

I. Introduction

Harriet Lovatt, the protagonist of the novel who tries her best to subvert social hierarchy behind normality for deciding to raise Ben and disregarding the rest of her and David Lovatt's (her husband) children though he is treated as a social outcast throughout the narrative. The society creates the demarcation line to differentiate between what is normal and what is abnormal. And it is true that normality is always defined by viewing the abnormality. In the Lovatt family, Harriet and David, early married couples have desire to create a big family with 8-10 children. They like to pass their lives in mass with entertainment and collecting relatives. They are happy when they give birth to four children, they appear too hurry to reach the destination that they find their four children within six years. Next they give birth to the fifth child, Ben who is quite different from other four children. They themselves and their relatives are afraid of the newly born fifth child. All the desires of the Lovatt family change into sand. She gives birth to four socially defined children before Ben's birth. These children are placed for living where we find everything in order and balance in Harriet's contemporary society. Ben is her fifth child and Ben's arrival becomes curse in the Lovatt family. Delight, peace and prosperity gradually vanish in Harriet's life, she suffers in society for Ben's life. Ben appears as an extraordinary child with unusual behaviour and physical structure. He presents his precocious acts by killing a dog, a cat and balancing himself in the window-sill; which are enough for stigmatization of his existence. Ben's presence threatens to the contemporary society. In such situation, Harriet comes forward challenging the stereotypical representations of Ben. She tries her best to bring him in normal condition though she is even hated by Ben. Her three children leave home because of Ben,

they are living with their relatives. Her relatives along with her husband create a distance. She is left alone but she mostly passes her activities with Ben and makes her efforts to bring him back till the end of the novel. In all these efforts and activities, she defies the social conventions and notion of normalcy widely established with the help of discourses. Ben's acts appear against the social norms and value of the contemporary society because they have certain discourses, so society judges Ben is of normality.

Harriet gives birth to her fifth child, Ben who is himself a problematic figure, Ben is different from Harriet's other children in comparison to physical structure as well as action and behaviour. He does not care others and their actions, he only does what he likes. Almost all his actions create problematic situation in the society. Society stereotypes Ben as an abnormal child for he lacks similarities with other children. Society exercises its power when it applies its discourses which are within range of normality. Normality always discards abnormal ones in society by showing certain social truths. They are away from the biological truth because they are guided by the norms and values.

Ben does not cry after the birth which is mostly rare incident in child birth. He weighs eleven pounds in birth period which is excessive weight because generally children weigh seven pounds. Ben has different physical structure, a masculine shoulders and big forehead. His arm is like the matured man's arm, so, his body creates fear in the mind of publics. He sucks the breasts of his mother within half minute and drinks ten or more than ten bottles of milk per day. He could not recognize his relatives, so he attacks his own brother, Paul and a big school girl. Judging everything of his actions and behaviour, society declares Ben is an abnormal child. At the presence of Ben in society, is thus

against the social norms and values, so society decides him to send at the institution. Harriet, a mother who is powerless to save Ben. Nobody is allowed to meet there which is written outside institution. Normal family background is created in Lovatt family after Ben's departure. Ben's brothers and sisters celebrate happiness and they kiss Harriet after listening about Ben's absence. Relatives begin to come in the Lovatt family and everybody feels secure and happy.

Ben's presence in the Lovatt family brings disorder and disturbance. Harriet frequently used to invite her relatives, during Easter-day, Summer vacation and Christmas. They used to come and involve in happy celebration and entertainment but after Ben's arrival in the Lovatt family leaves negative impact on family and the relatives. They stop coming at her home meeting her family.

So, it is clearly seen that society is creating certain truth over someone's existence either he/she is fit for living or not. Society exercises power by giving birth to certain truths. These truths are circulated or it has limitation. According to power and truth, there is presence of discourses, and discourses give birth to someone's identity in the society. Majority and minority have important role in society, minorities are depressed and marginalized from the centre, they have no authorities, they are not listened. Majorities determine certain living sectors in the society. Minorities have different lifestyle and they perform what they origin from their birth which cannot match with the mainstream. As a result, they are displaced and nobody can guarantee their way of life, they are threatened, beaten and even they meet their pathetic end of life. Social discourse unable to see the reality of the minorities groups and discouse creators are powerful, they are in secure position but they lack to see biological truths.

All of us are living in the world of norms which are often used to categorize people in different ranks. Everywhere norms are functioning, vital forces determine one's position. The notion of 'able' and 'disabled' also moves around these norms which are expected to establish normalcy in social life: "The problem is not the person with disabilities but the problem is the way that normalcy is constructed to create the problems of disabled person" (Lenard 2). These actual social norms and the processes of construction of the norm involve discourses:

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 others. But the idea of a norm is less a condition of human nature than a feature of a certain kind of society. (Lenard 9)

Thus, some concepts of norm must have existed in any society. From the perspective of the privileged norms of any specific society, people are categorized as 'able' or 'disabled'. People try to compare with others and form an idea about it which is most often ideal and imaginary. This abstract idea or imaginary becomes the measuring rod to determine normal or abnormal in the society. People fail to judge that inherent norms are more important than social norms.

Another concept which is inter-related with the construction of normalcy is the concept of 'stigma'. Stigmatization and constructing normalcy exist side by side but these both terminologies are different in their position. The former is a kind of mark of disgrace whereas the latter is a medium of the base through which something or somebody is stigmatized in any society. In the novel *The Fifth*

Child, Ben is a stigmatized child by the society under constructed normalcy. Normalcy and stigmatization cannot sit at the same bench but they are complementary to each other. But they move ahead where one's existence determines another and normalcy is more powerful than stigmatization. And society always forgets if stigmatized ones are in large number, they will be powerful and they will displace normalcy.

Stigma is a social, cultural and psychological construct which is understood as a set of negative values and attributes attached by the society to someone or something. These values or attributes symbolically refer to the bearer as culturally unacceptable or inferior with the consequent feelings of shame, guilt and disgrace. In other words, it is social process related to personal experience characterized by exclusion, rejection, blame or devaluation that result from experience of anticipation of an adverse social judgment about a person or group in any society. Stigma has a negative connotation and its effects are very adverse:

Sometimes it is also called a falling, a short coming, a handicap. It constitutes a special discrepancy between vital and actual social identity for example 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 not all undersirable attributes are at issue, but only those whose are in congruous with our stereotype of what a given type of individual should be. (Goffman 204)

It is, thus, a social categorization that legitimates the negative attributes on the basis of differences. So, the marginalized people are always avoided from the

mainstream of community simply because they do not fit in the norms of a specific culture and thus possess an undesired differences from what the norms anticipate. Every society adopts such norms or notion of normalcy which provides constructed social value rather than biological. Thus, normalcy always bears relations of power pervasively. Normalcy moves ahead before stigma by suppressing and opposing its existence. Normalcy and stigma are two sides of the same coin. Normalcy only introduces its value and norm by defining or viewing the issue of stigma.

Stigma uniquely alters perceptions in other ways, especially with respect to the notion of normality, and raises other questions about the dilemma of differences. Most people do not want to be perceived as different or abnormal. Normalization as attempts to be not different and to appear normal; such strategies include passing or disguising the stigma and acting normal by covering up keeping 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 differences that stigma reflects, it is not clear whether anyone can ever feel normal.

Fear is important to a discussion of how and why stigma persists. In many cultures that do not use the term stigma, there is some emotional reaction beyond interest or curiosity to differences such as children who are born with birthmarks. Certain physical characteristics elicit fear; fear affects not only non-stigmatized but stigmatized individuals as well. Many stigmatized people who are attempting to pass live in fear that their stigmatized attribute will be discovered. These fears

are grounded in a realistic assessment of the negative social consequences of stigmatization and reflect the long-term social and psychological damage to individuals resulting from stigma.

