limit their relationship to other stigmatized people and to those whom social bond outweigh the stigma further lies such as family members. Therefore, paradoxical societal norms establish a subordinate and dependent position for stigmatized people. Stigma is, in fact, the need of non-stigmatized people to maintain a sense of supremacy. It is thus seen as a social taboo. With this regard Goffman writes:

We construct a stigma-theory, an ideology to explain his inferiority and account for the danger he represents, sometimes rationalizing and

animosity based on the differences, such as those of social class. We use specific stigmas such as those of social class. We use specific stigma terms such as cripple, bastard, and moron in our daily discourse as a source of metaphor and imaginary, typically without giving thought to the original meaning. (209)

These lines excavate the fact that stigma is a constriction, if not everyone is creative in one or other though he/she is able or disable. A society constructs a discourse that a disabled one cannot do anything really the new one.

Goffman puts forward a poignant idea that all human difference is potentially stigmatizable. As we move out of one social context where a difference is desired into another context where the difference is undesired, we begin to feel the effect of stigma. No people in this world are exactly alike. The variations in shape, size, skin, color, gender, cultural background etc. can be stigmatized at any time. That's why Erving Goffman says "Stigma is equivalent to understand differentness" (207).

Stigma is a complex phenomenon of the society and it is ambiguous and arbitrarily defined. Basically, any human difference, different cultural background, or any other undesired attributes qualify to be stigmatized. The dominant group of the society judges the other groups. In part stigma reflects the whole value judgment of other groups thereby creating a sense of supremacy. On this account stigma is a dynamic and powerful social tool. According to Coleman:

If a stigma is a social construct, constructed by social groups, and by individual to designate some human difference, a discrediting, then the stigmatization process is indeed a powerful and pernicious social tool. The inferiority/ superiority issue is a most interesting way of understanding how and why people continue to stigmatize. (48)

Therefore, stigma is an open-ended synthesis that continues from one generation to the next.

Stigmatized people are not the burden to society. They can do something really creative to their society and can uplift their and their country's status. It is only the social construct that a disabled one can not do anything to the nation. Biologically, each and every human being is equal either he/she may be disable or able. It does not matter. A crippled man lacks a leg but he/she does not lack mind, eyes, hands etc. He/she then can lead a society in a creative way. With this regard Coleman asserts:

The concept of disabled one lacking a true creativity is merely a social construct. Who can claim that a mute boy lacks his mind or hands? A stupid can only claim that stigmatized people are social burden. The one having creativity and capability does not bother whether he lacks hand or eyesight or legs. He moves forward and be the centre of all and makes them think, "Oh! What a spirit or seed does he possess?"(227)

These given lines make it clear that there is no difference between able and disable in terms of creativity and criticality. But one thing he/she should understand is that she should not mourn for certain deformity in his/ her body.

Moreover, any human difference serves as the preliminary requisite to be stigmatized. To be stigmatized is an inescapable fate as this process depends upon cultural and historical background. Coleman defines that stigma is a product of socio-cultural context. He says:

People are concerned with stigma because they are fearful of its unpredictable and uncontrollable nature. Stigmatization appears uncontrollable because human differences serve as the basis for



stigmas. No one really ever knows when if he/she will acquire a stigma or when societal norms might change to stigmatize a trait he or she already possesses. To deny this truth by attempting to isolate stigmatized people or escape from stigma is a manifestation of the underlying fear. (226)

In this sense, stigma is the social factor and it becomes necessary for non-stigmatized groups. Those possessing power of dominant group in society determine the concept of stigmas, which human differences are desired and which is not. So, the stigmatized people are always marginalized from the mainstream of the community simply because they do not relate to the norm of a specific culture and thus possess an undesired difference from what the norm anticipates.

Stigma is a human construction, which legitimizes the negative attributes to the human differences. The process of stigmatization occurs only when the social contact compounds are imposed or the undesired differentness leads to some restriction in physical and social mobility. Besides, it also restricts access to the opportunities that allow an individual to develop his/her potential. In addition, stigmatized people are segregated, ignored, neglected, and isolated from social participation. Negative attributes related to stigma of the people are thus cast down from the societal periphery, for instance, the dwarf people in every human society are marginalized simply because they are stigmatized in every social factor. Though they are used in movies they are not portrayed as the main protagonist, they simply partake in the role of idiots, and the foolish people. In this way, they are used as the objects of the entertainment rather than the subjects, and their contribution is seen as inferior. They are not given priority in other jobs as well. People do not suspect their ability to work but they judge them on the basis of difference as they do not meet the criteria

ascribed to the majority of people. So, they are deprived and marginalized in every walk of life. These practices are critically criticized by this theory of stigmatization.

As Cerita M. Coleman defines:

Stigma often results in a special kind of downward mobility. Part of the power of stigmatization lies in the realization that people who are stigmatized or acquire to stigma lose their place in the social hierarchy. Consequently, most people want to ensure that they are counted in the non-stigmatized majority. This, of course, leads to more stigmatization.

(218)

In this way, stigmatization appears to be uncontrollable because any human difference serves as the basis for stigma. Moreover, it also manifests the underlying fear of being stigmatized as anyone can be stigmatized at any time. Stigma is therefore non-stigmatized people's necessity in order to feel good about themselves. They possess false superiority thereby enslaving the concept that stigmatized people is fundamentally inferior. Likewise, non-stigmatized people convey a sense of inferiority to stigmatized people as invisible, non-existent or dead through social avoidance and social rejection.

Some stigmas are more physically silent than others, and some people are more capable of concealing their stigmas or escaping from the negative social consequences of being stigmatized. The ideal prototype (e.g. young, white, tall, married, male, with recent record in sports) that Stafford cites may actually possess traits that would be the sources of much scorn and derision in another social context. Yet, by insulating himself in his own community a man like the one described in the example can ensure that his "differentness" will receive approbation rather than rejection and he will not be subjected to contract and severe stigmatization. This is a

common response to stigma among people with some social influence (e.g. artists, academics, millionaires.)

