

## **Chapter-I**

### **Empathy and Racism: Provocative Politics**

Empathy is the capacity to recognize or understand another's state of mind or emotion. It begins with awareness of another person's feelings. Thus, to show empathy is to identify with another's feelings and mental state. It is emotionally put oneself in the place of another. It is closely related to compassion and understanding. It seems to both precede compassion and a prerequisite for it. When we feel empathy for someone we are getting emotional information about them and their situation. By collecting information about other people's feelings, we get to know them better. As we get to know others on an emotional level, we are likely to see similarities between one's feelings and theirs, and between one's basic emotional need and theirs. When we realize that someone else's basic emotional needs are similar to ours, we are more able to identify with them, relate to them and empathize with them.

We can also show empathy through a simple sign of affection such as hug or a tender touch. Though empathy is usually used in reference to sensing someone else's painful feelings, it can also apply to someone's positive feelings of success, accomplishment, pride, achievement, and so on. In this sense a "high five" would also be a sign of empathy. Empathy ("physical affection, partiality") is commonly defined as one's ability to recognize, perceive and feel directly the emotion of another. It is often characterized as the ability to "put oneself into another's shoes", or experiencing the outlook or emotions of another being within oneself. It involves the inner experience of sharing and comprehending the momentarily psychological state of another person.

Indeed, empathy is both about sharing the emotional state of others and understanding it in relation to oneself. The capacity for two people to resonate with

each other emotionally, prior to any cognitive understanding, is the basis for developing shared emotional meanings, but is not enough for empathetic understanding. This requires forming an explicit representation of the feelings of another person, an intentional agent, which necessitates additional computational mechanism beyond the shared emotional level.

Two general methods for empathy are possible - A person may stimulate 'pretend' versions of the beliefs, desires, character traits and context of the other and see what emotional feelings this leads to. Or, a person may stimulate the emotional feeling and then look around for a suitable reason for this to fit. Some research suggests that people are more able and willing to empathize with those most similar to themselves. In particular, empathy increases with similarities in culture and living conditions.

Rafael Moses in his article "Empathy and Dis-Empathy in Political Conflict" says, "Empathy is that faculty which enables us to feel with another human being, to cognitively and effectively put ourselves into his or her place and therefore to become aware of the other's feelings, needs and wants" (135). Thus empathy means not just knowing or understanding the others but seeing the other person's view point. Just a good mother is empathic with her child: she knows when it wants to eat, to sleep, to be cuddle, to have its diapers changed.

Emotional response is not empathic, because it is not the perception of the emotion of experience of another, but rather one's own response. One's own emotional response is certainly something to explore or consider but, it is not empathy. The psychological phenomena of projection – attributing ones own mental or emotional state to another – complicates things further. This is, of course, part of larger problem of empathic accuracy – the ability not only to empathize, but to

understand correctly what another is experiencing. It may not be possible to empathize totally with another from a completely different culture and it is not always possible to interpret correctly the empathic messages received because it needs more practice and work then only one is able to empathize with another person.

A terrorist who throws a grenade at innocent bystander must guard against empathy with his victims-to-be. Otherwise he cannot carry out his planned action. Empathy on his part with his intended victims would not allow him to go through with it or inhibit him. Hired killers in the United States have been known to convince themselves out loud that their intended victim is evil and does not deserve to live (Arlow 1973). Thus they “ideologically” eradicate their empathy so as not to interfere with their task of killing.

When soldiers fight at close range, where they can see their enemies, they must work more strongly against a neutral tendency as equally human. Those who have difficulties in such dehumanization end up by being in disharmony with themselves and with their conscience, both about what they actually did and about what they wished to do unconsciously. The psychological casualties of the Yom Kippur War in Israel showed such difficulties in dehumanizing themselves and the other. They also suffered from pangs of conscience about more or less unconscious death wishes, mobilized and galvanized by the deaths and injuries of friend and foe alike. In brief, empathy is anathema to killing, to torture, and to the waging of war. It stands in contrast and in contradiction to the dehumanization of the enemy, to scapegoat, to that polarization of good and bad which creates a world view as in the films of the Wild West: a world of heroes and villains and little else.

An entire mode of understanding and interpreting is seemingly foreclosed by legal discourse – or, more likely, it rumbles underground, much like the Freudian

unconscious, seldom explicitly breaking through. That mode of understanding is best captured by the word “empathy”, a word that at first seems counterintuitive in a world defined as legal. Lynne N. Henderson in “Legality and Empathy” says, “empathy is a form of understanding, a phenomenon that encompasses affect as well as cognition in determining meanings; it is a rich source of knowledge and approaches to legal problems – which are, ultimately, human problems” (1576). Properly understood, empathy is not a “weird” or “mystical” phenomenon, nor is it “intuition.” Rather, it is a way of knowing that can explode received knowledge of legal problems and structures, that reveals moral problems previously sublimated by pretensions to reduction rationality, and that provides a bridge to normatively better legal outcomes.

While there exists a tendency on the part of lawyers, judges, Lynne adds – law professors, to deny a role to empathic responses in their approaches to legal problems, it is no hunch to claim that the better understanding we have of a situation at all levels, the better our decision making is likely to be. To have total historical, empirical, emotional, experiential, and contextual understanding of given legal problem before making a decision is an unreachable ideal. But empathy enables the decision maker to have an appreciation of the human meanings of a given legal situation. Empathy aids both processes of discovery – the procedure by which a judge or other legal decision maker reaches a conclusion – and processes of justification – the procedure used by a judge or other decision maker to justify the conclusion – is a way that disembodied reason simply cannot.

Empathy has become a favorite word in critical and feminist scholarship. Unfortunately, it is never defined or described – it is seemingly tossed in as a “nice” word in opposition to something bad or undesirable. Lynne argues that “empathy is a phenomenon that exists to expand understanding of others” (1578). But he shares the

concerns of those traditions about the lack of humanistic response in legal thinking and has drawn on them to shape his own thinking.

Duncan Kennedy's article, "Distributive and Paternalist Motives in Contract and Tort Law", suggests some of the ideas developed here. He states that "the basis of paternalism is empathy or love" (1578), but he fails to define empathy. It appears that he substitutes the words "intuition" and "intuitive" to describe what in fact are empathic phenomena, but he makes several mistakes while correctly arguing that this "intuitive" form of knowledge is a form of "real knowledge." First, he seems to assume *that* empathic understanding necessarily leads intervention, "paternalist action," or altruistic behavior. Second, he alludes to intuitive understanding/empathy as a form of "unity" with the Other, but it is not clear if he is alluding to the collapse of ego boundaries, which is not a necessary consequence of empathy, or simply fellow-feeling. Finally, he leaves tantalizing unanswered the question of how empathic knowledge, particularly knowledge of people who are not intimate associates, can occur.

Empathy has a vital function to perform; as in the safeguarding by the mother of the physical and emotional viability of her infant. This function prevents people from committing acts of violence against those with whom they empathize. Lynne says, "the word 'empathy' often appears to be used interchangeably with "love", "altruism", and "sympathy," it actually encompasses specific psychological phenomena" (1579). Although the literature of empathy manifests disagreement about what is or is not "empathy", rather than projection sympathy, there are three basic phenomena captured by the word: (1) feeling the emotion of another; (2) understanding the experience or situation of another, both cognitively and affectively, often achieved by imagining oneself to be in the position of the other; and (3) action brought about

by experiencing the distress of another (hence the confusion of empathy with sympathy and compassion). The first two forms are ways of knowing, the third form a catalyst for action.

We can see another variation in the difference of the levels of readiness for empathy or dis-empathy which are found in different people, or different types of people. Among the “helping professions,” those generally considered most empathic are social workers. They identify with their clients, with the clients needs and interests, and fight for them. Mostly though not invariably – this requires a good deal of empathy with the individual clients and the client group. Yet there are some “helpers” who become aware that their empathy serves as an obstacle to their helping function. They over identify. A doctor of excellence once confided that he could not let his patients talk to him about their worries and problems, because they moved him so. He felt he just could not afford this degree of exposedness, of vulnerability. Sometimes, then, what may be “too much” empathy must be prevented from exerting a harmful effect. Thus the function of dis-empathy is, in certain circumstances, a protective one for its holder. This is so either when the individual is particularly sensitive; or when the task to be carried out requires it; or last, when there is much suffering around us.