This present research attempts to subvert the meaning of normalcy viewing its no final and real meaning. Society draws the line between normality and abnormality. Here is a question, where society defines the final existence of normality, if we go deeper and deeper inside of it, we only find different medium of power-keepers. They are rulers of society but normality is only way to rule. Normality only exists in vacuum and by viewing norms and values, society gives birth to discourses. Domination and condemnation over someone or something, are the issues of deafness, abnormality, sexuality and so on. Thus, the issue of normalization is only method and it has no real existence. So, by arguing with the normality and displacing to abnormal people is itself useless.

II. Discourse, Power and Normalcy

Discourse is the act of representing something. It is clearly said that it is talking and communicating using symbols and signs to format things. It also shows implication for speech and the relationship between signifier and its signified. But in broad sense, it can help us to generalize of our contemporary social and political systems and truth that we have never even considered before. Discourse also helps us to create another world which is controlled by power. Power represents the norms and values which are always more ahead side by side. Discourse is a guiding force where what we speak, act and interpret. According to Michel Foucault:

Discourse of an era, instead of reflecting preexisting entities and orders, brings into beings the concepts, oppositions and hierarchies of which it speaks; that these elements are both products and propagations of 'power', or social forces, and that as a result, the particular discursive formations of an era determine what is at the time accounted 'knowledge' and 'truth' as well as what is considered to be criminal, or insane sexually deviant. (188)

Discourse is not merely linguistic sign but it is a long set of expression which constitutes shape of things in which it is speaking of. Importantly it is condemnation or exclusion that defines what can and cannot be said or done in our daily activities; the intellectuals create the condition and then divide the line between speaker and non speaker (power and powerless) for society. It defines what is real and what is unreal through the eyes of power holders.

Power is always in suppressive ways in horizontal line. Discourse can change in course of time. The system of discourse in regard to everything constantly changes within years, decades and centuries according to who has the power. And power

holders use the discourse according to their benefits. Discourse is always within the range of action-oriented issues because general people do their actions according to existing norms and values of society that is called discourse. Discourse is constructed to achieve particular social goals rather than representing facts. In this sense, discourse is something which produces something else such as utterance, concept, an effect rather than something which exists in itself and which can be analyzed in isolation. It does not exist in a vacuum but in constant conflict with other discourse and other social practices which inform them over a question of truth and authority. Powerful people control the powerless ones through discourse. General people are followers of existing norms and values, which are written words and spoken speech of discourse. Any form of discourse is considered to be source of power because it orders us to speak and act in certain ways. Mostly every sort of social lives are guided by the rules and norms of discourse and creators that carry it out within society. This form of modern sociological theory shows us a shift toward a different type of organization of power in the ordinary world. So, discourse is more an unseen power which we take for granted, and do not even think to question in our every day lives.

Power is generated in society by producing the discourse and constructing the truth, such power is creative. Marxist power is just political and economic, whereas Foucauldian power is applicable everywhere. It operates in horizontal way other than Marxist power that gives in the vertical way (from upper class to lower class). In Foucauldian power, there is always check and balance. In terms of power, Marx creates hierarchy but Foucault ruptures the hierarchies. It means there is equality in terms of power division. For instance people exercises power in choosing the president or prime minister who exercises his power over the publics by making certain rules and regulations. So, power is always relational for Foucault. If there are

no people, there is no place of prime minister. If there is no ruled, there is no ruler. In this way, relational relationship indicates the horizontal way of power. But very this power is accepted in society. And the acceptance is the outcome of our constructed truth. For example, parents create discourse over their children about what they should do and should not do. By generating power through discourses (information and knowledge) parents even beat their children if they disobey. So, discourse provides information to give knowledge about the things. These truths are constructed and power is created. If power changes through resistance or condemnation, truth and knowledge also get changed.

For Foucault, power is always divisional or multiple because it is not invented. It always makes different sites of daily human activities and different ways of resistance, power always remains shakable in society. Foucault's subtle, flexible and dynamic conception of power suggests that the volatile and contingent relations of power that saturate social space are actually determined by the crystallization of power in the state apparatus. Foucault emphasizes that:

Power's condition of possibility . . . must not be sought in the primary existence of a central point, in a unique source of sovereignty from which secondary and descendant form would emanate, it is the moving substrate of force relations which by virtue of their inequality, constantly engender status of power but the latter are always local and unstable. (*History of Sexuality*.Vol-1. 1:93)

This strictly relational character of power relationships depends on multiple points of resistance: These play the role of adversary, target, support of handle in power relations.

Foucault marks power as productive not repressive in nature. Power is 'bent' on generating forces, make them growing and ordering, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit or destroying them. Such horizontal conception of power-meaning introduces the revolutionary social transfiguration and other possible modalities of power and resistance. Power, then, is the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and constitute their own organization. Traditional notion of power, he says, is monolithic, hierarchical which is more subtle, complex and related to the social truth. The new methods of power are not ensured by right but by technique, not by law but by normalization and not by punishment but by control. There is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives. Foucault's genealogical concept of power is explanatory. It aims to uncover how power diffuses itself in the system of authority and how the effects of truth are created within discourse which in themselves are neither true nor false. Truth itself is a product of the power relation and changes as the system changes. And Foucault points out the differences between good and bad use of power as follows:

In defining the effects of power as repression one adopts a purely juridical conception of such power, one identifies power with a law which says no power is taken above all as carrying the forces of a prohibition. Now, I believe that this is a wholly negative, narrow, skeletal conception of power, one which has been curiously widespread. If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes power hold, good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it does not weigh on us a face that say no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms, knowledge

produces discourses. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the mobile body, much more than as a negative instance whose functions is repression. (60-61)

Power is pervasive that occurs in all social bodies. In society, the normal is defined by viewing the abnormal. If one goes mad, he/she is excluded from the groups. His voices and claimings are not listened. People send him into jail or institution by claiming him to be mad because normal people have power over abnormal people. They have certain knowledge about madness and behave accordingly. Therefore, power is occurring in society in a subtle way. If one is out of system, she/he can be punished in way

. The power Foucault talks here is subtle, complex and related to truth. Power, therefore is everywhere, keep on changing for example, because of new form of power that are generated in society. The issue of homosexuality, lesbianism, feminism and other minorities get a new definition in the course of the history. For Foucault, there is no external position of continuity, no universal understanding that is beyond history, and society. His main tactic is to historicize such supposedly universal categories as human nature each time he encounters them.

Power effects the acts of others particular desire and purpose. The main intension of power is to de-center of powerless public, in society and give the identity of norms and values. One side power has will to rule and dominate people by creating sites of discourse, it is the negative aspect where powerless people are dominated and marginalized and their voices are aired and they are humiliated. On the other hand, power is used to liberation and service the people and this power is creative, formative and productive which is exercised between the mutual understanding of the

subject and object. Charles Reich has viewed to power of domination as 'force' or negation.

Everyone believes that all power-relationship should be interactive, mutually modulating and reciprocal the concept is developed from human nature. In the early age, to a small extent people had control over nature. They had learnt to use tools for hunting and cutting and had learnt how to set traps to catch game and build simple shelters against the elements. But nature also controlled them, setting the rhythms of their life, bringing the threat of famine and illness. They perceived themselves as a part of interconnected web of nature, influencing it and being influenced by it. They were not separate from nature. Every action they did affected nature, and its act affected them. They did not set themselves above nature, nor did they consider nature above them. Nature may be more powerful than humans, but it is not all powerful.