Often, attributes or behaviors that might otherwise be considered "abnormal" or stigmatized are labeled as "eccentric" among persons of power or influence. The fact that what is perceived as the "ideal" person varies from one social context to another however, is tied to Martin's notion that people learn ways to stigmatize in each new situation:

Stigma stems from differences by focusing on differences. We actively create stigmas because any attribute or difference is potentially stigmatizable. Often we attend to a single different attribute rather than to the large number of simpler attributes that any two individuals share. Why people focus on difference and denigrate people on the basis of them is important to understanding how some stigmas originate and persist. By reexamining the historical origins of stigma and the way children develop the propensity to stigmatize, we can see how some differences evolve into stigmas and how the process is linked to the behavioral (social control), affective (fear, dislike) and cognitive (perception of differences, social categorization) components of stigma. (Coleman, 218)

Stigma uniquely alters perceptions in other ways, especially with respect to the notion of "normality", and raises other questions about the dilemma of difference. Most people do not want to be perceived as different as "abnormal". Becker and Arnold and Gibbons discuss normalization as attempts to be "not different" and to appear "normal" by "covering up" ... keeping up with the pace of non-stigmatized individuals for stigmatized people, the idea of normality takes on an exaggerated

importance. Normality becomes the supreme goal for many stigmatized individuals until they realize that there is no precise definition of normality except what they would be without their stigma. Given the dilemma of difference that stigma reflects, it is clear whether anyone can even feel "normal".

Disability is a socially constructed form of the biological reality because our culture idealizes the body and demands that we must have control upon it. Able bodies thus dictate upon the disabled body and their knowledge always silence individual's capabilities and true characteristics. The stigma and stereotypes are the cause of discrimination, much more than the disability itself. Hence, it could be argued that the disability is not the cause at all, that the social reaction to disability is the cause, Susan Wendell says:

The power of culture along to construct a disability is revealed when we consider bodily difference- deviations from a society's conception of a "normal" or acceptable body-that, although they cause little or no function or physical difficulty for the person who has them, constitute major social disabilities. (44)

Social structure therefore draws the artificial line that separates disabled people from others. Disability is therefore, seen as otherness and discriminated from the majority of the society.

The attitude that a disabled child is not significant effort, required to advance his/her personal or social development leads to emotional abuse and feelings of isolation, low self-esteem and worthlessness for the disabled child as well as the disabled personality. Sometimes, parental neglect is compounded by others in the community who encourage the family to ignore the disabled child by reinforcing

prevalent ideas of a disabled person's worthlessness. Anita Ghai in this context asserts.

The personal tragedy model posits "better dead than disabled" approach and reinforces the stereotypes that the disabled cannot be happy or enjoy an adequate quality of life. The disabled person's problems are perceived to result from bodily impairment and a troubled mind, rather than a failure of society to meet that the person's need in terms of appropriate human help and accessibility. This understating places specific burdens on disabled to reconstruct themselves as normal people as they contend with both implicit and explicit assumption about their reluctance to acknowledge their disabled existence. Consequently, disabled people are subjected to many disabling expectations by the able bodied society. (37)

Stigma often inhabits or makes impossible healthy social or familial relationships, which thereby adversely affect the full integration of disabled people into social structures and institutions. In addition, a deep seated belief in most cultures that disabled child shames the child, as a result of embodiment of some kind of former sin of the family. This stigma attaches both to the child and the parents in the form of guilt about whom and what they are and often leads to parental abandonment, neglect, or abuse. As for instance, in Zambia, large children are seen as future security, so a family will not put effort or hope into a child who is disabled. So, the parents blame their child and they see disability as a burden. Therefore, disabled child has no future; likewise, disabled people are often deliberately denied education, insurance, health care, and employment. In short, they are deprived of the fundamental right to life and development.

Disability is shaped by history, defined by particularity, and negates the stable physical state of being. It is needed to discover the socially disabled women who have hardly found a place in any existing theory. Even non-disabled women never understand the problems of disabled women. The disabled felt that they could put forth their problems in a better way themselves, and though they did not mind support they would have to fight their battles themselves. Asha Hans, in *Women Disability and Identity* says:

We ascertain that the barrier in disabled women's lives fundamentally related to images affect their very being and reinforce the “triple discriminations” (Of being discriminated because they are women, are disabled, and are women with disabilities). The present imaging of women with disabilities [...] produce social inequality [...] we acknowledge gender to be a societal norm and the images, which we reflect, are far from reality and require not only analyses but also deconstruction and reconstruction. (19)

The imagery of “perfect bodies” has always existed and continues to exist, and one of the reasons for this is the misuse of the most powerful visual medium in creating illusory images, which affect women with disabilities. Women having disability from non-English – speaking background, a smaller minority within the minority group of disabled women, suffer from “triple discrimination” (23).

The concept of disability defines heterogeneous group of people whose commonality is being considered as abnormal. It is a social reality than a biological reality. Hans further writes:

Women in the space have no weapon to protect themselves, as most, unlike women without disabilities, are dependent on this space.

Discriminatory social and political policies emerge from this private space. Many disabled inside this space are kept invisible by their families, to be hidden from the outside gaze, because they are ashamed of their disability. As they are usually invisible to the outside world, government and movements find it easy to overlook, as they do not see. (28)

Women disability is taken as stigmatization because it appears lack of bodily appearance which the society seldom desires. Prejudice and discrimination are based on the appearance. People are judged not by their ability but by the way they look and disabled people are marginalized because they look different. The difference is caused by disability. Discrimination results when this difference triggers off the negative attitudes towards disability that are held by the other person. Most importantly, the attitude towards disability is formed accidentally. These are the obvious outcome of society that values competition between people. People are judged according to their success in education, work, marriage, the ability to produce (healthy) offspring, creativity, and beauty. As a result of segregation, disabled people have fewer opportunities to acquire the skills necessary for a good job, and their education is substandard.