To feel empathy is crucial in order to protect and help those who are vulnerable. Only by feeling the other’s pain, by anticipating his needs and wants ; only by feeling – with him how crucial it is that his needs be met, can we be aware of the other’s suffering , and thus make an effort to lessen it. But we pay a price for such an empathic ability: we experience personally, even if vicariously, some of the other’s pain; we are moved by him. We also feel urged to act in order to relieve the suffering. Through such experiences, we perforce relieve some of our own past losses and hurts.

When empathy becomes dysfunctional, when it is necessary to hurt someone to achieve a goal considered “right”, empathy is shunted aside. For most “helpers,” an excess of empathy becomes an encumbrance because it causes too many painful feelings in them. And even when empathy is exercised- and when its exercise is vital – a price is often paid in pain, in uncomfortable introspection, and in some inhibition of action.

There are two psychopolitical explanations that might help us understand such a trend, if indeed it is corroborated. One seems illogical at first glance. How can it be that those who have been victimized by others would not, in their turn, feel and empathize with those who are now victims - as indeed they themselves were not long ago? True, to have been a victim often sensitizes one, even inordinately, to the fate of other victims. Indeed, such ex-victims fight the battles of their victims in many places. And yet there is, at other times, a marked insensitivity to the suffering of others (Mack 1979). This is particularly striking in those who themselves have had a similar experience. One’s own suffering seems to loom so large then, that one cannot free enough sympathy to feel with other sufferers. One is too busy licking one’s own wounds: there is no room for yet more suffering.

The second explanation comes from those who discuss a now fashionable phenomenon: narcissism. Certain people are so concerned with themselves, as a result of their emotional development, that they view others only in relation to their own needs and satisfactions. For that reason – say experts like Christopher Lasch (Lasch 1979), the late Heinz Kohut (Kohut 1971-1977), and Kernberg (1976) – they are unable to empathize with others. They are too filled with their own urgent wants and needs to be able to feel those of others.

Some of the confusion about the meaning of empathy may result from its origins and comparatively recent entry into the language. “Empathy”, came into English as a translation of the German word *Einfühlung*, a word describing aesthetic perceptions. Translations of *Einfühlung* sometimes used the word “sympathy,” and “empathy” – which perhaps could be said better to capture a specific type of sympathy that involves being flooded with emotion – has persisted. (Thus, some twenty century philosophers have scoffed at “empathy,” while at the some describing empathic phenomena as important to human understanding).

According to Martin Buber, the term empathy meant “the exclusion of one’s own concreteness, the extinguishing of the actual situation of life, the absorption in pure aestheticism of the reality in which one participates. Buber’s use of “inclusion” or “dialogical relation” captures the understanding, affectively and cognitively, of the other embodied in the psychotherapeutic definition of empathy:

It is the extension of one’s own concreteness, the fulfillment of the actual situation of life, the complete presence of the reality in which one participates. Its elements are first, a relation, of no matter what kind , between two persons, second, an event experienced by them in common, ... and , third, the fact that this one person, without forfeiting anything of the felt reality of his activity, at the same time lives through the common event from the standpoint of the other. (1579)

As originally coined, empathy simply meant a physical reaction to something: e.g., people observing the leaning tower of Pisa tend to lean with the building. It also meant grimacing when someone else hit her thumb with a hammer – feeling the physical sensation of pain. This meaning quickly expanded to include the empathic response to emotions. Empathy thus captured the concept of feeling globalize



emotions from others – anger, fear, joy, love – or understanding the affect of a communication by “tuning in to the feelings of another” (1580). Globalize emotional reaction alerts a person to the presence of emotion in an interaction or in another; however, these reactions may be misinterpreted or the emotion mislabeled.

Empathy is the one often referred to in psychotherapeutic literature: the understanding of the situation of another. “The function of empathy is to help one understand and relate to another person” (1580). It is embodied in the idealized vision of the field anthropologist or participant-observer sociologist who understands totally, through empathic “magic,” the meanings, concepts, and way of being of a culture or group. Total understanding may be unachievable because of the social learning and cultural baggage the ethnographer, sociologist, or psychotherapist carries with her, yet it is an important mode of understanding the Other.

Another meaning of empathy that is commonly used is that of sympathy, care, or compassion, captured in Hoffman’s notion of “an empathic distress response” – “an aversive [e.g., uncomfortable] affect that can result from the discrepancy between some desired state of welfare of an object . . . and perceived/ cognized reality” (1582). This distress can lead to action in order to help or alleviate the pain of another. It is this form of empathy that is linked to action and altruistic behavior. Yet, “the relationship between action and the sharing of feelings is obviously not a simple or direct one,” and while empathy may lead to helping behavior, it does not necessarily do so. Indeed, a person feeling the distress of another may find ways of blocking the experienced distress by thinking of other things, rationalizing nonaction by rules or limits, or withdrawal. Thus there is not a direct causal relationship between empathy and helping behavior, but a connection between empathy and helping or altruistic behavior does exist.

Legality gives judges a number of ways to block human pain and escape responsibility. Thus, a judge who believed himself to have chosen “fidelity to law” as a “higher value” could discount any moral concern about enforcing fugitive slave laws. Court’s opinion speaks of feeling, of human pain, and of moral evil. The recognition of human experience and pain – of feeling - is obvious: “To separate (school children) from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be done” (1594). The opinion, varying as it did from the established form, was immediately and repeatedly attack by legal scholars and the legal and political communities. The favorite criticism was trashing the social and scientific evidence that segregation stigmatized and harmed black children; therefore also cries “neutral principles” against judicial legislation and attack on the opinion’s departure from established form.

Chief Justice Warren, who as Attorney General of California had indulged in racism against American of Japanese descent by playing an instrumental role in the internment of Japanese Californians, had no doubt that segregation, existed simply to perpetuate “a belief in the inferiority of the negro.” On the merits, the natural, the logical, and practically the only way the case could be decided were clear. The question was how the decision was to be reached. “Empathy probably did play a role in Warren’s decision to strike down school segregation laws, for the chief justice was frequently to decide cases by “putting himself in the other’s shoes . . . . ‘to get to the essence of the case’ ” (1606). Apparently, Warren was not especially concerned about the obstacles presented by legality, whether characterized by apparent congressional approval of segregation, the attitudes and laws of the South, or the long existence of

the doctrine of Plessy and its progeny. Instead, to Warren, “the injustice of an enforced separation of human beings based on their color was apparent” (1606).

The change in doctrine facilitated empathic understanding of blacks, by forcing white to acknowledge their humanity. Racism persists, but many whites by virtue of becoming accustomed to being with blacks rather than separated have recognized common humanity; while “contact . . . cannot always overcome the personal variable in prejudice,” people “with a normal degree of prejudice” will become less prejudiced as a result of “equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals” (1650). Unfortunately, empathy for the poor has not continued, perhaps because “the poor” can trigger so many prejudices – racial, ethnic, and sexual. Empathy for the poor also conflicts the work ethic of capitalism and the belief that poverty is never inescapable.

In *The Wrong of Victim's Right*, Lynne attempted to demonstrate that the so-called “Victims’ Right Movement” largely ignored the phenomenological dimension of a crime victim’s experience and that, laws passed ostensibly in the crime victim’s name may have worsened conditions for victims. Undoubtedly, the victims’ rights movement evoked an empathic response in at least some voters and legislators, and that response led to action to remedy perceived injuries. Yet the genuine empathic response seemed quickly to be sublimated into existing ideological debates about the criminal process. He argued many of the laws pushed in the name of “victims” often seemed to be anything but altruistic or caring toward those victims. The divergence of empathic response and actual outcome was that the empathic response to crime victims was inaccurate or incomplete. For example, the unreflective translation of anger of victims into desire for retaliatory retribution might have been inaccurate. The initial empathic response to the stories of victims may have been so distressing that

the listener avoided empathizing further, and instead withdraw from victims. Finally, the existing structure of legality in the criminal process may have provided refuge from empathic response, so that those structure and debates about them replaced the very real debate over the pain a crime victim experiences and how the legal system might address that pain.