This concept of power relation shapes the social system of the time. It never occurs that one social role could be superior of another, or that a certain talent was more important to the well being of the tribe than another. Even though there were elders in positions of authority, every member was valued for their unique personality and abilities. And the elder leaders realize they need the support of other, just as other needed the guidance of superiority. When people live in close contact, they understand the dynamics of give and take among humans. And they knew and believe that power should be exercised mutually. Today also this sort of thinking services in every society. But most of the time, we tend to think of power as absolute following one way from dominator to the dominated.

This idea has its root in the idea of supreme God. The God was a terrifying spirit that answers to no one and nothing that ruled over nature, over humans, over other spirits, over judge, jury, executor and there is no appeal. Certain people who

claimed they can communicate with the God now set themselves as part from the rest of the community. They were priests they were powerful because they had access to power. They formed a class. This is the birth of another new idea: hierarchy.

Hierarchy means there are the dominators and dominated. The cosmic model of God ruling over nature and humans are reproduced in the social model of an elite class ruling over other men and women.

The ideology of power as domination and control takes another ominous turn with the birth of science. God was marginalized, how there were new rulers, the religion of science and technology. And it was all about domination and control, domination and control of other humans. Likewise, there are many types of power: religions power, king power, power of science and technology, economic power and many more. Each type of power has its own time and degree of activeness. But the fundamental goal of these power users is to rule the people. In every period of history, the way of power is exercised and the means are employed in its exercise and make a difference.

But the most insidious kind of power is power-over, whoever or whatever controls it. Power creates sort of mechanism which have layers of its development. This is the power of domination and control, power that seeks to rule unilaterally. Power-over is voracious. Power-over takes what is there, it makes no distinctions between right and wrong. Power over must expand or die. Power-over fills all vacuums, crushes the weak and extends itself wherever it can. Lord action's famous statement "All power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely" (27) reflects the basic trend of power. In this regard Bertrand Russel writes: 'Naked power, i.e. to the kind that involves no acquiescence on the part of the subject. Such is the power of the butcher over the sheep, of an invading army over a vanquished nation,

and the police over detected conspirators. (57) The development of power-limit initiated the founding of civilization. The present problems have their roots in the defining characteristics of civilization itself: domination and control. In the last century, two trends, the accelerating sophistication of technology, and increasingly ubiquitous global organization have given power the tools to dominate and control as never before.

Thus, rulers love power-over. They crave the capacity to control the lives of large number of people. It is their job to make us believe that he/she is committed to helping people, or making the world a better place or carrying out the will of his/her constituency. In fact, a true ruler has but one goal: acquisition of more power. Power for power's sake. Power of the thrill of it. Love of power of them is an end unto itself. They often surround themselves with sycophants and portray themselves as god-like omniscient and infallible. Overwhelmed by data, they make irrational decisions based on gut feelings. They take advice from experts who know nothing. They hire incomplete people because they themselves are too incompetent to know better. If they cannot get hold of power they use fear to manipulate the people because from the early age people are infected by the fear.

Propaganda is another type of discourse which can serve to rally people behind a cause, but often at the cost of exaggerating, misrepresenting, or even lying about the issues in order to gain the support. Those who promote the negative image of the enemy may often reinforce it with rhetoric about the righteousness of themselves, the attempt is to master up support and nurture the belief that what is to be done is in the positive and beneficial interest of everyone. Often, the principles used to dominate the other, is not used to judge the self, leading the accusations of double standards and hypocrisy. One reason that propaganda often works better on the

educated than the uneducated people is that educated people read more, so they receive more propaganda. Another is that they have jobs in management, media, and academia and therefore they work in some capacity as agents of propaganda system and they believe what the system expects them to believe. By the large, they are part of the privileged elite, and share the interests and perceptions of those in power. So, propaganda is essential to politicians, particularly prevalent during wars or revolutions, in order to effect mass persuasion and manipulation by means of deception and distortion. Through this evil technique, questionable ends such as the hatred of an enemy or the glorification of a regime are achieved because it is an art of manipulating people's emotions.

In each an society, power remains at the centre and plays a crucial role for existence of human lives. As a result, it gives birth to certain conventions among the publics then they directly and indirectly follow fixed rules and regulations while they are inside the society. In course of time people themselves create discourse where they determined which parts are to take or not. Gradually norms replace the place of power and people sink inside the normality. Normality or normalcy provides the position of people for living. We see normal people are always in power because they are discourse creators, they are great in numbers and mostly dominate the minor groups in another anotherside, called abnormal. Abnormal ones are frequently marginalized from the main stream of human living in society. Normality and abnormality falls under the construction rather than invention in society. Every societies have their own identities where they build social mechanism which we can link with the disability study. The concept of disability is a social construction. It is again a cultural and historical construction fabricated buy the socio-factors. It is therefore a broad term that cluster ideological categories as sick, deformed, ugly, odd,

affiliated, abnormal. Which disadvantages people by devaluating bodies that do not confirm to certain cultural standards. Disability therefore refuses to be normalized, 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 interactions between bodies and world that create disability, from the human variation and instability.

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 do not fit into the hegemonic discourse of normality are excluded, separated and social 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 subjugation deny the disabled a voice, a space, even power to disrupt these deeply entrenched normative leads that deprive them their social presence and any semblance of identity. (lenard16)

In this way disability studies centre 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..." (Fontaine

45) perfection is thus always desired by the society in terms of physical, emotional and intellectual states.

Besides, disability has always been perceived negatively from the very beginning. It has been historicized with negative attributes and considered as the agents of evil, Satan, or devil. During Greek and Roman times, disabled children were exiled, burned or thrown into river. Not only the disabled children but even weak children were exiled because they could not perform any functional work in the society and proved to be a burden to the nation. Likewise, mentally retarded people were sold as slaves or beggars. In addition, at Rome disabled people served as amusement for the wealthy family and mentally retarded people for the amusement of the household and its guest. This is how, society perceives them as other and negates them in every social participation. Furthermore, disabled people were even seen as a public threat that creates a social enigma among the people as well.

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, earns or consumes. We rank out 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. Doctors measure and weigh them to see if they are above or below average on the height and weight curves. There is probably no area of contemporary life in which some idea of a norm, mean, average has not been calculated.

To understand the abnormal one, one must return to the norm. After that, all people seem to have an inherent desire to compare themselves to others. But the idea

of a norm is less a condition of human nature than it is a feature of a certain kind of society.

Michel Foucault in his classic *Madness and Civilization* shows how individual houses replaced leper colonies as the dominant confining institution in Europe at the middle ages. This switch from the confinement of defects of the body to the confinement of defects of the mind signals a switch to an age of reason and, by extension, madness, from an age that focused on the superficial disease of the body. Thus, madness became visible and the treatment of madness became a discourse.

Society establishes the means of categorizing person's and complement of attributes felt to be ordinary and natural for members of each of these categories. Social settings establish the categories of persons likely to be encountered there. The routines of social intercourse in established settings allow us to deal with anticipated others without special attention or thought. When a stranger comes into our presence, then, first appearances are likely to enable us to anticipate his\her category and attributes, his\her "social identity" - to use a term that is better than "social status" because personal attributes such as "honesty" are involved, as well as structural ones, like "occupation". We lean on these anticipations that we have, transforming term into normative expectations; into righteously presented demands. Typically, we do not become aware that we have made these demands or aware of what they are until and active question arises as to whether or not they will be fulfilled. It is then that we are likely to realize that all long we had been making certain assumption as to what the individual before us ought to be. Thus, the demands we make better be called demands made "in effect" and the character we impute to the individual might better be seen as an imputation made in potential retrospect.... a characterization "in effect",

a virtual social identity. The category and attributes he could in fact be proved to possess will be called his actual social identity.