Not all persons are born with equal "capabilities" in the existing meaning of the term. Being disabled is being different. A mentally retarded person might not be considered capable, but "do such a person's rights shrink because his / her contribution to society may be considered less than that of a normal person"? Who lays these standards of what is normal? Do the disabled have any say in this establishment of standards" (33)? There are layers of injustices, which are

hierarchically placed, and by removing injustice simply at one level, does not make things better for all. Hans says:

The right to work plays the most crucial role in women's life in disabled women's lives it is more so. Women subdued by tradition and physical or mental problems find it very difficult to overcome the double blind. We chose to focus on this right, as keeping women out of the workforce is the most important form of victimization faced by women. (33)

In order to understand the disabled body, one must return to the concept of the norm because society desires for the hegemony of normalcy. Unable to perform any social function due to the lack of physical appearance is perceived to be an error or fault in the prevalent social circumstances. In other words, disability is stereotyped with negative attitudes. Again, the concept of disability is a social construction thus disability is a powerful social construct within most existing societies and because we are presented with confliction images of it, disabled people have been placed into the role of abnormal outsider who live and experiences are consoled from the 'normal' majority.

Foucault's concept of discourse is an important one for understanding much of his thinking on power. According to Foucault, discourses are historically situated truths or means of specifying knowledge. Power and knowledge are intimately linked together through multiplicity of discursive elements, and ultimately bound in the formation of discourse. Foucault claims:

" Discipline" may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus; it is a type of power a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of



application, targets; it is a " physics" or an " anatomy" of power, a technology ... an essential instrument for a particular and (schools, hospitals), or by preexisting authorities that find in it a means of reinforcing or reorganizing their internal mechanisms of power or by apparatuses that have made discipline their principle of internal. (206)

The conception of a subject as central to specific age involves locating the body as a site for the operations of power. It is primarily through sex and the establishment of "normal" behaviors by society that the notion of bio-power arises. Deviations from "the norm" established by either society or cyber community then can be disciplined. The mechanisms for judging both deviation and extern of deviation are embedded in the very core of our society: Teachers, psychiatrists, social workers etc. It is through the process of problematisation that the illusion of "normality" is created. In this light normalization becomes the great strategy of power. The disciplinary pyramid constituted the "small cell of power within which the separation, coordination, and supervision of tasks were imposed and made efficient; and analytical partitioning of time, gestures, and bodily forces constituted an operational schema that could easily be subjected to the mechanisms of production" (210).

The panoptical modality of power, however technical, but merely physical level at which it is situated, is not under the immediate dependence or a direct extension of the great juridical- political structure of a society: it is nonetheless not absolutely independent. The disciplines provide at the base. The corporal disciplines "constituted the foundation of the formal, juridical liberties" (211).

Disability is, thus, a social construct in the sense that normality creates it in the process of defining itself as creative, positive and normal. The disabled ones are social burden and they are unable to do anything creative to society is also a mere

social construction. The person lacking speech does not lack hands, legs and mind then he/she can use these parts of body. Similarly at present, disability is also a reading of the body that is infected by race, ethnicity, gender, class, social positioning etc. As it is culture bound, it varies with society and culture. Deafness does not make a person disable in a community where people communicate by using both sign language and words. Black people in America may feel disabled because they can not meet the criteria of whiteness which is considered the normal standard skin in America. But they may feel normal when they are back in Africa or in their own community. When a person from so -called caste goes to the casteless society, his / her, identity as a so- called lower caste dissolves. A person with lower economic status may experience disability in a capitalist society. But he/she may be at ease in socialist society. In a patriarchal culture, feminity and disability are linked inextricably. So, if viewed with the gendered lens, the identity called female itself become another category for disability. Disability is the product of the society where a difference is undesired. The disability modal, thus, regards disability as a normal aspect of life, not as a deviance, and rejects the notion that persons with disabilities are in some inherent way “defective”.

### III. Disability as Constitutive of New Structure of the Family

This thesis unmasks how the characters with disability prove themselves creative to society and family challenging hitherto prevalent notion of disability as social burden. The three Central characters: Simon, Kerewin and Joe, before they find salvation by fusing into a spiritual and psychological triad, are initially self-destructive. Kerewin develops modernist alienation, wants to keep in distance from Joe and Simon, and blames Simon to be thief. Joe reels under the impact of incessant drinking, his sense of his lost wife, and constant teetering on the edge of violence by brutally exploiting Simon. Simon, orphaned by storm and shipwreck and adopted by Joe, insists on his elective muteness and rebelliousness. In addition to their individual angst, the three form a dysfunctional family that is physically abusive, a parody of father-mother-child relationship. Joe regularly beats Simon and tries to beat Kerewin, who, to her horror, is eventually provoked into beating Simon. On one occasion, she thoroughly beats Joe as well, and Simon deliberately provokes the beatings. As a negative triad they are a study in self-hate and mutual flagellation.

As the two try unsuccessfully to merge, they also manifest the divided culture, the divided culture, the disturbed coexistence of colonial European (Pakeha) societies with Maori ones. Kerewin is genetically and culturally half and half, Joe is almost completely Maori, and Simon is European, perhaps even Scottish nobility. The violence and alcoholism are seen as outgrowths of their mutual loss of roots of having lost a source that they have been replaced. All the major characters in the novel, not just Simon, find liberal communication unacceptable or insufficient preferring instead visual art, drunkenness, violence, and extreme- physical action. The characters' individual, familial, and cultural lives are negative because each of them lacks the spiritual infusion necessary for unity and growth, a unity that they eventually achieve

after much suffering and mythic revelation. And Simon is the agent of this fruitful evolution.