As Professor Lawrence Becker has accurately noted, “incompleteness in the range of empathic powers can produce moral error” (1652). This is not, however, an argument that eliminates the usefulness of empathy as a morally relevant mode of understanding. *Absence* of empathy produces moral error as well. It is simply a caution that selective empathy or unreflective empathy can mask moral choice. This is especially likely in the case of something like Affirmative action, where a white decision-making unreflectively empathizes with whites to the exclusion of minorities and reaches a decision “in favor” of whites. As a result, patterns of covert discrimination are legitimated and become more entrenched.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the foregoing discussion about legality and empathy are that empathic understanding is possible and that empathic narrative can and should be a proper and influential part of legal discourse. Thus Legality and empathy are coined with each other. So, Empathic narrative is a part of legal discourse, and that empathic understanding can play a role in decision-making. Empathy cannot necessarily tell us what to do or how to accomplish something, but it does alert us to moral choice and responsibility. It also reminds us of our common humanity and responsibility to one another.

Racism, as socially and culturally constructed form, is the mistreatment of a group of people on the basis of race, skin color, complexion, bodily structure, hair color and religion; a blind and pointless hatred, envy, or prejudice obviously

expressed in the form of graffiti; intimidation or abuse, discrimination on offering jobs. It refers to the false belief that one group is superior to another group. White thinks themselves superior than the Afro-American and other minor groups and mistreated them in various levels like not providing good job opportunities, facilities and using rough languages for them. They made a boundary of racism to avoid the majority group of blacks and protect themselves from blacks internalizing blacks as inferior and lower beings. Thus racism becomes the major cause of disintegrating the society and hatred relationship between these two un avoiding groups. Because of racial discrimination and prejudice black suffers a lot in day to day life even though the laws are made to abolish the discrimination but that is not practiced in real life by whites. Unless they cannot change their perspective toward the blacks the dream of blacks for equal rights cannot take its full space; and find their identity in American society. Racial discrimination is often based on the discrimination of color where the word 'discrimination' denotes the denial of equality based on personal characteristics such as race and color. Discrimination is based on prejudice and stereotype where the stereotype refers to forming an instant fixed idea of a group, usually based on false or incomplete information, and prejudice refers to prejudice based on idea that are formed without any knowledge about others.

Racism is founded on the belief in one's racial superiority over other. It encompasses the belief, attitudes, behavior, and practices that define people on racial classifications. It involves a generalized lack of knowledge or experience as of applies to negative beliefs and attitudes. It uses the inflexible assumptions that differences are biologically determined and therefore inherently unchangeable. It does not take place in a vacuum, but rather is enacted and reinforced through social, cultural, and institutional practices that endorse the hierarchical power of one group over another

and people are following this false belief that one group is superior to another group.

Gretchen Gerzina defines racism as:

An active or passive response to the specious belief that genetically transmitted traits are linked to social characteristics. [ . . .]. Racism at individual level involves a misguided personal belief that an entire racial group is deficient or superior because of a set of moral, intellectual, or cultural traits that are thought to be indicated by the group's biological origins. (126)

Racism always emerges from race, a concept confused with ethnicity and culture.

Race, in particular, is the classification of human beings into distinguishable groups that are based on innate and immutable physical characteristics, e.g., skin, color, hair texture, eye shape, and so on. Ethnicity is a classification of individuals who share the common ancestry comprised of customs and traditions that are passed on between generations, e.g., religion, dress, and nationality; whereas culture on the other hand is a broader category that extends beyond race and ethnicity to include any group of people who share common lifestyles, which are passed on to members of the particular group, e.g., socio-economic status, geographical location.

Racism is the belief of distinguishing human characteristics, often dealt with prejudice, that one group of human beings is inherently superior to another group of human beings. It is the matter of discussion that 'Racism' springs from the term 'race,' but the use of race for the biological, psychological, sociological, and economic differences among the human characteristics are taken into consideration that these qualities of one group make it either inferior or superior to each other. European supremacy over the globe for the last few centuries has given conducive milieu to purport that 'the white-skinned' beings are superior to the 'the black-

skinned' or 'the brown-skinned' individuals. The concept of colored race prejudice has worked with the production of natural inferiority of black to white, physically, intellectually, religiously, socially, and morally. So, the whites take the advantages of superiority economically, politically, and socially. For the whites, the justification works as the relation with human and less human. The Negro is less human because he has "an oval skull, flat forehead, snout-like jaws, swollen lips, broad, flat nose, short crimped hair, calf less legs, highly elongated heels, and flat feet" (Ellis 13). But still many views springs regarding the single human race that nature has endowed us. A Negro is no-more naturally inferior for he is the product of complex and subtle forces of his milieu.

A child is not a born racist, but rather racism is a learned social phenomenon, via family, education, religion, the la, and the media. It is difficult to group up in a society without adopting the world views and biases of the society. He becomes a 'made' racist and subsequently perpetuate in the same society. It is based on the tendency toward adhering to and preferring the values and personal beliefs of one's own group; tendency towards associating with individuals or groups that have similar values and beliefs and therefore limiting the access of inter group contact and experience from which to draw; tendency toward categorizing information and using generalized assumptions, which often lead to stereotypes and negative biases; and judging the values and standards of minority group cultures by the values and standards of the majority group culture and labeling the former inferior.

The term Racialism, racism and racist are different but coined with each other. Racialism is the philosophical belief that differentiate the existing races in terms of racial superiority, inferiority and purity based on conviction that moral and intellectual characteristics, just like physical, biological, social, psychological, or in

the realm of the soul. Racism is using this belief to push forward the argument that one's particular race is superior to the others. It refers to a system of oppression, such as institutional racism that is based on ideas that one race is superior to other races. Organization and institution that practice racism discriminate against and marginalized class of people who share a common racial designation. The term 'racism' is usually applied to the dominant group in a society, because it is that group which has the means to oppress others, but readily applies to any individual or groups, regardless of social status or dominance. And it often includes the belief that people of different races differ in aptitudes and abilities, such as intelligence, physical prowess, or virtue. One who uses the concept of racial categories believes that different races can be placed on a ranked, hierarchical scale and practices racism is known as a 'racist'.

Racism is product of racial prejudice, and it works with biological and sociological definitions. Queen and Gruner define, "From the biological standpoint, a race is large body of people, relatively homogenous as to inheritable, non-adaptive features [...]. There are various criteria of race- head, hair, skin color, stature, Blood group, and so on" (21). Racism can be both overt and covert. Overt racism is what most people are familiar with since it is easily detectable and the form of direct behavioral or verbal racially discriminatory acts. Cover racism is more subtle, yet occurs more often than overt racism and is more easily hidden, denied, or discounted.

The notion of racism is also attached by the modern science. Modern Science "believes that such classification as Negro, Caucasian, and Mongoloid are of no importance for biological purposes" (Appiah 277). It is not concerned with race as a significant aspect of a people's identity. Scientific racism refers to the belief that human species can be categorized into the inferior and superior groups on the basis of



psychological data so that social policies can be implemented to promote the breeding of the superior groups and discourage the breeding of the inferior groups. The use of race in natural science radically changed the existing racial themes. Darwinian evolution theory and Mendelian science of heredity challenged the existing belief that physically, anthropologically the black-skinned individuals are inferior to the white-skinned individuals. The concept of race was defined on the certain criteria that were given scientific slogans. Stephen Jay Gould writes, “the language, concepts, methods and authority of science were used to support the belief that certain human groups were intrinsically inferior to others as measured by some socially defined criterion, such as intelligence or civilized behavior” (39). The tradition of inequality can not only be found in classical and modern observation but even in Thomas Hobbes’s words for his quasi-scientific justification for slavery “as if master and servant were not introduced by consent of men but by difference of wit” (383).