While the stranger is present before us, evidence can arise out of his possessing an attribute that makes him different from others in the category of persons available from him to be and of a less desirable kind - in the extreme, a person who is quite thoroughly bad, or dangerous, or weak. He is thus reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one.

Institutionalization

Antiquity had no institutions for the case of disabled or indigent persons, and the early Christian era saw only scattered hospices and asylums established across Europe beginning in the fourth century. Public institutionalization for health problems developed between the sixth and the thirteenth centuries when leprosy became a major health concern. Leprosaria multiplied – there were perhaps as many as 19,000 throughout the Christian world (Foucault).

As the leprosy epidemic in Europe began to subside at the beginning of the seventeenth century, many of these institutions were converted, especially to needs of those who were considered insane. Early medieval society made no effort to conceal the insane and mental defectives from public view. They were a visible part of everyday society, and by and large, community attitudes toward these individuals were a compound of fear and contempt, mingled to a lesser extent with an element of compassion. Insane persons occupied a special place in the society; they were seen as outcasts characterized by disorder and incoherence, particularly the most dangerous among them, namely, the frenzied, the angry, the threatening, and the maniacal (Doermer).

Though many outcasts wandered freely through the squalor and cruelty of the late Middle Ages, society eventually reached the point where it could no longer tolerate the potential dangers posed by the insane. Converted leprosariums became the focal points of a complex of institutions, variously termed madhouses, bedlams or lunatic hospitals. Rarely were these places named asylums... this gentler term was generally reserved for places of protection, retreat, and shelter, which little resembled the realities of the seventeenth-century madhouse. It was not until the late eighteenth century that the word asylum was used to describe a hospital for lunatics.

Institutions do not exist in a vacuum, nor do they arise without precedent. The practice of confining mad people and other exceptional persons that became widespread in the mid-seventeenth century constituted a response to both their higher visibility in society and the perceived need for society to protect itself against the harm that the deviant, the defective, or the dependent person might incur. Witch hunter had not managed to exterminate all of society's troubling elements, now alternative methods were sought, and the confined congregate institution seemed a logical solution. Unlike the monasteries and hospices that arose to save disabled persons from a vile world, the institutions that developed from the early seventeenth century served to protect society from the physically, intellectually, and socially deviant and dependent persons in its midst. (Winzer)

What is stigma and why does stigma remain? As stigma mirrors culture and society, they are in constant flux, and therefore the answers to these two questions continue to elude social scientists. Viewing stigma from multiple perspectives exposes its intricate nature and helps us to disentangle its web of complexities and paradoxes. 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 usurpations of the stronger" (Blanchot, 216).

As stigmatization often occurs within the confines of a psychologically constructed or actual social relationship, the experience itself reflects relative comparisons, the contrasting of desired and undesired differences. Assuming that flawless people do not exist, relative comparisons give rise to a feeling of superiority in some contexts (where one possesses a desired trait that another person is lacking) but perhaps a feeling of inferiority in other contexts (where one lacks a desired trait that another person possesses). It is also important to note that it is only when we make comparisons that we can feel different. Stigmatization or feeling stigmatized is a consequence of social comparison. For this reason, stigma represents a continuum of undesired differences that depend upon many factors (e.g. geographical location, culture life cycle stage):

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

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

a recent record in sports) that Stafford cites may actually possess traits that would be the source 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 "different ness" will receive approbation rather than rejection, and he will not be subject to contrast and severe stigmatization. This is a common response to stigma among people with some social influence (e.g. artists, academics, millionaires).

Often, attributes or behaviours 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 similar attributes that any two individuals share. Why people focus on differences 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 behavioural (social control), affective (fear, dislike) and cognitive (perception of differences, social categorization) components of stigma. (Coleman)

Stigma uniquely alters perceptions in other ways, especially with respect to the notion of "normality", and raise other questions about the dilemma of difference. Most people do not want to be perceived as different or "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 nonstigmatised 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".

III. Subversion of Normalcy in Lessing's *The Fifth Child*

Doris Lessing in her novel *The Fifth Child* challenges the existing norms of society and especially its relation to the concept of abnormality. This novel reveals the unusual situation from its different corners to give indirect construction of contemporary social norms, by presenting a character, Harriet, Ben's mother who accepts her abnormal child in the face of social disgrace. Ben an early-born child, a rebel in terms of mainstream tradition is unusual in comparison to the children at his time and society. Ben's unusual acts and Harriet's help to provide him a settlement indirectly involves Lessing's question to the contemporary norms of the society. These acts are done by Ben, he has no any feeling of its negative and positive affects in the society. Behind Harriet, all the characters in the novel fluctuate from Ben's acts and his appearance because they have not seen such child and such acts before in their society. They are habituated with the line of normalcy which is shaped by power and discourse. They are ruled by power and social norms. According to their social norms, Ben like children are not allowed to exist in the contemporary society. So for them, Ben is an abnormal child.

Ben's abnormality and his acts shake someone's power and value in society. All the social members are guided by the social truth which is not the biological truth. It is itself product of the discourse so that they are habituated to perceive any thing from the social eyes and they always lack to see by their individual's eye. Harriet is such a character who understand that Ben's existence is possible in the society though she knows the reality that she is faulty in the eyes of contemporary society. Thus, Harriet is ready to accept Ben as a normal or her decision to give him a secure position in the society subversive act as they defy the defined line between what is normal and what is abnormal.

Ben's acts like killing the dog and balancing himself in the widow-sill when he was one year old, are not judged as rewarded because society does not expect such acts in that early age. Society finds fearsome and terror from the Ben's acts and his physical structure because he is not like the social constructed child at that very age. It is clearly seen that everything is situated within the range of construction that is called normalcy. In this novel, Lessing gives the message about normalcy that is product of discourse and power. And another side, we find novel's protagonist Harriet who suffers throughout the narrative because she appears as a subverter of social truth do but she does not stand fully succeed because she has less power.

So, the whole novel moves around Ben's activities. Ben's every act make conscious everybody's mind that society is run by social discourse. Lessing's main intention to create Ben-like child in the novel, is to message that social norms and values are within the territory of power which is circled by discourse, and later it remains as conventions till another social norms and values create. And such conventions in the society devaluate someone's existence and freedom. Lessing is conscious about the truth of the contemporary society which is itself neither true nor false. But power holder divides society into two parts: the people who worship the consisting norms and values, are called right or normal so that they are fit for living. And people who do not respect, are called faulty or abnormal so, they are not fit for surviving and they must be outcaste from the society. If we forget everything about norms, values, truth, discourse and power, society will always remain single where everybody has equal place for living.