First of all, I will try my best to expose the disability condition of three central character, though all are not equally physically disabled and then their reception of physically disabled character named Simon and finally Simon's attempt of motivating them to form a new unit of family that blurs every sorts of binaries though he is received brutally by them. Simon shows up at the hermit Kerewin's tower on a dark and stormy night. Simon is mute and thus is unable to explain his motives:

A rustle of movement, a subdued rattle, and there, pitched into the open on the bird boned chest, is a pendant hanging like a label on a chain.

She leans forward and picks it up, taking intense care not to touch the person underneath. It was a label.

Pacific street whangaroa

Phone 633 collect.

She turns it over.

*Simon P. Gillayley cannot speak.* (11, my italics)

These lines conclude that Simon cannot talk. The young boy wears a pendant that bears his name, phone number, and address.

Simon is physically abused i.e. mute, thus is received badly by Kerewin. She does not like to look at the child. She tells him to go home though he has piece of sharp wood stick in his foot and the time is of night.

She doesn't like looking at the child. One of the maimed, the contaminating ... Reluctantly she turns to face the child. "Well, we will do nothing more. You found your way here, you can find it book."

Something comes into focus. "O there is a sandal you can collect before you go." The rain's still beating down.

Though it is raining she doesn't let him stay in her house so that he will feel comfort imagining her as his substitute mother. Rather she blames him that he specializes in "Sneak thievery and petty Vandalism" (34). Later, she describes him as "Vandal" "Vagabond" "Wayward urchin: and "outlaw" (36-37-49). But it is a form of indigenous borrowing. His first act of borrowing occurs when he takes Kere's black queen chess piece. In Maori culture, borrowing was governed by strict rules; an article could be borrowed but had to be returned when finished with or on demand and should be acknowledged with a gift or counter-loan. Gift exchange could be delayed for months or years. Simon, after stealing the chess piece, leaves behind his sandal and later gives Kerewin even more generous gift, his rosary and signet ring. While being of greater overt value the gift expresses his desire for reciprocity, that Kere in return forge familial linkages as Simon's substitute mother. At other times, Simon seems to engage in thievery as in his taking Kere's knife. On the one hand, his hoarding of her possessions is a form of petty larceny; on the other hand, it might be a "call for help" (206), an attempt to kindle Kerewin's maternal and familial feelings. In contrast, Simon's relation to objects, characterized by communal ownership and borrowing lies somewhat outside capitalist economy and exchange. Simon's "borrowing" is distinct from his desire to own. (206). His relation to toys is non-possessive. Not knowing why he should value them, he openly gives them away to his cousins (204). Kere thinks "I have a suspicion that... you (Simon) never had any sense of property, just that of need, you thought everyone else was really the same way too" (323). Though she thinks that he does not have capitalist heart, she blames him to be thief because he is physically deformed.

She gives more emphasis to material possessions than human beings when Simon, in need of money, visits Daniels whom he finds dead, drunkenly sprawled in a puddle of sherry, the child seeks out Kere who tells him he should not visit again. She inquires about her favorite knife which she suspects, correctly that he has "borrowed". She agrees to forego the other stolen items if he returns the knife. She even agrees when Joe calls Kerewin to ask for permission to beat him. (307).

Joe, though, is Simon's adopted father, he beats him so bitterly near to death. Simon was found washed up on the beach years earlier with no memory and very few clues to his identity. Joe and his wife, Hana take in Simon, despite his apparently dark background, and attempt to raise him. However, both Hana and their infant son die soon after, leaving Joe alone to raise the wild boy, Simon. Then onwards, he begins to beat him thinking that he is the cause to their death because this deformity is the sign of bad luck.

From the nape of his (Simon) neck to his thighs, and all over the calves of his legs, he is cut and wealed. There are places on his shoulder blades where the ... whatever you (Joe) used, you shit ... has bitten through to the underlying bone. There are sort of blood blisters that reach round his ribs on to his chest.

And an area nearly the size of a hand, that's ... infected. It's raw and swollen and leaking infected lymph. (148)

Joe thinks to himself "I loved him [Simon] too hard, hated him too much"(881). He blames Simon for his family's demise. Joe, thus, beats him severely, fracturing his skull and breaking his jaw resulting in the hospitalization of Simon. By the end of the novel he has lost hearing in one ear and is barely the same person," mainly calm and good as bread" (444).

Disability here is a spiritual as well as a cultural wound. Though Kerewin and Joseph are not physically deformed, they have spiritual and cultural wound. Kerewin, though, has normal female body, she claims herself to be "neuter" (266).

I' have never been attracted to men or women or any thing else. It's difficult to explain, and nobody has ever believed if when I have tried to explain but while I have an apparently normal female body. I do not have any sexual urge or appetite. I think I am a neuter.

This passage emphasizes Kere's sexual neutrality. Here asexuality is a symptom of colonial treatment of Mori woman as sex object. Thought, she has normal female body, she claims herself to be neuter. Then how can we not claim that disability is a socio-cultural construct. She is always afraid of the fact that she will be used as a means of producing child and a sex commodity. In order to save her from this inhumanity, she is compelled to declare herself to be of neuter sex. She, thus, rejects Joe's marriage proposal. In light of this history why would not she distrust the institution of marriage?

In one of the many dream sequences which structure the novel, her dreams of a yellow-faced man sucking her throat with his lips. Kerewin, vulnerable and fearful wonder" How to bite?" She asks him, " Are you kissing me?"(186)

He replies lazily, wearily, and with a shades of alarm in his dry voice," I wouldn't exactly call it kissing".

The pain increases. At the tip of her voice in terror, "he is not kissing me?"(186).

The above explained dream unfolds the reality behind male's treatment to female. The yellow faced man doesn't in tend to provide warm kisses to the lady but tempts to use

her sexually. Because of which the lady becomes afraid of such a black horror. Kere wonders what she has done to deserve "Dream vampires" (187).