Though waged with scientific experiments, racism, in the twentieth century, has become more political. The question of colonial racism to political racism is either to keep up the political status or political authority, for the genetic differences between blacks and whites is replete with scientific propaganda. William H. Tucker writes:

The question of genetic differences between races has arisen not out of purely scientific curiosity or the desire to find some important scientific truth or to solve some significant scientific problem but only because of the belief, explicit or unstated that the answer has political consequences. (382)

Racism is regarded by all but racist as an unacceptable affront to basic human dignity and a violation of human rights. So a number of international treaties have sought to

end racism. As officially laws and rules are legalized against racial discrimination or segregation but in practice it is not seen or applied by the whites. Even today the blacks are treated as Second class or Others through the behavior and language used by whites. Blacks are in search of equal right of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness or brotherhood which is the dream of every black in the American society. They are avoided of good education, facilities, and job opportunities. So, they are obliged to involve in the jobs that are risky and need more physical labor than mental. Some of them are also linked with bad activities like murder, robbery and theft because of this crude discrimination. Though they are innocent and trapped by the whites given sever punishment. Laws are also different for the blacks and the whites.

Valentine, in his analysis of racism, equates ethnicity with racism and racially separates the ethnic villains from the oppressed Black minority. "If relying on common ethnicity as the main basis of trust, main motives to all egalitarian relationships are not racist orientations, and then what are they?" (Stein 841). With a criticism such as this leveled would analyze such concurrent phenomena as the Native American Movement (Stein and Hill 1973). Would we not do better to inquire into the conditions and process through which a common group self-reference becomes the only trust worthy basis of trust; where consciousness-raising and maintenance emerge to define groups relative to one another; and where a preoccupation with hierarchical measuring and distancing on the social ladder serve to strengthen one's precarious position and sense of place? Although stereotyping is clearly part of the process, identifying the whole as "racism" is misleading. "Racism, the shoring up of groups and ego boundaries, a projection of all one dissociates from one's own upon another, and a heightened self-consciousness are symptoms of cultural stress and attempts to cope with it" (Stein 841).

A note on “The Language on White Racism”, Weber extended Professor Bosmajian’s clear and useful article in December 1969 *College English*. Though it touches on many important points, the article’s chief emphasis is on the offensive terminology. The reader is therefore apt to reach the reductive conclusion that he can take an important step in “eradicating white racism in white communities” simply by ridding his language “of words and phrases (like ‘the Negro problem’ or ‘our colored boys in Vietnam’ as well as ‘boy’ and ‘nigger’) which connote racism to the blacks” (863). His article will be to sensitize his readers to some of the residual refuse in our habitual diction. It refuses well got rid of, of course, but we ought to be concerned to more rapidly past this embryonic stage of linguistic decency. If we concentrate on ‘phrases’ we run the risk of merely making our racism less obvious – sending it underground, rather than really trying to end its existence. One can master a brief list of ‘unfortunate phrases’ perhaps too quickly. We should direct some attention to other linguistic dimension of Whit racism and listen more carefully to all of our social language. And we need to resist these subtly racist forms of language not only when they may “connote racism to the blacks,” but when they connote racism to ourselves. If we as teachers try to bring to the white community “the increased awareness and sensitivity of the black American to the impact of language,” that interracial communication is obstructed by many more offences that those of diction.

As Professor Bosmajian observes, it will undoubtedly be “difficult and painful” for whites to refashion their speech into a language truly free of racism. Even this hard task, however, by no means exhausts the challenges which aspect of language pose for whites who seek to communicate without prejudice with black people. Whites have to learn not only how to speak with blacks but also how to listen to them. This is difficult one because, as Professor Bosmajian’s quotes from Stokely

Carmichael show, whites cannot expect blacks to make this part our interaction easy for them. “The first need of a free people,” he said, “is to be able to define their own terms and have those terms recognized by their oppressors” (865).

Some black rhetoric goes beyond this assertion of pervasive racism among white people. There are probably times when racial hatred is so intense that there is nothing a member of the hated group can say or do to moderate that feeling. (This is, needless to say, another lesson which blacks learned long ago in this country but the truth of which whites are still discovering.) Nonetheless, there are several points we can keep in mind. One is that a reflexive relapse into aggrieved and self-righteous postures will achieve nothing in the way of deflating what whites perceive as hyperbole in black rhetoric. Another, trickier one is that we can perhaps distinguish between the blacks’ definition of terms and our own; some statements have different meanings when used by speakers of different races. These differences will probably, at worst of times, be irresolvable; but whites often multiply the difficulties of communication by failing to make the most rudimentary effort of empathy or imagination in order to understand what a given rhetoric means to the black person using it.

Weber also shares Professor Bosmajian’s view that “a person’s language is an extension of himself” and that “the language of white racism of the whites are almost one and the same” (865). Since he also wish with him to eradicate or counter white racism in white or predominantly white communities. The intimate connection between racism and racist language have a convenient access to the core of the problem and wonder whether as this late date it is excessively rhetorical to say that we need first of all to eradicate racism from our institutions and our lives. Careful

attention to our language can help us to do that; but our language will probably continue to betray us until it is done.

As the historical and social conditions shifted, the significance of race also has shifted. In the course of time, race referred to “the noble race, the Jewish race, and the French race.” This practice was much more prevalent but it is also present today in America where riots have taken place associated with racial matters. So, racism is not a stable ideological form consisting over a long period. Race studies are at peak in Nineteenth century but it does not mean that the practice and the study of it were not presented before, it was presented even in the classical Greek and ancient Hebrew societies at different levels.

Thus, the meaning of race changes over times as it is socially constructed rather than an inherently meaningful category. It is also linked with hegemony or power relation and process of struggle. The ‘domination by consent’ principle worked during the time of colonization, later in the time of slavery, and at present in the time of advancement. The ‘God-chosen’ people could rule any subject became first principle of domination; and the rightful heir for selling and buying the black individuals was made second principle; and the history taught the blacks to be inferior. So, they should be inferior was made the principle in the world of advancement, and a new principle of ‘history’ was brought into account. In this way the practice of racism is predicted on the belief that one race is superior to another and so now African American are understood racially as “others” and also treated like wise. Racism absorbs the notion of exclusion or inclusion.

The notion that blackness exemplifies inferiority of intellect and literary capacity has been defied by African American writers from the colonial period to the present. So, the black writers in America have played significant role to make a

significant change in American literature. African American presence in literature was less presented to American literary tradition. Anglo American master narratives place black even out of the boundary and failed to acknowledge the African Americans' contribution. Thus African American literature deals with racism-as a literary record of African American experience in America. The Virtual exclusion of African American history and culture from American education, which began to be addressed only in the 1960, reflects the virtual exclusion of African American history and culture from official versions of American history before that period. Only over the past few decades, American history books have begun to include information about African Americans that had been repressed in order to maintain the cultural dominance of white Americans. As African Americans are misrepresented believing in false stereotypes so the political content of African American literature includes correcting those stereotypes of African American; correcting the misrepresentations of African American in American history and omission of African American from American history; celebrating African American culture, experience and achievements; and exploring racial issues, including institutionalized racism, internalized intra- racial racism, and the combined oppression of racism, classicism and sexism.

Concluding, the culture of America is a projection of hierarchy of whiteness and blackness. White writers cannot go away from its frequent touch because they are also a part of this historically derived cultural hierarchy. Their literary works are the product of the stereotypes or imagination which in turn is the product of racial hierarchy. Consciously or unconsciously, racism is enforced and maintained by the legal, religious, educational and other forms of institutions.

As we discuss empathy and racism separately, it is impossible to apply empathy in racism during the period of racism and apartheid because racial hatred creates the wall between whites and blacks. But Harper Lee's *To Kill A Mockingbird* attempts to show whites empathy toward blacks going beyond the racism through the characterization of Atticus Finch, a white lawyer, defending a black, Tom Robinson who is falsely alleged. But, indeed, in this defense of a black by the white lawyer, there lies the politics of showing whites as superior, rational and humanitarian. Therefore, racism and politics of empathy remains a provocative issue to be observed or researched in this novel.