The door of subversion of normalcy starts with events of the birth of Ben in Lessing's novel *The Fifth Child*. Till the birth of Ben everything is fairly governed by the norm so that power and truth are in the secure position. As a result it is ruling over

that very age of society. However, Ben comes in this world, everybody keeps him at the centre. "A real little wrestler", said Dr. Brett. "He came out fighting the whole world" (60). The very given line introduces the meaning that Ben's birth makes conscious to the contemporary society where they fix someone's existence in one side and another side someone's power. It is also clear that Ben has such power to change the long lasting truth and power which is also called normalcy. The following narrative lines make clear Ben's birth shakes discourse of the society:

He was not a pretty baby. Eleven Pounds of him. The other had not been more than seven pounds. He was muscular, yellowish, long. He did not look like a baby at all. He had a heavy-shouldered hunched look, as if he were crouching there as he lay. His hair grew in an unusual pattern from the double crown where started a wedge or triangle that came low on the forehead. (60)

Everything about Ben's outer physical structure which is maximum differing from general babies during birth-time. Society finds quite unusual baby that is not matched so that we can say that Ben's birth and his appearance creates upheaval in the mind of the people of the contemporary society. By introducing Ben in her novel, Lessing's purpose to depict unique structure of Ben is to question to the general expectation of the norm that could be in any babies of that society.

Ben's arrival even makes conscious in the mind of mother, Harriet, that she is afraid of discourse. The following narrative gives the idea that power of discourse is making rule. "His mother disliking him so much... But she heard say herself, though she tried to laugh, He's like a troll, or a goblin or something. And she cuddled him, to make up" (61). Because the presence of power gives birth to the discrimination between the general expected child and different child. "But there was none of the

atmosphere of festival, of achievement, no champagne, on the contrary, there was a strain in everyone, apprehension...He had not cried since he was born, except for a first roar of protest or perhaps surprise" (61). This narrative line reflects the meaning of newness that can be appear in the society which has equal power to exist.child's roar sound threatens the understanding of discourse paves the way to subvert norms and value.

Harriet's earlier children are socially accepted ones so that they are sunk inside the norms of that society. They are governed by power. So they find their younger brother Ben quite different with disappointment which is more clear from these lines. "The three older children stared down at the new-comer who was so different from all them: of a different substance, so it seemed to Harriet" (62). The power of norms of society frequently haunts in the mind of Harriet, that she is giving birth to a unusual child who is quite ugly. But she believes that "he was stiff and heavy" (61). She has a intension to go ahead taking with Ben in society but it is not an easy task where she needs to struggle which is more supported from narrative statements: "She stayed in bed a week that is, until she felt she could manage the struggle ahead-and then went home with her new child" (62). Ben's appearance not only creates bad effects in the minds of other characters but sometimes we even find that mother herself creates negatively over Ben's physicality though she determines to make independent to Ben in the society. It is more cleare from this lines: "His small cold eyes seemed to her malevolent" (64).

She is afraid of Ben that he can be destructed for her as she imagines in mind but she makes herself bold and tries to best avoid every such things. Normalcy is appeared as a product of existing discourse, power and truth. So normality and abnormality are creations of the society behind norms which is cleare from a dialogue

from one of character in the novel. Dr. Brett: "It is not abnormal to take a dislike to a child. I see it all the time unfortunately" (67). Stigmatization is one of the things that causes inferiority in the mind of someone. So it creates discouragement in the mind of character. Discourse devaluates someone's feeling by showing the power of norms in the society:

The new baby had of course been offered to everyone to hold, when they asked, but it was painful to see how their faces changed confronting this phenomenon. Harriet came into the kitchen one day and heard her sister Sarah say to a cousin, "That Ben given the creeps. He's like a goblin or a dwarf or something. This afflicted Harried with remorse; Poor Ben, whom no one could love" (68-69).

Harriet is in more tension when she finds no one could love her son, Ben creates coldness in her mind because Ben is out from the discourse of society. They are habituated to anything see from the social eye, they cannot see individually and evaluate. She has intension to teach Ben the normal behaviours and makes him adjust in that society but nobody could help her so she finds herself more stigmatized herself when she more closes with Ben. This very idea is widened from these narrative lines in the novel - "She did try hard to make him ordinary. She took him down into the big living-room where all the family were but very soon they tended to go away" (69). Except Harriet in her family nobody could love Ben as a newly born baby where he needs love and affection but they are indifferent towards Ben. As a result they even behave coldly with Harriet. They know that Harriet is herself a normal member. It is not anything else rather than the absolute power of norms where they are blind followers of existing power.

Discourse has such a power that creates an inhumane truth over a human being which is found in the novel, from narrative lines between Harriet and her husband, David, "But now they were both thinking, that creatures arrived when we were being as careful as we knew how suppose another like him comes?" (70). Both husband and wife especially David are feeling guilt or even crime at giving birth to Ben like unusual child. We find that Ben is regarded as a creature instead of an innocence child. We can say that putting Ben inside the creature is the result of construction of normalcy where nobody individually is wrong:

Ben has grabbed the hand and pulled Paul hard against the bars, bending the arm deliberately backwards. The two women freed Paul. They did not bother to scold Ben, who was crowing with pleasure and achievement. Paul's arm was badly sprained. (71)

Ben is an innocent child and he does not know who are his men. His acts like attacking his own brother Paul is given the meaning to challenge the construction of normalcy because Paul is a production of norms of contemporary society. Ben's attacking skill raises the questions before the power that it can be changed in course of time.

Harriet everywhere in the novel appears as figure of criticism because of Ben's presence: "She glanced at David, and saw he felt the same condemnation, and criticism, and dislike". "The day after this incident Alice announced that she felt she was no longer need in this house, she would go back to her own life" (72). Alice, a minor character and Harriet's Sister in the novel who sees Ben's behaviour and his heavy physical structure that makes her that he could attack even at her and her children. But another side Harriet feels inferiority because of Ben's acts, as a result Alice determines to return without information. We find here discourse and

stigmatization move ahead at a single path. Harriet is one of stigmatized characters throughout the novel because of Ben. The society disgraces the presence of Ben from his birth which directly affects Harriet's family life badly. It is clearly seen that how discourse produces power and results out the line between Ben in one side and all the other are another side. "All the other children had laughed, chuckled, and wanted to be loved, admired, praised, on reaching this moment of achievement. This one did not. It was cold triumph" (73). This following narrative lines gives the biased meaning which itself comes from the normalcy:

One early morning, something took Harriet quickly out of her bed into the baby's room, and there she saw Ben balanced on the window-sill. It was high heaven only know how he had got up there! The window was open. In a moment he would have fallen out of it. There Ben would stand on the window-sill gripping the bars and shaking them, and surveying the outside world, letting out his thick, raucous cries. (73)

This above mentioned narrative lines threatens the contemporary society that a powerful baby can be born in the society. What Ben does, it is not a general act what we imagine. He does as a heavenly man can only do. Those acts by Ben question on the existing norms and values of society. Above mentioned narrative Ben's acts clearly placed in outer space of book's cover. Ben appears extraordinary child which makes thinkable even to Harriet so that Harriet finds it is challenging act to adjust Ben in the present society "The dog was lying dead on the kitchen floor. She locked Ben in; if he could kill a dog, then why not a child? Of Course it was impossible -a small child killing a lively dog. But officially the dog's death remained a mystery" (75-76). To killing lively dog is not an ordinary act which can be done by a first year child, Ben. It

is clearly seen that Ben has terrible bravery that only can change the society and give the message that newly born any human being has equal right to live in the society.

Because of Ben in the Lovatt family, Harriet is not able to establish fruitful relation among the relatives. They have hatred feelings over Harriet. "At Christmas the house was half empty. It was the worst year of Harriet's life" (76). Christmas is one of the greatest festivals, Harriet invites all of her relatives at her home but they do not come because they have negativity by the Ben's presence. They like to outcast Ben from the surrounding. They are discourse creators, they have norms which exercise the power. But poor Harriet is unhappy, she has desire to celebrate Christmas but they do not arrive which create sad situation in her mind of being a mother of an abnormal child. Till Paul, Harriet and they have remained same delightful movement but after Ben. "He may be normal for what he is. But he is not normal for what we are" (79). It means that what Ben physically appears, he is all right so that he is normal child. But later when we remember our norms and discourse, we find him an unusual or abnormal being. It is clearly seen that abnormality is not because of physicality but sociality. If we forget everything about social discourse individually, every human being is normal.