She refuses Joe's marriage proposal saying she has not been jilted, abused or raped, but has always disliked "close contact... charged contact, emotional contact, as well as any overtly sexual contact. It always feels like the other person is draining something out of me" (265-266).

Similarly, Joe's grandfather treats him unfairly and with complete biasness. In the novel, the orphaned Joe is raised by his paternal grand parents. His grandfather abuses Joe for being dark, like Joe's grandmother. Joe explains, his grandfather was "secretly ashamed of my Nana and her Maoriness ... I think he took it out on me for being like her, for being dark, and speaking Maori first, all sours of things ... he was hard on me" (227). Moreover, Joe is always mourned for his dead wife and infant child. He also is psychologically wounded. His alcoholism and his love-hatred for himself and specifically for Simon are symptom of his melancholic inability to mourn for the death of his wife, Hana and son, Timote.

Kerewin, because of above explained reality, develops modernist practice that helps her to form unitary identity. Here modernist unitary identity is evident in her solitary existence, her alienation from community, her collection of exotic objects, and her library. The most telling aspect of her collection of fetishes is her *pounamu* (greenstones) which she confesses she has brought. The only jade piece of family inheritance is a ring-she gives to Joe. She contemplates the loss of their magical power. "They were supposed to be delight and inspiration. They turned to be the same sort of detritus as every thing else ... It was beautiful to have them at first, but all the magic has worn off. Little by little it has all gone away." (314). She, in the same fashion, cuts her contact to her family and community. After refusing Joe's marriage



proposal and resisting the maternal role expected of her, she attempts to preserve her unitary identity by involving in dialogue with "a married me" (275). In this way, she denies her ancestors who constitute her being in the world. Joe's final attempt to woo her includes a pounamu fishhook pendant. Kere initially sneers at the gift distancing her further from Joe and Simon (313). Both Kere's hair burning and her grading acceptance of the gift are attempts to immure herself from genealogical relations thereby creating unitary identity.

He whistles and she looks round. She sits down, and takes off the duffle bag her carries... Takes out two parcels, one large and wrapped in very greasy brown paper the other small and neatly folded in a black silk wrapping. He beckons.

"Gillayleys bearing gifts" she hands it, almost reluctantly, back to Simon.

"I have touched your gift, appreciated its richness and your intention and that is enough for me." (59-60).

This passage reads the response of able human being to deformed/handicapped human being. Here in this case, Kerewin herself is crippled though not physically but culturally and spiritually. What would be the case if she will be psychologically sound? Such a rude behavior makes a human being crippled though he has not any sign of deformity biologically.

Simon, though, is badly received by Kerewin and Joe. He kindles the light in their heart. Simon, the child with a disability, is the pivot. He has special secret ability to see human auras, those natural spiritual energies that emanate from each individual but which partake of the whole of nature. At one point he tries to explain this talent to Kerewin:

*On people?* Scratching his head with the pencil, frown still in place, writing again finally. *On people.* "I don't see anything on people. Do you?"

He nods wearily. Then he keeps his head bent, apparently unwilling to look at her. Kerewin is turn to frown. What the hell would you see on people in the dark? Shadows in the daytime, yeah, but at night?

It's the word shadows that give her the answer. "What a minute." Sim, do you see lights on people?" Head up fast, and his bright smile flowering. Yes. [...]

In the library, the books spread round them, "well, that's what they are. Soul-shadows. Coronas. Auras. Very few people can see them without using screens or Kirlian photography." he touches by her eyes.

"No, I cannot see them. I will bet Joe cannot either."

Right, says the boy, grinning wolfishly. He writes quickly, sacred said not to say. (93).

Thus, Simon is marked, not as a disabled mutant (although the local town folk see him as that), but as a young shaman of European origin but in touch with Island's energy and spirit.

Simon's ability to forgive Joe and Kerewin for damaging him gives a way to the reconciliation of the three. Simon's final beating is horrendous and deplorable but structurally and allegorically it is pivotal to the eventual process of reconciliation. Having finally assumed the burden of guilt and responsibility, however, Kerewin sets in motion a process whereby, following a purgatorial period of physical and psychological suffering, she is redeemed through a new sense of social responsibility and engagement with the collective. The final apocalyptic beating to Simon allows the

three wounded beings to reach out to others, establishing new communal patterns of identification. It is clear throughout the novel that Simon bears no grudges for the abuse he endures, and his repeated attempts to escape foster care in order to return to Kerewin's tower indicate that his personal happiness is dependent upon being reunited with Joe and Kerewin. In spite of opposition from the authorities, Simon's dogged determination and Kerewin's decision to give Simon and Joe her name effect the reconciliation and secure the companionship which Simons so desperately desires.

His disability becomes a bridge between the two adults and between the two cultures. Simon is completely conscious of using violence for meditation. He chooses this role and becomes the agent that creates a new, united community to replace the fragmented old one:

All morning the feeling had grown, start, a fight and stop the ill will between his father and Kerewin. Get rid of the anger round the woman; stop the rift with blows, with pain, then pity, then repair, then good humor again. It works that way ... it always did. There is not much time left for anything to grow anymore. It must be in this place, or the break will come, and nothing will grow any more.

So start a fight. (192)

Simon is sensitive to the precise status of the relationship, to its fracture, and fault lines, and he knows just when to apply the ameliorating explosion.

Kerewin and Joe are first aware of each other in a bar. Joe is drunk and loud, Kerewin feels contempt for him, and they do not make contact. The two are brought together only when Simon invades Kerewin's isolated tower, forcing Joe to come for him. Simon continues to be the agent that propels them out of their shells and into each other's lives. Simon is supernatural and would generate fear in both cultural

communities if knowledge of his talent were to be widespread. He must reach people, not through his divine gifts, which they would reject, but through physical action the only means they are able to understand and to accept.