## Chapter-II

### Politics of Empathy in *To Kill A Mockingbird*

Empathy means as discussed in earlier chapter knowing a person from their point of view effectively or cognitively. Unless a person cannot see the situation from his or her perspective the thing cannot be understood properly. Only showing outwardly sympathy, pity, compassion and love is not empathy, as these terms are coined with empathy, it is more than that in which one compares the man with oneself and find out what is the real condition and feeling of the man. But because of racial segregation prevailed in the society the white people does not have empathetic feeling toward the blacks as they think that blacks are inferior beings and they have to suffer from the problems and face harder conditions. They are treated as second beings or like animals, no love, sympathy, affection is shown towards blacks. Whites have false assumption that they are superior, intellectual, independent and talent by birth and blacks are inferior, dependent, emotional, and weak. White themselves constructed all these things not created by god. All human beings are born with equal rights but it is the man who made the boundaries between people thinking one is superior to the others. Thus race becomes the major cause of racial discrimination in terms of appearances like skin color, bodily structure, complexion; color of hair and so on. One group is mistreated by the other group in these false assumptions. So people are judged by their skin color not by their ability or capacity.

Racism is the constructed form not fore gifted by the god to discriminate one from the other in name of religion, culture, ethnic, social status and so on. Racial segregation and apartheid is spread all over the American society during Nineteenth-century but this does not mean that there is no segregation before that but in different form. One is not born racist but family, society, culture, law, and religion made one



racist and shows their limited areas or boundaries. Whites treated blacks as their enemy and offer no opportunities to them as they think that if blacks are given the opportunities they become their competitor in every field. So they made boundaries to save one from the fear of majority blacks. If the blacks try to cross the limited boundaries, they are severely punished or given fatal punishments in the name of violating the law which is also made by the whites, no voice of black is listened. Blacks are dependent upon whites because they have no job opportunities as whites are in higher post and the lower post is given to them which need more physical labor. Whites have no mutual communication with the blacks so there is no understanding between them and no empathetic feeling towards the blacks. In the present novel also the same thing happens because of racism prevailed in the Maycomb, Alabama, one black character, Tom Robinson, who tries to help a white woman crossing the boundaries becomes the victim of cruel white society .

Even Tom is innocent and ignorant the court cannot listen his voice and believe in the words of white woman although she is lying and hide the truth for her betterment and considered him guilty. But Atticus Finch, a white lawyer, tries his level best to defend Tom going against the racism. Knowing he is a black, he supports Tom and his family fully. All community people are against him and his family and says him a nigger-lover but he avoids all these things and gives the same lesson to his children who are also mocked by their friends. He knows Tom and his situation as if he is a Negro, he is a respectable one and lives in his own moral codes and does not harm anyone. Eventhough at the surface level it seems that Atticus, protagonist of the novel, has empathetic feeling toward Tom but in deeper level the writer attempts to show the supremacy of whites using empathy as a tool. As he is a lawyer and it is his appointed task or case which he has to defend and support his client and sees the thing

from the point of view of his client. Empathy as a key attribute of true professionalism. He is obliged to accomplish it. This thing we find in the novel while we read it clearly. Though we think white characters are empathetic to blacks and really want to help them but the thing is not that simple it is only their strategy to make oneself superior than the blacks. Black characters are shown as immoral, dependent, passive, emotional, uneducated and weak so the white lawyer represent the condition of blacks as they have no representatives.

We find empathy is spread in the novel as white character are in support of blacks and help them in their own ways which is the very important point to focus because in that period when the novel is published there is no empathetic sharing between the Whites and the Blacks as whites think they are superior to blacks and there is no need of mutual communication between these two groups. Black people are needed by whites when they have the work to do. In a characteristic episode, Atticus , moral conscience of the novel imparts to his daughter, Scout, a “simple trick” for getting along with others: “You never really understand a person until you consider things from other’s point of view”- that is until you climb into his skin and walk around in it.” He also bequeaths legacy of humanism to his children. At first the narrator, Scout, does not like the word ‘nigger-lover’ as said by Cecil Jacobs and Francis to his father so, she fights with them without knowing the exact meaning of the word but later when Calpurnia, a black house maid, took them to the Church she sees the situation of the black people who have no hymns to read and write, there are less educated people and they are poor but collecting the money for Helen, Tom’s wife. By knowing the condition as her father says, “sees the situation from other’s point of view or wear the shoes of others.” Then she shows her love towards blacks

and Calpurnia and wants to go in the house of Calpurnia and help her in household works.

Atticus's empathy toward the black characters is transparent in the novel as he is central character and moral conscience of the novel. White community is against him and his family so Scout asks him why he is defending a Negro when she is mocked by her friends. From the rumblings of the Robinson case, the mantra Atticus instills in his children is "hold your head high and keep those fists down. No matter what anybody says to you, don't you let 'em get your goat." She asks:

Do you defend niggers. Atticus?

Of course I do. Don't say nigger, Scout. That's common.

's what everybody at school says.

Atticus sighed. I simply defending a Negro- his name's Tom Robinson. He lives in that little settlement beyond the town dump. He's a member of Calpurnia's church, and Cal knows his family well. She says they're clean-living folks. (75)

In above lines Atticus easily accepts that he is defending a Negro, who is falsely accused of raping by a white woman. He taught his children moral lessons that all human beings are equal and do not accuse others without seeing the things from their point of view. Ignoring Community's reaction against him and his family as he has taken the case of negro but he collects the information about him and tries to see the thing from his point of view because he believes that every lawyer gets at least one case in his life time that affects him personally. For him this case is one that touched him because all blacks are not bad or dishonest as all whites are not good. Despite he is a Negro; he is well living and respected in his society and does not want to harm anybody. And also says, "If I don't I couldn't hold up my head in Town, I couldn't

represent this county in the legislature, I couldn't even tell you or Jem not to do something again" (75). So, he wants to teach his children good moral lesson as if they grow older they do not found him guilty of not defending Tom Robinson.

Atticus supports Calpurnia though she is a black and only a house maid when Alexandra, his sister, is against her and tells him to avoid Calpurnia and let her to leave the house. She says:

Atticus, it's all right to be soft-hearted, you're an easy man, but you have a daughter to think of. A daughter who's growing up. That's what I am thinking of.

And do't try to get around it. You're got to face it sooner or later and it might as well be tonight. We don't need her now.

Atticus voice was even: "Alexandra, Calpurnia's not living this house until she wants to. You may think otherwise, but I could't have got along without these years. She's a faithful member of this family and you'll simply have to accept things the way they are. (137)

Here, Alexandra tries to persuade Atticus to make Calpurnia out of the house as she thinks calpurnia is showing wrong direction to the children as Jem and Scout went to the Church with Calpurnia and met the black people. Alexandra is aristocratic lady owning the Finch's Landing tries to impose her own moral virtues to be accepted by Scout and Jem and wants to do the things according to her ignoring Capurnia's idea But she fails in her mission because Atticus knows Cal from many years and she brought up his children like mother as they have no mother and gives them good moral lessons and tries to show them a right path ignoring they are whites which is a difficult task in that period.

Scout also examines Tom as her father sometimes said that one way to tell whether a witness was lying or telling the truth was to listen rather than watch and heard Tom denied it three times in one breath, but quietly, with no hint of whining in his voice and found herself believing him:

He seemed to be a respectable Negro, and a respectable Negro would ever go up into somebody's yard of his own volition. [...] Tom was a black-velvet Negro, not shiny, but soft black-velvet. The whites of his eyes shone in his face, and when he spoke we saw flashes of his teeth.

If we had seen whole, he would have been a fine specimen of a man.

(192)

Tom being a black knows his virtues and moral codes so he cannot go up into the ward of whites with bad intention or without invitation of his own volition. He knows his limitation and does the works accordingly. He never cheats others for his benefits rather help other people whether black or whites when they need him. So he is respected in the society for his good deeds and virtues which is also seen in the court. His face too reflects the innocence in him. Ewell does not like Negroes so they accuse him to show themselves superior in the society as Scouts says four kind of folks in the world: our kind of ordinary folks do not like Cunninghams (farmers), the Cunninghams do not like Ewells, who does not want to work and live at the dump, and the Ewells hate and despise colored folks who want to work but does not get opportunity.