The given below narrative sentences create the pillar between a husband and wife. They even cannot love each other, they are afraid of because of power and discourse:

Now Began a time when every night Harriet and David lay awake taking about what could be done. They were making love again, but it was not the same. This must be what women felt before there was birth control; Harriet said. "Terrified they waited for every period. (79)

David and Harriet both are husband and wife. They have desire to establish big family by giving birth to 8-10 children. But after Ben they became afraid of. Ben's presence makes them wide from the society. Society changes the eyes to look at them than before. They are afraid of contemporary society that what to do for Ben. They are close but they lack love, their love disappears from them love is a natural instinct which is even threatened by normalcy. "It was the strain of it all, watching Ben, watching Amy who was the centre of everything. Her head was too big, her body too squat, but she was full of love and kisses and everyone adored her"(81). Amy is Sarah's daughter who is also ugly child but she is quiet and she stays at a single place, neither she talks very much nor she harms anybody. Amy is also different from the general child though she is center of affection because she does not react any actions in society. Her place does not give any harm to society. But Ben in another side cannot live in the single place quietly. Mostly he brings disorder in society which cannot be expected, so he is center of hatred and condemnation.

David being a father, he has no any love and affection for Ben because he is afraid of norms. He is blind follower of normalcy. He thinks that Ben like child should be outcaste from social territorial:

David added, his voice full of cold dislike for Ben, He's probably just dropped in from Mars. He's going back to report on what he's found down here. He laughed cruelty. He said, no, he's not our child, finally. Well, he certainly is not mine. (90)

Above mentioned David's dialogue with Harriet reflects how David like people can secure the position of power safely even being ready to discard his own child from society. Easily he says that Ben is not our child and he is not his own child. He gives value the social norms by disregarding of his own blood. He tries to rub the blood

relation being afraid the existing power. David is cowardice man even getting a braveries child as his own son. "She could hear yells and shouts coming from inside it and took her to the sofa, where- still holding tight- he said, over and over again, we have to do it, Harriet. We have to "She was weeping with the shock of it". (92) This above narrative line clearly shows that heartless man (David) exercises his power because he is a part of norms of his society. He even forgets that how a mother can stay by losing her son.

He spits over the mother-love and its importance in society. He feels himself joyful by sending Ben in the institution. Displacing Ben's place from the family, there come delightful environment except Harriet:

When the children came home, they were told Ben had gone to stay with some. Four pairs of suspicious, apprehensive eyes became suddenly full of relief. Hysterical relief, the children danced about, unable to help themselves, and then at supper they were over bright, giggling, hysterical. They are full of high spirits, and they kept coming to Harriet with little gift of a sweet or a toy, "This is for you, Mummy." Or they rushed up to kiss her, or stroke her face, or nuzzle to her like happy calves or foals." (92-93)

Above mentioned narrative sentences gives the meaning that normalcy is looking blinding ruled even in the mind of these innocent children who are Ben's own elder brothers and sisters. The contemporary society provides the knowledge of existing norms and makes them conscious from the created line between who is acceptable and who is not acceptable. They are celebrating like they win the match. They have no mind where they are losing their own bloodline but it is not their own fault. It is fault of power, it is blind knowledge of discourse and it is cruel behaviour of

normalcy. If those children are given right lesson of respect, love and affection for Ben, instead of celebrating they might revolt against the society. As a result, they raise the voice for the secure place of Ben in family as well as in society. "The days went by, and normality filled the house" (93).

When they send Ben at the institution, they feel more secure where they become the master of norms. Ben's presence tries to shake their power position but now they are happy because they are successful to outcaste Ben from the society:

Again Harriet was wondering why she was always treated like a criminal. Ever since Ben was born it's been like this, she thought. Now it seemed to her the truth, that everyone had silently condemned her. I have suffered a misfortune, she told herself, I haven't committed a crime. (94)

This above written narrative sentences give the meaning of stigmatization. It is clearly seen that Harriet is treated as a figure of hatred and condemnation because she gives birth to an unusual child, Ben. She thinks herself that Ben's birth has changed her fortune. Her contemporary society is conscious the fact that she does a crime so that she is criminal. Everywhere she is criticized so that she cannot speak confidently. Normalcy is such a product of cruelty and inhuman qualities that can change an innocent mother to a criminal without killing a fly.

When she finds the address of institution where Ben is kept, she determines to go there and back to Ben at home. "She said, already stubborn, 'I'm Mrs. Lovatt and I've come to see my son. It was evident that there were words this institution, whatever it was, did not expect to meet'" (95-96). This narrative extracts reflects clear meaning of subversion of normalcy when Harriet gets the exact place (institution) where Ben is kept, she forgets everything to follow. At the entrance of institution, she

introduces herself boldly though nobody is allowed to meet their ones when she/he was kept inside it. But Harriet breaks every rule and regulation. Love of Ben makes her bold and courageous. "Listen, said Harriet. I don't think you understand. I'm not just going away, you know. I've come to see my son, and that is what I am going to do" (97). Harriet is in hurry to meet her son, Ben because she is losing at him from many days. Harriet knows very well that when she returns back at home with Ben, they do not like her acts and begin to hate.

Inside the institution, Harriet finds Ben in the pathetic situation. Ben is out of conscious state, he is naked and lying at the dirty floor. This institution never treats good behaviour to those abnormal children like Ben. But it suppresses those children. And final every child who is kept inside the institution, meet the pathetic result, death: "She remarked", they were killing him" (104). Harriet returns home with Ben. Everybody in the family becomes centre and begins to thinking what has Harriet done. "Ben's screams and struggling were shaking the house" (105). Absence of Ben in Lovatt family brings happy entertainment because they are all the product of normalcy, they blindly follow existing norms and they have fear to secure their powerful position in their society. But Ben's arrival makes them again to threat over power and discourse. All right, I am a criminal. But they were murdering him" (105). Harriet awakens her family members and relatives who call her a criminal but in reality they are actual criminals which she finds inside the institution. If she does not go in time to institution, she will notice her own son's death pathetically.

Actually contemporary society makes them to discard Ben from the surrounding because they cannot listen to raise any question to their power and truth in society. Society educates them by providing social knowledge that they can fail to

judge any one individually. They have social spectacle, as a result Ben becomes an abnormal child:

That they were going to turn him (Ben) into some well-adjusted member of society and then everything would be lovely? She thought, all right, he was right, and I was wrong. But it's done. She said aloud, all right, but its done'. That's the mot juste, I think. (105-106)

Adjustment is seen as a big issue rather than abnormality of any child in society.

Permission to involvement is controlled by the power in every society. For example, if a white woman in British societies gives birth to a baby whose face is very much similar to a monkey. At this period, Britishers become terrified at looking at monkey's face in child and they begin to hate such child. In that context that baby and mother have to face lots of difficulties for adjustment like in our novel, Ben and Harriet are struggling. But the same case happens in the context of Nepal, Nepalese people do not behave as Britishers do. Because Nepalese people were already introduced with such faced child. Instead of hatred, they worship the baby by providing laddues because his face is similar to one of God, Hanuman. God's power is more over than social power. So, such child can easily adjust in the society in name of god.

Every society has social mechanism which is ruled by norms and values where power is exercised. Social mechanism is found differently in various societies. So every social mechanism has exilement as well as adjustment. Like same monkey faced child has exilement in one case and adjustment in another case.