All the major characters in the novel are disabled in the sense that they are emotionally and psychologically crippled. Literally, the eponymous "bone people" are displaced bones of the Maori ancestors, but more generally they signify all the displaced people orphaned by family schism. Additionally, the "bone people" can denote the totemic *wairua* (an unseen double, a soul-shadow, your own spirit) in the story: the mystical disfigured person Kerewin encounters; the old man, Tiaki Mira, who helps Joe; and Simon himself (Hulme and Jurcotte 142). Because everyone has a *wairua*, these figures can be seen as extensions or doubles, the auras, are seen as well, by Simon.

Thus, Hume seems to agree to see disability, not as sinister other, but as something positive. The novel's direct attention to postcolonial situations and attitudes seem to posit non-western spiritualities, a cultural oneness with the land, as a rebuttal to western fragmentation and compartmentalization.

Similarly in *The Bone People*, Kerewin and Joe move out of isolation and the self destructive behavior that goes with it only after near-death visions that are accepted by the text as mystic. Kerewin's cancer goes away when she sequesters herself in a natural retreat appropriately owned by her estranged family, and Joe's vision of the underground water prepare them to join the Triad with Simon. They become triple headed figurine, created in a fire by Kerewin, with their three faces and her entwined. The three people are shriven in preparation for rebirth: Kerewin's cancer is a diseased, false pregnancy that will be replaced by a true son, Simon, who is also the sun child who replaces the destruction sun eater, her artistic monstrosity.

Joe must survive a belly wound, making him a kind of Fisher King whose renewal will be tied to that of the land itself. And Simon must transcend a fear-fatal beating.

It is appropriate that when she goes into retreat and cures herself Kerewin leaves the Triad Sculpture buried in embers and takes a small bag of earth from near her tower. Her connection with the Earth mother and with the concept of home will go with her, as the Triad is baked in what are both a funeral pyre and a phoenix's rebirth. Hulme's emphasis on peace also suggests the general privileging of spell over time noted by postcolonial scholars.

Post-colonial literary theory, then has begun to deal with the problems of transmuting time into space, with the present struggling out of the past as it attempts to construct ... place is extremely important in all models, and epistemologies have developed which privilege spell over time as the most important ordering concept of reality (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, *Empire* 36-37)

In the novel, Hulme's awareness of the Maori past evolves into the vision of syncretic future that encompasses both Maori and European derivations. Because Kerewin considers entering the fire herself. It is both an image of death the dissolution of self and of necessary purgation (330-331). In fact transformations occur for a number of properties connected with three characters. All three have three haircuts, and because hair is one of the oldest symbols of the life force, the loss of their hair suggests the shriving of their old lives. Meanwhile, the painful fishhook in Simon's thumb is supplanted by the jade hook Joe gives to Kerewin, said by Kerewin to be set into her heart. A braid from Simon's hair is attached to the jade (greenstone) which is the color of his eyes and of substance the Maoris consider mystical (Hulme, "Mauri" 307). Clearly Simon is marked as transcend.

In accounting for Simon's bodily suffering and recovery in particular, many critics have done analogies with the suffering of Christ: both figures are Phoenix like martyrs who, with their resurrection from suffering and persecution, become redeemers of mankind. In this context, Simon's scars may be interpreted as stigmata testament both to his suffering and to his patient endurance. Simon's narrative of suffering is therefore is also the narrative of regeneration, and his scar- tattoos point towards a new cultural maturity which emerges from suffering and pain.

Similarly, in the eyes of true Christian, all man should be equal and Christianity should facilitate to flourish the spirit of brotherhood and consanguinity. But Joe's grandfather treats him unfairly and with complete biasness, though he is an elder of the Catholic Church. In the novel, the orphaned Joe is raised by his paternal grandparents. His grandfather, who is an elder of the Catholic Church, abuses Joe for being dark, like Joe's grandmother. Joe explains his grandfather was "secretly ashamed of my Nana and her Maoriness... I think he took it out on me for being like her, for being dark, and speaking Maori first, all sorts of things... he was hard on me" (227). Joe's grandfather though is Maori himself, he pretends to be a person having Pakeha consciousness. In this case, does Christianity help Joe's grandfather to be faithful to his wife and grandchild? Then how can we claim that Christianity leads one to salvation? Joe's grandfather wants Joe to be a priest. But Joe abandons his goal of becoming a priest thus challenges his grandfather's desire of him in perpetuating his discriminatory so-called pakeha consciousness.

Moreover, at the beginning of the novel, Joe's abuse of Simon replicates his grandfather's production of Joe as dark heathen. But latter on he realizes his mistake and gets motivated to form a unit of family in which Kere is a non-biological (foster and later, adopted) mother to Simon that does not have sexual relations with Simon's

non-biological father, Joe, hence, a family that contradicts the basic sexual and reproductive premises of the nuclear family. Rather, this new models of community is based on sentiment, fostering, and adoption. Such a formation of family is the outcome of Joe's realization of his exploited childhood and his contact to Tiaki Mira's notion of Maori sensibility, not the result of Christianity.

The novel thus exhibits major Christian myth, most notably in its symbolism of Simon as a Christian figure. He is a powerless figure, reputedly abused and subjected to extreme violence and trauma, yet is continually forgiving, and in the words of Joe " he doesn't hate" (435). Joe and Kerewin perpetuate the biblical imagery. Kerewin is a literal virgin; she has not her life, yet takes on a motherly aspect towards Simon, as did the Virgin Mary. Similarly, Joe appears a parallel to the biblical Joseph; he is not the blood father of Simon, yet willingly takes on his care and parenting.