Another White character, Mr. Link Deas, also shows empathy toward Tom and his family because he knows Tom very well as he worked eight years for him and gives no chance of complain or dissatisfy him. He is sincere and faithful toward his work and a helpful person. So, he says he is most trustable and honorable person.

When Tom is cross-examined by the lawyer of opposite side saying things that are not true he would not sit quietly hearing all those words. So, he stands up from the audience and announced: “I just want the whole lot of you to know one thing right now. That boy’s worked for me Eight years an’ I an’t had a speck o’ trouble outa him. Not a speck” (195).

As he is well aware of the situation that Tom is not guilty but court treated him that he had done a big crime. His only crime is to help the white woman seeing her poor condition. Tom did not hide anything that took place and says, “I felt sorry for her, she seemed to try more’n the rest of ’em-” (197). In spite of her family she is alone and they did not help her doing the work so he helped her when she called him by watering her flowers, chopping woods and hauling. In November twenty-first too, he is called by her to bust up a chiffarobe and he went inside without any bad intention. But thing is not that simple as he thought, there is no work to do this time; he is called by her to take advantage from him. But he is tempted by white woman though he is ignoring or rejecting the things because he cannot go beyond the morals codes as he is married with three children. So Mr. Link supports Tom but his voice does not matter for the court because he is speaking for a black man.

Dill, Scout’s friend who comes to Maycomb in every summer season, is deeply upset and cries when Mr. Gilmer, Mayella’s lawyer, is cross examining Tom Robinson. As he is a small boy he is quite innocent and unaware of the situation of racism and its evil consequences that made a gap between whites and blacks. He Says:

That old Mr. Gilmer doin him that way talking so hateful to him- Dill exhaled patiently. I know all that, Scout. It was the way he said it made me sick, plain sick.”

He's supposed to act that way, Dill he was cross- He didn't act that way when-

Well, Mr. Finch didn't act that way to Mayella and old man Ewell when he cross-examined them. The way that man called him 'boy' all the time an' sneered at him, and looked around at the jury every time he answered- I don't care one speck. It ain't right, it ain't right to do 'em that way. Hasn't anybody got any business talkin' like that- it just makes me sick. (199)

Dill breaks into tears and felt sick because of prosecutor's racist insinuations and intonations and is forced to leave the court-room. Mr. Gilmer all the time addressed Tom calling him 'boy' which sounds humiliating and dominating the black people as they have no identity in the white society. Dill being a small boy felt bad listening those words but Gilmer being a lawyer does not care because for them blacks are no beings and treated them as they like, have no courtesy with him just opposite of Atticus, he treated with Mayella and Bob Ewell in courtesy manner though they are guilty. Scout tries to explain: "They do 'em all that way, most lawyers," except Atticus, who is "the same in the courtroom as he is on the public streets" (199). The phrase echoes one coined by the Finches' neighbour and friend, Miss Maudie, earlier in the novel: "Atticus Finch is the same in the house as he is on the public streets." This shows Atticus's conduct both at work and in the personal sphere, is governed by similar, ritual: "courteous detachment" with which he treats his children and everyone else. Dill's emotion is shared by the readers.

Atticus is disturbed and paused by hearing all those things that are against black people and case is misjudged in the name of racism because he is linked with the case both personally and professionally, then he is doing something professionally

that he does not ordinarily ever do. He is abandoning ritual in a specific way and set aside his “arid professional detachment” to appeal directly to the hearts and emotion of the jury. He is, in other words, letting empathy out of the bottle- because he feels that it is only the way to win them over. He unhitched his watch and chain and placed them on the table and wants to say something “with the court’s permission-”

Gentleman, I shall be brief, but I would like to use my remaining time with you to remind you that this case is not a difficult one, it requires no minute sifting of complicated facts, but it does require you to be sure beyond all reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the defendant. To begin with, this case should never have come to trial. This case is as simple as black and white. The state has not produced one iota of medical evidence to the effect that the crime Tom Robinson is charged with ever took place. It has relied instead upon the testimony of the two witnesses whose evidence has not only been called into serious question on cross-examination, but has been flatly contradicted by the defendant. The defendant is not guilty, but somebody in this courtroom is. (203)

Atticus shows his frustration on the courtroom because racism becomes the major cause of discrimination and prejudice. He says the jury that they should not doubt the defendant on the stereotypes and tries to see the real thing that had happened.

Although there are no medical reports and other evidences except two witnesses who contradicted by the defendant during cross-examination, he is found to be guilty because of his race which is thought inferior by the whites as they are the superior being. Negro people always becomes the victim of whites though they are ignorant and not guilty in such cases where whites have the case against black, no voice of



black is heard and support the whites blindly. As Atticus said, “people go stark raving mad when anything involving a Negro comes up.” It suggests that social prejudice, attitudes, and beliefs, controlled primarily by race and class attitudes, determined justice. He says it is simply a case of white and black so the court’s decision is also in favor of whites because it is a case of black-on-white sexual assault. But Atticus knows who is guilty; it is not Tom but somebody else in the courtroom, indicating Mayella, who pretends to be ignorant.

Mayella being a white woman tempted a Negro who helped her unintentionally because she is compelled by her desires. She is the victim of poverty and loneliness, no better than the mixed child, belonging no where. She does not find love from her family so she tried to gain it from Tom but he rejects her because he is a moral being and married with three children. Atticus says:

What was the evidence of her offence? Tom Robinson, a human being. She must put Tom Robinson away from her. Tom Robinson was her daily reminder of what she did. What did she do? She tempted a Negro. She was white, she tempted a Negro. She did something that in our society is unspeakable: She kissed a black man. Not an old Uncle, but a strong young Negro man. No code mattered to her before she broke it, but it came crashing down on her afterwards. (203-4)

Here, Atticus clarifies that Tom is the evidence of Mayella’s offence because the things are happened with him. He is only the eye witness of her crime. As Tom becomes the daily reminder of her guilt, she wants to put him away from her. Whites do the mistakes or crimes violating their codes and to hide their crimes and live in society respectively, they accuse the blacks. Same happens with Tom even though he always helps Mayella, is tempted by her for her desires and kissed a young Negro not

a old man breaking rigid and time-honored code of our society, a code so severe that whoever breaks it is hounded from our midst as unfit to live with. The relation between white and black cannot be accepted by the society but her desires are stronger so she crosses her limits than the codes she is breaking. Though she is the victim of cruel poverty and ignorance but it cannot be forgivable or pitied upon her. Later while she realized her mistakes and to hide her guilty, she accused Tom.

Further he says that it is not fair to decide the case in the false assumption that is accepted blindly generation to generation that black are immoral, murderer, uncivilized, liar and so on without understanding the real thing or situation. He says:

And so a quiet, respectable, humble Negro ho had the unmitigated temerity to ‘feel sorry’ for a white woman has had to put his word against two white people’s. I need not remind you of their appearance and conduct on the stand- you saw them for yourselves. The witnesses for the state, with the exception of the sheriff of Maycomb County, have presented themselves to you gentlemen, to this court, in the cynical confidence that their testimony would not be doubted, the assumption-the evil assumption-that *all* Negroes lie, that *all* Negroes are basically immoral beings, that *all* Negroes men are not to be trusted around our women, an assumption one associates with minds of their caliber. (204)

Here, Atticus shows how black people are misjudged in the name of race by whites which are not the natural gift but a socio-cultural form to make one superior than the others. Blacks are restricted in limited boundaries and not given the equal rights.