Likely, if Ben is given a well-adjusted membership of society, every thing will be fine and lovely. In Ben's society Ben like children are not put inside the social mechanism so that he is struggling. In another word social mechanism is itself a

discourse which includes certain truth. And truth is always representational and it can be changed if power changes.

Harriet has only one goal to provide Ben's adjustment in society so that he has to adopt normal behaviours or social skills:

He had unlearned all the basic social skills that it had been so hard to teach him. She talked quietly while he ate. And you behave well and every thing will be all right. You must eat properly. You must use the pot or got to the lavatory. And you mustn't scream and fight. She was not sure he heard her. She repeated it she went on repeating it. (108)

This above narrative sentences show that Harriet tries the best to involve her son, Ben in her society. It is itself challenging task. To teach the normal acts to a abnormal child raises the questions against the contemporary society Ben does not know how to speak, eat and use lavatory and other basic skills. By providing basic skills to Ben, she wants to create a place of adjustment in society. Every society has misconception that unusual child does not have permission to involve in side the normality because these children are powerless. Power always displaces the powerless people's position in the society:

She knew he had become a pet or a mascot for this group of young men. They treated him roughly, it seemed of Harriet, even unkindly, calling him Dopey, Dwarfey, Alien Two, Hobbit and Gremlin. Hey, Dopey, you're in my way. Go and fetch me a cigarette from jack, Hobbit. But he has happy. (114)

This extract clearly shows the wide gap between powerful people and powerless people. Powerless ones are treated as a doll but they are unknown though they feel

happy. This is clearly seen that two types of world within a single society- world of dominated and the world of dominator.

They treat Ben like people by calling different names-names of suppression and names of condemnation. But powerless ones can easily digest and compel to remain peacefully. So, power sweeps someone's heart and love and affection, though they are certain that their power anytime can be collapsed:

Dr. Brett said, Well, Mrs. Lovatt would you say it is untrue? First I must say it is not your fault. And then that it is not uncommon. We cannot choose what will turn up in the lottery and that is what having a body is luckily or unluckily, we can't choose. The first thing you have to do is not blame yourself. (125)

Dr. Brett appears mostly in supporting Harriet from the beginning when he is introduced in the novel. Being doctor he has faced many experiences like Harriet-Ben problem. Everybody blames Harriet of giving birth to Ben. Actually he says that such can happen over any body's life so that it is a common phenomenon. Everybody has desire to stay with healthy and usual child but sometime time beats and our choice can be changed. He even says that giving birth is equal to choosing lottery. We have to endurance power to tackle coming challenges in lives: "Do you want to give you a letter to the zoo, "Put this child in a cage"? or hand him over to science?" (127). Being an unusual child in society, it can seen that he/she can be caged or he/she is given to science experiment department. Ben's precocious behaviours threat to everybody's general lives and some people also think that he is needed to experiment in science lab to find out his extraordinary behaviours. Ben's precocious acts challenge science. "On the doctor's face she saw what she expected: a dark fixed stare that reflected what the woman was feeling, which was horror at the alien, rejection by the normal for

what was outside the human limit. Horror of limit, who had given birth to Ben" (128). This is a part of human limitation for existence in society which gives birth two things: stigmatization and humiliation. Both are directly and indirectly related to discourse of contemporary society. Ben's birth brings horror and threat in Harriet's life. Her expected life cannot move ahead thoroughly. She is mostly haunted by norms and humiliated by own society. But she has power to bear everything at giving place him in society which is itself a part of subversion.

Society itself crests biased environment and later it valuates on side and devaluates another side. "Paul was even more difficult than Ben. But he was a normal 'disturbed' child, not an alien" (129). "He's not learning anything, he's a real mess. He's worse than Ben! At least Ben is what he is, whatever that may be", (130). This above mention narrative clarifies the vision of discourse where power is governing. Paul, Ben's own younger brother, a disturbed child and real mess. Both are staying at the same family but in course of time, one is given place and another is given hell or outcasted from society at calling him abnormal child. That society is exercising power of exilement and adjustment within same family and narrative line clearly shows that Ben is far better than Paul but he is disliked by his own surrounding.

Paul being worse than Ben, he is accepted by the society because he is real mess and he does not act anything that go against society. But in another side, Ben performs the extraordinary acts which are not seen at that \very age. Every acts by Ben raises questions to the contemporary society or tries to subvert the normalcy. Paul is inside normalcy but Ben steps to break norms so that Ben is aliened:

Who had not let Ben be murdered, she defended herself fiercely, in thought, never aloud. By everything they -the society she belonged to stood for, believed in she had no alternative but to bring Ben back from

that place. But because she had, and saved him from murder, she had destroyed her family life. Had harmed her life ... David's ... Luke is Helen's Jane's ... and Paul's, the worst. A scapegoat. She was the scapegoat-Harriet, the destroyer of her family. (140-41).

Harriet saves Ben's life being murdered which gives the meaning of subversion because she is living in society which is another part of normalcy. Normalcy always disfavours to those unacceptable ones from the main stream line. Harriet does her best to link marginalized ones to centre. So, she brings back Ben from the institution. At one side she saves someone's life but the sometime she destroys the family relation. Harriet's three children Luke, Helen and Jane are studying living at their relatives home because they do not find liveable environment at home because of Ben. So, in Harriet's life we find superiority part of saving Ben's life and inferiority part of breaking the norms and values of family and society. So she is a figure of scapegoat in novel. Majority of the society are against Harriet's acts so that they call her destroyer of relation to society: "Now Ben was almost always in his room, like a prisoner" (72).

Because of Ben's strange behaviours, he is become prisoner at his own home. His society cannot judge his different acts and behaviours individually. Ben's own unique identity threats social organization. Then social systems come into indexed by Ben's presence:

When the summer holdings were due, Harriet wrote careful letters to everyone, explaining that Ben was hardly ever in the house. She felt unfaith fall and treacherous doing this: But to who? Some of them came. Not Molly, or Frederick, who did not forgive her for bringing Ben Back; nor would they ever, she knew. (113)

Above mentioned narrative structure represents the meaning of inferiority or insecurity because of the stigmatization. Harriet, a stigmatized character because of her son. She even tells to her relatives to invite them in festival occasion. They are disinterested after Ben's birth in Lovatt's family. As a result, she is making faculty decision for the society but she raises question at the some time, to whom she make to lie? So, this is the undecided period for the protagonist. Harriet has true love for Ben, which is clearly proved: "Angel's children and the Lovatt children knew they would not have company for the holidays because of Ben" (113). During the period of holidays, Ben brings disturbance among the children because these children have negative identity for Ben so that they cannot company for Ben. It is clear cut scene of discourse in the novel. Discourse helps them to create negative feelings for the Ben. so Ben's presence within range of normality, and normality for condemnation.

Society always acts against the Ben's existence because they place him in differently where he can meet his final steps of life. Society practices him discarding from the human world:

Have you known a child like Ben before? Harriet asked. This risked the headmistress saying, "what do you mean, Mrs Lovatt? And in fact Mrs Graves did say, what do you mean, Mrs Lovatt? But quickly, and then, to stop Harriet telling her, She fumbled if with he is hyperactive, perhaps? Of course that is a world that often feel evades the issue. To say a child is hyperactive does not say very much! But he does have this extraordinary energy." (120-21)

Harriet, Ben's own mother, is suppressed by the false ideology. She has fear for the power of society. As a result, she also complains to do what society demands. She question to headmistress about the Ben but Harriet is scolded by her. The

condemnation towards the Harriet's question by headmistress shows the meaning of subversion. Headmistress's such feeling for Ben might be illuminated the line between abnormality and normality. This part represents the submersion of normalcy. She sees the extraordinary every acts of Ben: "Dr. Gilly said, "I'm going to come straight to the point, Mrs Lovatt. The Problems in to with Ben, but with you. You don't like him very much." (124). This is a part of conversation between Dr. Gilly and Harriet where Dr. Gilly makes clear the formation of discourse, it is neither true nor false. True and false is depend on discourse not a individual one.