The novel, in the same fashion, depicts Kere's and Joe's house as a prison in the sense that Joe's house is the site of Simon's many beating and Kere's house leads her estrangement from family and the loss of her artistic talent. Joe's home, site of Simon's many beating, is like a penitentiary, "a chilly institutional hutch" (272). An "older state house", it lacks a domestic atmosphere, its neat lawn devoid of flowers, shrubs, or garden. An unshaded light bulb dangles from the ceiling; the Kitchen is "square and bare, almost institutional in its unadorned plainness" (76). Kere's Tower is also a penitentiary, for when Simon asks her how she had slept, she replies, "Aside from the penitential past" (38). The tower is a "prison" where she replays the past, her regrets about her estrangement from family, the loss of her artistic talent.

But the pinnacle becomes an abyss, and the driving joy ended. At last there was a prison.

I am enclosed by a wall, high and hard, and stone, with only my brainy nails to tear it down. (7)

This passage describes Kere's Tower as a prison house that does not provide facilitation to Kere and her artistic talent. Thus she desires "a new *Home* that have larger sense than have used to term before" (434). She destroys her isolated (phallic) tower and builds new spiral house that incorporates both Maori and Pakeha tribe. She further explains her artistic failure in the following remarks:

Estranged from my family, bereft of my art, hollow of soul, I am a rock in the desert. Pointing nowhere, doing nothing, of no benefit to anything or anyone. Flaking, parched, cracked ... so why am I? (289).

The above given realization of Kerewin's traumatic reality motivates her to perform social role and to carry out the maternal role expected of her.

After Kerewin's return, she destroys the tower in which she had lived in isolation and constructs instead a spiral house along the lines of the chambered nautilus. Here the selfish theme that recurs in the novel is a superb symbol of inclusion. The concept of family in the larger Maori sense is thereby fulfilled: Kerewin is reconciled to her own family on all levels, from a nuclear family of parents and child to her whole tribe and to humanity and the Entire Earth. Individual selves and preserved within the separate chambers, all within the unity of the society in accord with the natural, spiritual realm, the nautilus. Simon is the agent of those fruitful evolutions, which unfortunately puts him squarely in the tradition that views people with disabilities in the other extreme, as links with the divine. Hume allows her character with disability to emerge as a fully complex individual with a personal perspective on events and an evolution of self. These characters are saved from the traditional literary exploitation, but only by the implementation of yet another



traditional metaphor, the disability as divinely linked. This problems with disability may be countered however, by postcolonial beliefs and so subverting the European domination of her people.

They were nothing more than people, by themselves. Even paired, any pairing, they would have been nothing more than people by themselves. But all together, they have become the heart and muscles and mind of something perilous and new, some thing strange, and growing and great. Together, all together they are the instruments of charge. (4)

This novel hence constructs an alternative vision that draws upon both European and indigenous epistemologies. This is underscored by Kerewin partial destruction of her isolated tower and the rebuilding of a populated, spiral home. Or as she describes it, "a shell shape, a regular spiral of rooms expanding around the decapitated Tower ... privacy, apartness, but all connected and all part of the whole ... it will be a studio and hall and church and guest house ... but above all else, *Home*. Home in a larger sense than I have used the term before" (434). At the conclusion of the novel, the reunion takes place in Kerewin's new spiral-house and importantly incorporates her previously estranged blood relatives, suggesting a nationalist imaginary.

The novel undermines the authority of both settler and native history. As we saw above, the suppressed history of criminals and popular movements is confined to a dark corner of imperial and settler nationalist history. The narrative shape of national history, one of increasing emergence, growth, and rationality, is produced through excision, when the state or the historian who occupies the site of the dominant center "performs a cutting operation, remembering/ furthering that which it deems meaningful for its concept of development, and forgetting/suppressing the

dissonant, disorderly, irrational, archaic, and subversive" (Najita, 124) . While settler and imperial history exclude the history of criminals and so-called enemies of the state, Maori are confined to limited notions of authenticity and tradition. Najita argues that the novel fictively reconstructs a lost origin, all the while acknowledging its "unreality and inadequacy" (125).

But Hulme attempts to establish the communal identity through an acceptance of the entangled set of relations as she advocates a new mode of living grounded in a negotiation between pakeha and Maori sensibility and this foundation of a new structure is based not on the blood-descent of nuclear families but on the entangled oppressions wrought under empire and settler nationalism. This is underscored by Kerewin's partial destruction of her isolated (phallic) tower and the rebuilding of a populated, spiral home, or as she describes it, "a shell-shape, a regular spiral of rooms expanding around the decapitated Tower... privacy, apartness, but all connected and all part of the whole... it will be a studio and mall and church and guesthouse ... but above all else, *Home*. Home in a larger sense than have used the term before" (434). Here, the reunion takes place in Kerewin's new spiral house and importantly incorporates her previously estranged "blood" relatives suggesting national identity that situates Maori arrival as the primary site of origins, yet incorporates latter settlers in this new architecture of the nation.

With this regard, the novel shows how the three main characters are separated by emotional and physical violence. Joe has beaten Simon so severely that the boy ends up in the hospital; denied access to his son, Joe travels across the country until a Maori elder, a living remnant of the pre-colonial past, rescues him. Meanwhile, Kerewin develops a tumor in her belly (a cancer of her meta-physical being) and retreats to her cabin on the shore, anticipating her death. When the elder dies, Joe is

bequeathed guardianship of the canoe, called "the spirit of the islands ... one of the great voyaging ships of our people." This great voyaging waka (vaka) "the heart of Aotearoa" is "sleep" because of the "mess the Pakeha have made "of the land. (364). Joe's quest for origins is posited as a meta-physical journey, the attainment of which can redeem both land and the bicultural nation.

When, after the Kaumatau death, Joe brings the stone that holds the mauriora (life force) to Kerewin's property in whanyaroa, it sinks deep into the earth. The spiral house Kerewin builds there, and the family relationship that is established among the white child and the two Maoris, represent not only their triumph over their own personal demons but also the germ of a new society, neither pakeha nor Maori, whose spirituality is based on the Mauriora life-energy, now grounded in the land and in its people.