When Tom said he felt right sorry for Mayella, the jury and the prosecutor smiled and said you felt sorry for Mayella. Because whites think empathy is shown to the people

who are inferior to them, not sharing the emotions and feelings, as whites are superior to blacks so it is impossible to think like that. For this ground as Tom felt sorry for a white woman becomes the victim because white does not accept that a black felt sorry for a white. According to class the rules and punishments are made however the crime is same. White believes that blacks are less intellectual, uneducated, uncivilized, immoral, liar, not trust worthy and so on from their fore fathers and did not want to change their perspective which is evil assumption without any real background. For Atticus all Negroes are not bad as all whites are not good. Despite the jury's apparent certainty of Robinson's guilt, he thought it likely that his conviction would be overturned on appeal. So, he made several appeals not to decide the case in the name of discrimination and change the perspective to see blacks with partial eye and through the mechanism of empathy, narrative often achieves its desired effects by appealing directly to jury's ability to identify emotionally and psychologically with the viewpoint expressed. And lastly, he says in the name of God believe him.

Jem, Scout's brother, sitting in the jury heard all the words told by the Atticus in favor of Tom and evidence of left handed that Tom's left hand is shorter than the right, when taking the oath it is revealed. Mayella is beaten by the person who is left handed but Tom's left arm is injured in cotton gin, a machine primarily used by slaves while working. He is delivering harsh truth that is rooted in the society like Maycomb County. No correlative relation between whites and blacks. Court also guided by such false assumption where white's words are enough to give the decision against the black people without any evidences or proofs that shows the defendant is guilty. He is quite happy as Atticus presents the truth in front of the court which is heard by many people. Jem was jumping in excitement while reached home and said "We've won,

haven't we?" (206). But when Tom is declared guilty in courtroom, Jem turns to cry and his face was streaked with angry tears.

Lastly Tom Robinson is considered "Guilty... guilty... guilty... guilty..." by Judge Taylor in spite of his several efforts. Court favors white woman but cannot hear the voice of black and believe her so court is no better than the person sitting in the jury. Blacks appreciate Atticus as he tries his level best to free Tom by sending chicken, tomatoes, beans, scuppernongs and other things for him but Atticus's eyes filled with tears. He did not speak for a moment. "Tell them I'm very grateful," he said. "Tell them-tell them they must never do this again. Times are too hard . . ." (213). He is quite upset by the court's decision but for the blacks it is the moment of celebration because the case like Tom is heard by court and he is only the man in these parts who can keep a jury out so long in a case like him. Other people in the society like Miss Maudie think Atticus Finch won't win, he can't win but we're making a step-it are just a baby-step, but it's a step" (216).

Tom Robinson becomes the victim of racial hatred and racial segregation that is prevalent in the society. The society wears the glass of darkness which symbolizes ignorance, hatred, and mistreatment of whites to blacks:

Cal, Atticus said, "I want you to go with me out to Helen Robinson's house-

Tom's dead.

They shot him, said Atticus. "He was running. It was during their exercise period. They said he just broke into a blind raving charge at the fence and started climbing over. Right in front of them-

They got him just as he went over the fence. They said if he'd had two good arms he'd had made it, he was moving that fast. Seventeen bullet holes in him. They didn't have to shoot him that much. (235)

Atticus's efforts fails to provide him true judgment so he leaned against the refrigerator, pushed up his glasses, and rubbed his eyes. "We had such a good chance, he said. "I told him what I thought. [...] I guess Tom was tired of white men's chances and preferred to take his own" (236). They shot him like an animal, seventeen bullets, which show that they have no empathetic feelings towards the blacks and shows their inhumanity and cruel nature. Tom is well aware of the situation that he is not freed and fed up with the behavior of whites treating the blacks and compelled him to escape from that place but unfortunately whites saw him and shot him on the spot severely going against humanity. The title of the novel *To Kill A Mockingbird* signifies him like mockingbirds only produce good music for the people to enjoy and does not harm others and it is a sin to kill a mockingbird. It is also a sin to kill innocent people like Tom Robinson who does not harm others but help others.

Later also Mr. Link Deas when Tom is no more, he provides the job for Helen, Tom's wife, because society avoid her and did not offer her work though he did not really need her. Mr. Link is not only a good master but also a good person who goes against wrong things and work for fairness but he is unable to do anything for Tom to free him from false accusation. He said he felt right bad about the way things turned out. He also helped Helen when Ewell "chunked at her" while she tried to use the public road coming to work from her way. He threatens Bob Ewell:

Ewell? he called.

I know every last of you's in there a-layin' on the floor! Now hear me,

Bob Ewell: if I hear one more peep outa my girl Helen about not bein' able to walk this road I'll have you in jail before sundown!" Mr. Link spat in the dust and walked home. 249)

Mr. Link sees that Helen comes to work from wrong direction and wanted to drag the reason but she denied. But later when he followed her knew the problem of Helen that it is Bob Ewell who makes the difficulties in her way to work. Then he yells Ewell not to disturb her because it is not his private way if he does so any more he put him in jail soon. She is not alone I am here to stand for her. In this way he proved his deep affection toward Tom's family and thinks that it is his responsibility to do so for her. Ewell, poor whites who is not accepted by the class whites so they wants to dominate blacks who are inferior to the Ewells. Bob Ewell wants to take revenge from the Tom's family and the people who support him so he creates the troublesome for the people and enjoys. His bad activities are ended when he is killed by Boo Radley while saving Scout and Jem. Boo too is misjudged by people of the society as he always lives inside the house but Scout when sees the things from his point of view he knows the reason that he does not like this social injustice spread in the society so keeps himself inside the room, out of this daily affair but helps the people in trouble.

Atticus as a moral guide of the community goes beyond his professional rituals at certain critical moments and stands up to the men who come for Robinson and appears prepared to defend him physically, even at the risk of his own life when Tom is transferred to the local jail of Maycomb the night before his trial. He does not believe white supremacy which separates men into two groups and wishes to do away with these categories and power discrepancies. As he saved the society taking a gun against the mad rabid dog, here also he is ready to save Tom standing in the door of the jail which is his symbolic role throughout the novel. He is there to guard the basic

rights of Tom but not taking a gun or other weapon but a book. As it seems like he is really breaking with any kind of professional ritual, but he is certainly going beyond the conventional call of duty, primarily because this is no ordinary case.

Though in above lines it seems like Atticus breaks with ritual at this crucial moment of closing the end of the trail as his voice had lost its aridity, its detachment, and he was talking to the jury as if they were the folks on the post office corner. But in reality he is only playing his professional role rather than the conventional one because it is his duty to see the things from his client's point of view and intended to provide the best service to his client. Whether the defendant is black or white, the lawyer has to give up his best performance to save his or her client and has empathetic feelings toward the client. So, empathy becomes a key attribute of true professionalism. His eloquent plea may keep the jury out for a few hours but Tom was a dead man the minute Mayella Ewell opened her mouth and screamed. He is well aware that he does not win the case. So he maintained his personal and professional detachment together without infusing each other. Empathy is taken as a ritual and not given the full sway to the individual to the point of obstructing the fulfillment of his or her duties. This is clear after the trial is over and Tom Robinson is declared guilty, the children find Atticus "standing under the street light looking as though nothing had happened: his vest was buttoned, his collar and tie were neatly in place, his watch-chain glistened, he was in his impassive self again" (212). Although he slips a hint of bitter frustration- "They've done it before and they did it tonight and they'll do it again and when they do it- seems that only children weep" and he is back to his ritual or business.

Hearing the grim news that Tom Robinson is shot seventeen times at the state prison, Scout finds herself shaking uncontrollably, Miss Maudie and other principle

women are hosting missionary tea and does not affected by the news and remained unbroken and said her “Stop that shaking” (237). For whites of Maycomb it does not matters a lot or affect their emotions or feelings whether blacks are dead or live. For them blacks death is typical because it is not only Tom who is punished and killed but it is a foregoing process. Blacks are always found guilty in such cases of black-on-white assault; however, they are innocent and ignorant. When news is spread of Tom’s death in Maycomy, the reaction is:

To Maycomb, Tom’s death was typical. Typical of a Nigger to cut and run. Typical of a nigger’s mentality to have no plan, no thought for the future, just run blind first chance he saw. [...] You know how they are. Easy come and easy go. Just shows you, that Robinson boy was legally married, they say he kept himself clean, went to church and all that, but when it comes down to the line the veneer’s mighty thin. Nigger always comes out in ’em. (240)

Here, we find Maycomb people’s perspective toward the Negroes that they are venerable, liars, unbelievable despite of their clean living. They cannot trust by whites and for them blacks life is no better than animal, easy come and easy go not thinking for the future life. Even though they went to church, worship God, live in their own moral codes, help others but cannot admired by whites. No blacks are remembered after their death and not respected for their works or contribution. Whites never see the things from black’s point of view and feel empathy toward them. Thus lack of empathy and frustration made blacks to involve in extraordinary activities. The word used here for blacks like ‘negro’, ‘nigger’, ‘boy’ are also humiliating and infuriating which also shows their dominant role.