Ben is not abnormal nor anything else but he is made so by society. Discourse gives birth to the problem so that Ben is the central figure of problem. It is formation which is ruled by power so that it can be reformed. Within the formation of Discourse, Ben like child have no placement so that society dislike to him. Disliking and condemnation are only the sources of problem which is part of discourse. If we look Ben by forgetting all types of formation, everything will be similar what we easily can digest it: "Ben Lovatt is not an academic child, but ... but what?" (144) Ben is slow child at school because he cannot learn as fast as other general child in school. So, it is said that he is not academic child which means he is not fit for learning. This is a part of declaration of discourse for Ben and at the same time there is a another question "who is then Ben?" This sort of question makes conscious over the discourse. It tries to question against the formation of contemporary society. So we understand that Ben's presence gives birth to challenges to society.

Again and again it is seen that whole novel moves around the Ben's presence and Harriet's struggle to secure Ben's life in the contemporary society. And Harriet also loses her identity because of Ben: "Around and around and around: If she had let him die, then all of us, so many people, would have been happy, but I could not do it,

and therefore ..." (157). Harriet is seen at the centre to fix Ben's identity. Once time Ben was sent in institution but later Harriet makes him free and brings him back to house. If she does not bring, he might be disappeared there also. She has clear vision that Ben's presence brings everything imbalance in her family as well as in society but she cannot like outcast Ben. Her every acts always are questionable against contemporary society. She does not let him to die therefore she is becoming far away from her relatives as well as her own husband, David. Harriet's role in the novel is presented quite differently than other characters. So, her acts are called subversive against norms and values. She only understands that social truth makes Ben as an abnormal child. Taking the side of Ben, she wants to break social truth and places Ben in secure position where everybody can love to Ben.

Every society is ruled by fixed discourse which is exercised by authority and power. Anything can be happened in society, sometime it can be bearable and sometime it can not bearable. Behind that, who is responsible:

It would not, could not, be someone in authority who would than have to take responsibility. No school teacher, or doctor, or specialist had been able to say, 'that is what he is': neither could any policeman, or police doctor, or social worker. But suppose one day someone who was amateur of the human condition, perhaps an anthropologist of an unusual kind, actually saw Ben, let's say standing on a street with his notes, or in a police court, and admitted the truth. Admitted curiosity... what then? Could Ben, even now end up sacrificed to science? What would they do with him? Carve him up? Examine those cudgel-like bones of his, those eyes, and find out why his speech was so thick and awkward? (158)

Ben's presence brings lots of questions to the different sectors of contemporary society. Different types of people even fail to say who is Ben then? Here such type of power and discourse come in to threat. School teacher, doctor, policeman and social worker are discourse creator, they have authority. But Ben's identity shakes their discursive power and their responsibility in society come to loose. Ben's presence calls lots of curiosity as well. Science of the contemporary society can be indexed. His eyes, speech are so stick and strict which make imbalance over mechanism of society. It is clearly seen that normalcy appears for discarding Ben's place from his society. Normalcy determines every body's identities.

At this point Lessing tries to show that emptiness in one's life has been caused due to social normalcy. Protagonist, Harriet though she is fit for society by her own self but her son, Ben causes her whole life. Precocious child Ben appears quite different in society and as a result his behaviour and his physical structures lead him to institution. What Ben does in society he does not care about over that but his every acts always raises the question to contemporary society. At the same time, Harriet passes her whole life for bringing Ben into normal world. She is a part of lesson to all mothers as well as human beings who can bring adjustment by challenging the normalcy. In that sense Lessing attempts to subvert the existing social system and create a new kind of normalcy by indexing to the privileged social norms through her novel *The Fifth Child* representing her characters to the different fields of the society in the symbolic form.

IV. Conclusion

As the notion of abnormalcy signifies undersirable side of any member of society in the particular social norms, abnormal or unusual characters are marginalized from the centre of the society. Such characters have extraordinary acts but they are not judged inwardly. Doris Lessing tries to subvert the social normalcy within the existing norms of the society. Contemporary society creates different barriers for such characters and leads them to be stigmatized. Lessing through the central character Ben and his mother, raises questions against the accepted notion of normalcy and seeks to subvert it.

Ben is an unusual child who is mostly remains silent. If he remains free from social guide, mostly he brings social disorder. He is early born new child but in that very age he acts precociously in his society. As a result, society feels threatened and fears to him. He forgets all types of relations, norms and values. By giving birth to Ben, Lessing wants to question against power and social truth which are full of restrictions. At the same time, Lessing introduces another character, Harriet, protagonist of the novel and Ben's mother. Harriet is herself normal and social defined one, but because of Ben she is disrespected and stereotyped. Lessing's Harriet is well introduced by all types of Ben's acts but she mostly remains silent. Her silent is an another way to subversion of normalcy. In this sense both Ben and Harriet are the rebellions of contemporary social norms by saying that one's life should not be judged on the basis of blindly formed social norms. One can feel completeness in living, loving and dying by his/her own ways. So, these determining factors on the basis of the so called social normalcy have been questioned by Lessing. Her protagonist brings her firth child from institution and tries her best to secure his existence in society.

The whole novel moves around Ben and Ben's presence shakes the relation in family as well as in society. And it is true that all types of relations are ruled by power and discourse. Because of Ben, Lessing has been creating new kind of norms not only in the subject matter but in structure too. Inside the novel, it is said that Ben comes from mars and he comes to fight in this world. From this point of view it is clearly seen that Ben is a subvertor of existing normalcy. Ben not only acts but his outer structure also creates fear to the contemporary society. The theme, structure, message, characters, everywhere a subversion of normalcy can be sensed.

Characters with so-called abnormality are fundamentally isolated and are seen as an invisible social group who face all types of restrictions and limitations and, they suffer the long history of unequal treatment. But Lessing shows that this occurs due to stereotypes and prejudices that undermine the capacity to participate in the social scenario. In short, the domination by norm should be challenged to acquire the real identity in the society.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. New Delhi: Harcourt, 2001.
- Blanchot, Maurice. "The Essential Solitude": *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Eds. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searl. Florida: Florida State University Press, 1983.
- Coleman, L.M. *The Dilemma of Difference: A Multicultural View of Stigma*. New York: Plenum, 1986. 59-76.
- Davis, L.J. *The Disability Studies: Constructing Normalcy*. London and New York: Verso, 1949.
- . *Enforcing Normalcy*. London: Verso Press, 1995.
- Doermer, K. *Mad Men and the Bourgeoisie*. 1969. London: Blackwell, 1981.
- Foucault, M. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception*. New York: Vintage, 1975..
- . *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House, 1979
- . *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1. New York: Vintage, 1980.
- . *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Pantheon, 1961.
- Goffman, E. *Asylums*. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1961.
- . *Stigma: Notes on Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1963.
- Lessing, Doris. *The Fifth Child*. London: Flamingo Press, 1988.
- Winzer, Margret A. *The History of Special Education: From Isolation to Integration*. Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press, 1993.