In the process of this unification Hulme also dismantles any sorts of hierarchies in the name of class, race and gender. The three main characters represent the three social strata: European aristocracy (Simon, probably of Scottish nobility), New Zealand Middle class (Kerewin, who is educated, has traveled and has studied marital arts) and New-Zealand working class (Joe). At the same time those three represent the two races, pakeha and Maori (Simon and Joe) and hybridization of the two (Kerewin). Finally Kerewin completely subverts Joe's attempts at male domination, both physically and emotionally, attaining gender equality. Here, the multicultural family is formed via a negotiation of relations between pakeha and Maori that is based on non-spousal and non-biological relation. This is not a family premised upon heterosexual relations, nor on marriage and the nuclear family, nor on strictly blood descent, for Kere and Joe are not sexual partners or married in the usual

sense. There is no family in traditional sense. It is based on purely sentiments and freedom. The resulting synthesis is sweeping, and encompassing all perspectives.

Thus, Keri Hulme is proceeding toward inclusiveness. Here the novel rejects past western concepts of disability as her writings move beyond the traditional literary use of disabled figures as metaphors by which to define normal society. Simon is representational and symbolic character. His human complexity is as deeply portrayed as that of the non-disabled characters; he is allowed his own subjective viewpoints and development. Hulme, thus, associates disability with mysticism. In sum the portrayal of disability in the novel displays a fullness and respect for the characters with disability not traditionally found in literature.

#### IV. Conclusion

The narrativization of disability of the three central characters: Simon, Joseph and Kerewin and their incessant attempt of forming new unit of family challenge the traditional representation of disability. Despite many beatings and ill-treatment, Simon kindles the spirit of establishing a multicultural family within the heart of Joe and Kerewin. Toward the end of the novel, Joe and Kerewin find out the fact that their houses are, in fact, prison devoid of domestic environment, progress and prosperity. They, thus, get motivated to form a new structure of family devoid of any hierarchies in the name of class, race and gender. The establishment of multi-ethnic discourse, thus, celebrates the notion of egalitarianism and greater cultural inclusiveness materializing the vision of expansion of the circle of the 'we'.

The novel, in the same fashion, describes Simon as physically deformed child as he is a mute boy. Similarly, Joe and Kerewin are not physically crippled but culturally and spiritually. Kerewin claims herself to be neuter having no sexual urge though she has normal female body. It is because she is afraid of the fact that she will be used as sex commodity and a means of producing child. Joe gets ill-treatment from his paternal grandfather, thus, thinks himself to be a man having no identity. The disability, thus, includes physical, mental or psychological, cultural, spiritual and intellectual abnormality. The novel, at the end, succeeds to prove disability as not social burden but really creative and beneficial to social and familial development and advancement. The novel, thus, moves from self destruction to resolution and regeneration.

This thesis, thus, concludes that the analysis of physical and cultural deformities or abnormalities of Simon, Joe and Kerewin critiques the traditional representation of disability and forms the new structure of a non-biological and non-spousal family devoid of any hierarchies in the name of class, race and gender resulting into multi-ethnic discourse and community.

## Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writers Back*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995
- Benediktsson, Thomas E. "The Reawakening of the Gods: Realism and the Supernatural in *Silko* and *Hulme*." *Critique* (Winter 1992): 21-11.
- Blanchot, Maurice. "The Essentialist solitude." *Critical Theory since 1965*. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searl. Florida: Florida State University Press 1993.
- Coleman, Lerita M. "Stigma". *Davis*, 216-231.
- Davis, Lennard J. "Constructing Normalcy: The Bell Curve the Novel, the Invention of the Disabled Body in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century." *Davis*, 9-28.
- . *The Disability Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- DeLoughrey, Elizabeth M. *Routes and Roots: Navigating Caribbean and Island Literatures*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2007. 161-195.
- Foucault, Michel. "Panopticism." *The Foucault Reader*. Ed Paul Rainbow. London: Penguin, 1991. 51-75.
- Ghai, Anita. *(Dis)Embodied from Issues of Disabled Women*. New Delhi: Harananda Publications, 2003.
- Goffman, Erving. "Selections from Stigma". *Davis* 203-215.
- Hans, Asha. "Introduction." *Woman, Disability and Identity*. Ed Asha Hans and Annie Patri. New Delhi: sage Publication. 2006. 11-12.
- Hulme, Keri. *The Bone People*. 1st ed. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1984.

- Hulme, Keri, and Garry Turcotte. "Reconsidering *The Bone People*." *Australian and New Zealand Studies in Canada* 12. Sydney and Australia: U of Sydney, 1998: 135-54.
- . "Maori: An Introduction to Bicultural Poetry in New Zealand." *Only Connect*. Guy Amirthanayagm and S.C Harrex. Adelaide and Honolulu: Center for Research in the new literatures in English East- west center, 1981: 290-310.
- Keown, Michalle. *Reboulding the Body Politic in Keri Hulme's The Bone People*. London and New York: Rutledge, 2005: 102-126.
- Mitchell, David T. and Sharma L. Snyder. "Introduction: Disability Studies and the Double Bind of Representation". *The Body and Physical Difference: Discourses of Disability*: David T. Mitchell and Sharon C. Snyder. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997: 1-31.
- Najita, Susan Y. *Decolonizing Cultures in the Pacific: "Fostering" a New Vision of Maori Community*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006: 99-129.
- Reisman, Rosemary M. Canfield. "The Bone People Master Plots II: British and Commonwealth Fiction Series." *Literary Reference Center*. 1-4.
- Thomson, Rosemarie Garland. "Body Criticism as a Context for Disability Studies." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 17.4 (1997): 284-86.
- Wendell, Susan. *The Rejected body: Feminist Philosophical Reflections on Disability*. New Work: Rutledge, 1996.
- Wenzel, Marita. "Liminal Spaces and Imaginary Places in *The Bone People*." *Literator* April 2006: 79-96.