In this way, we observe, despite the Community's misbehavior toward Atticus and his family, they have empathy with blacks, though racism prevailed in Alabama of 1930s. This racism manifests most obviously in terms of the high sense of superiority on the part of the whites and relative inferiority of higher order on the part of the blacks. The wall of racism blocks the empathetic feelings because the whites do not want to see the things from blacks' point of view, so they cannot understand the real situation, sufferings, problems, feelings and wants of blacks. Thus, the gap remains forever if it is not practiced in real life. But in the novel we find white characters know the blacks and their condition so they help them in their own ways by offering job and defending a case and sharing rituals or emotions. Atticus, a white lawyer defers the case of a black, going against racism or racial discrimination followed by his community. He does not care what the people think about him and listens to his conscience. He knows the truth of Tom and he wants that it is heard by the people and court too. He tries his level best to defend Tom ignoring his community and professional rituals because he is touched emotionally and physically with the condition of Tom and his family. He understands their situation and mental status very well but time or situation does not favor Tom, white woman words are considered, and he becomes the dead man because of racial discrimination and prejudice even though innocent and honest as soon as Mayella Ewell opened her mouth and screamed. Though at the surface level we think that the novel is written to show empathy, love, support, and compassion for blacks by whites but in ground level the writer also tries to show that the blacks are immoral, uneducated, dependent, liars, criminals, dishonest and so on and whites are superior, intellectual, talent, moral, educated, and honest beings. Behind the overt atmosphere of empathy with the blacks, the covert act is, however, is one of the perpetuations of the white supremacy over the blacks.

### **Chapter-III**

#### **Conclusion**

It is almost impossible to arrive a definite conclusion in any literary work like *To Kill a Mockingbird* in particular which won the Pulitzer Prize and has gained much critical appraisal along with sharp comments. The power of Harper Lee's novel, published in 1960, during the Civil Right movement, attracts many critics and readers for making multiple readings on it and also influenced many lawyers' professional ideals through its ability to arouse empathy. The novel is viewed from different perspectives. Some emphasized on its harsh social realism as a poignant and insightful expose of social reality of South, some took it as a novel of child's experience, and others have taken it as an autobiographical novel and a novel about racial love-hate relationship between whites and blacks. Though there have been a multiple readings of the text, the present observation has attempted at drawing a distinct conclusion taking into consideration the politics of empathy in racism and applying it as the theoretical tool.

Set in the background of 1930s South, Lee's novel is based on realism as it shows the picture of racism prevailed in the Maycomb County, Alabama. During that period racial segregation and apartheid is spread all over America so, Alabama being a part of South America how it is remained untouched by such trends which separates people into two groups and arouse racial hatred. Racism as a constructed form of society becomes the main cause of social disintegration and destruction. One is judged by one's physical appearances like skin color, facial structure, complexion, hair color, and bodily structure not by one's ability and capability. Society is based on false assumption thinking whites are superior to the blacks. Despite of racism and prejudice which is overwhelmed in the Maycomb, the writer tries to show empathy of

whites toward blacks through her white characters. Empathy is to feel others whether one is happy or sad and assimilate one with others. If one is undergoing with similar experience, s/he knows the matter and situation well and have empathy toward her/him and knows their emotional levels. To feel empathy with others first we have to arouse such feelings in ourselves and gather information about others.

But because of racism white does not have empathy towards blacks or racism blocks the wall of empathy between these two groups. As blacks are mistreated and cannot understand or lack of empathy obliged the blacks to involve in extraordinary or bad activities like killing, murdering, thieving and so on to take revenge from whites and to fulfill their stomach because they are devoid of education and good job opportunities They are dominated by whites by their false assumption about them as blacks are dishonest, murderer, immoral, bad, liars and inferior being, however they are ignorant and innocence becomes the victim of white society or segregation.

Through Atticus Finch, a protagonist of the novel, Harper Lee tries to arouse empathy for blacks. Atticus, a white lawyer attempts to defer the execution and defend a Tom Robinson, a black, who is falsely charged of raping a white woman, Mayella Ewell, going against the rooted racial discrimination and his own community who despise him. Even though, he knows that it is impossible to win the case like that “black-on-white sexual assault”, for which death penalty is given directly, but he tries his level best to defense Tom but he fails to free Tom from the accusation because it is a white case against black as soon as Mayella opens her mouth and screamed, the jury blindly favor her and declared him guilty without listening his words. He becomes the victim of cruel segregation and prejudice and lastly shot down severely like animal, no humanly feeling toward blacks when he tries to escape or want to revolt against whites as he is mistreated and compelled to do that.

Superficially white's empathy toward the black is shown throughout the novel by the characterization of Atticus Finch and other white characters by defending case, offering job and sharing rituals and emotions of blacks whose image contrasts to the agreed image of white as cruel, brutal, merciless, and inhumanly during racism and apartheid as he is not only benevolent and generous but also bequeaths a legacy of humanism to his children. But in deeper level, the writer's politics behind the depiction of a generous, empathetic and benevolent white character is to project that white is rational, humanitarian, superior, and independent and blacks as inferior, immoral, emotional, weak, dependent and helpless. In this way empathy becomes only her strategy to show whites supremacy brushing or strengthening the image of white who prevailed in the period of apartheid and racism.

## Works Cited

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas Mclaughlin. Chicago: UCP, 1990. 274-7.
- Barton, James. "Being Atticus Finch: The Professional Role of Empathy in *To Kill a Mockingbird*." *Harvard Law Review* 117.1682 (March 2004): 1682-1702.
- Crozier, W. Ray and Paul Greenhaigh. "Beyond Relativism and formalism: The Empathy Principle." *Leonardo* 25.1 (1992): 83-7.
- Dorr, Lisa Lindquist. "Black-on-White Rape and Retribution in Twentieth-Century Virginia: Men, Even Negroes, Must Have Some Protection." *The Journal of Southern History* 66.4 (November 2002): 711-48.
- Ellis, George W. "The Psychology of American Race Prejudice." *Racism: Essential Readings*. Ed. Ellis Cashmore and James Jennings. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001. 10-17.
- Gerzina, Gretchen. "Racism." *The Encyclopedia America* 1996 ed.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981.
- Henderson, Lynne N. "Legality and Empathy." *Michigan Law Review* 85.1574 (June 1987): 1574-1653.
- Luvet, Steven. "Reconstructing Atticus Finch." *Michigan Law Review* 97.1370 (May 1999): 1370-72.
- Moses, Rafael. "Empathy and Dis-Empathy in Political Conflict." *Political Psychology* 6.1 (March 1985): 135-39.
- Queen, Stuart A. and Jenette R. Gruener. "Social Pathology: Obstacles to Social Participation." *Racism: Essential Readings*. Ed. Ellis Cashmore and James Jennings. London: Sage Publications, 2001. 10-17.

- Stein, Howard F. "Ideology in the Study of American Racism, Ethnicity, and Poverty." *American Anthropologist* 76.4 (October 1974): 940-45.
- Stone, Randolph N. "Atticus Finch, in Context." *Michigan Law Review* 97.1378 (May 1999): 1378-81.
- Tucker, William H. "The Science and Politics of Racial Research." *Racism: Essential Readings*. Ed. Ellis Cashmore and James Jennings. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001. 380-85.
- Weber, David. "The Language of White Racism." *College English* 31.8 (May 1970): 863-65.